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ABSTRACT

Many institutions are becoming more cognizant of preparing students for global leadership through measures such as service-learning and community service. Colby and her colleagues (2003) suggest that institutions should guide students to believe that they are members of a shared social structure. Black students are a group whose civic participation has sharply declined between the 1970s and 1990s (Putnam, 2000) when 50 years ago they were one of the most active civic groups (Davis, 1993).

This exploratory study investigated the relationships between Black students’ citizenship perspectives and independent variables such as institution type, racial identity, gender, classification, major, age, and socioeconomic status (SES). This research included a total sample of 379 Black students who attended, one of four universities. These were, according to the Carnegie classifications: (1) a large public master’s college and university I, predominantly White institution (PWI) in the South; (2) a large public master’s college and university I, historically Black institution (HBI) in the South; (3) a large public doctoral-extensive, PWI in the South; or (4) a large public doctoral-extensive, HBI in the South. Students took two surveys, the Revised Service Experience (RSE) survey and the Black racial identity scale (B-RIAS).

This exploratory factor analysis study combined elements of citizenship related to values, knowledge, skills, efficacy, and commitment (Eyler & Giles, 1999) to create factors. After ensuring that the factors held meaning, they were used as dependent variables. The Black racial identity stages (Helms & Parham, 1985), which is the extent to which Blacks identify with other Blacks, were utilized as independent variables, along with institution type, major, age, gender,
classification, and SES for subsequent regression models to explore the relationships to the citizenship factors.

Results show that seven factors underlie the RSE, while three factors underlie the B-RIAS. Regression results indicate that Black students who possess higher racial identity stages score significantly higher on some civic measures than those Black students who possessed lower racial identity attitudes. Women scored significantly higher on some civic measures than men. Also, students who belong to a hard-science major scored significantly lower on some civic measures than students who belonged to soft-science majors.
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

The concept of citizenship influences many facets of higher education institutions. Mission statements, pedagogies, curricula, and research can transform campus communities through messages and images of citizenship principles such as honesty, acceptance, and civic duty (Bringle, Games, & Malloy, 1999). This idea involves community-building outside of the university which includes but is not limited to working with, preserving, and establishing closer community relationships (Bringle et. al, 1999; Maurrasse, 2001). This idea also involves institutions making a commitment to develop students’ sense of responsible citizenship as many of these college students will be leaders of civic society and they will provide models of leadership for the citizenry.

This study explored the relationships of some civic dynamics of Black college students. Black students belong to a unique race with respect to citizenship in the United States. Citizenship was a concept very much rooted in the Black community during and before the Civil Rights generation, but has since been overshadowed by materialism and individualism, particularly with Black youths (Kitwana, 2002). This exploratory study combines two instruments to ascertain the relationships between some citizenship and citizenship-related concepts of Black college students.

Citizenship

Boyte and Kari (2000) posit that there are two prevailing conceptions of citizenship: the government-centered approach and the shared values and strong communities approach. The government-centered approach states that individuals have guaranteed rights under law and also have duties, privileges, and responsibilities as citizens such as paying taxes, voting, obeying the law, and serving in the armed forces when called upon. The shared values and strong
communities approach promotes the importance of character. Precepts of this approach are personal responsibility and concern for others. In addition, mutual regard, understanding difference, and the pursuit of common good are associated with the shared value perspective.

The shared values and strong communities approach is one that higher education is currently emphasizing through activities such as community service and service-learning. These efforts engage students in order to help them become civically responsible citizens. One characteristic of responsible citizens is that they perceive themselves as members of a shared social structure (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2003). Eyler and Giles (1999) also suggest that the civically responsible should embody certain values, knowledge bases, skills, commitments, and be efficacious for effective participation. As institutions are forming strategies to foster citizenship, these elements of citizenship may provide a model and reference points for institutions with which to work.

Higher Education’s Role

As it once was the focus in the colonial colleges in the seventeenth century, preparing students for responsible citizenship is again becoming a priority at many colleges and universities today (Astin, 2000; Boyer, 1990; Checkoway, 2001). This objective lies within a larger concern of many educators that American society has become civically disengaged, and students are entering the academic environment with characteristics reflective of such disengagement (Astin, 1999; Boyer; Checkoway; Colby et al., 2003). The purpose of this research was to document characteristics that influence students’ sense of citizenship. More specifically, this study investigated what characteristics influence Black students’ perspectives of citizenship.
Many higher education institutions once emphasized citizenship. Some higher education institutions veered away from emphasizing citizenship when research became a focal point in the 1940s (Boyer, 1990). Scholars and educators believe that higher education institutions have the intellectual and professional resources to address the civic disconnect, and help students cultivate their civic responsibility in ways that will positively translate into their respective domicile environments (Boyer; Hollander, 1999). Some colleges and universities have already instituted curricular and co-curricular activities to foster students’ sense of civic responsibility such as value education courses, community service requirements, service-learning, and capstone courses for seniors (Thomas, 2000). Checkoway (2001) deems this approach as Education for Citizenship, which helps develop students’ knowledge for the improvement of society and prepares them for participation in a diverse democracy.

Black Students and Citizenship

Black students belong to a unique culture within the democratic and citizenship context in the United States. From 1661 to 1865, Black people were not considered citizens of the United States nor were they granted full rights of the Constitution (Blackwell, 1975). Even after 1865 Black people had to challenge the American courts to be granted full rights guaranteed under the Constitution (Franklin & Moss, 2000). The Civil Rights movement, which includes the fight against segregation, was the impetus for Black people gaining full rights as citizens under the Constitution (Kluger, 1975).

During segregation, Black people were forced to create their own institutions of religion, government, education, recreation, and economics (Blackwell). The Black community was close and civic participation was active. For example, the YMCA, Boys Clubs, and other organizations were founded by Black middle-class men for mainly lower-class boys whose level
of esteem was of particular interest because they were perceived as the potential bread winners (Davis, 1993). After segregation, the Black community changed. Affluent Blacks moved from non-affluent Blacks and took their churches and organizations with them (Davis).

Today’s Black youths are a generation removed from segregation, and Kitwana (2002) believes that they do not understand the concept of community in the same ways as did the previous generation. Many of today’s Black students in college were born after 1965, which is when Black people were again granted full rights of the Constitution, and the Civil Rights Act of 1965 was passed, which abolished literacy tests as requirements for voting (Blackwell, 1975). Many Black people continued to be discriminated against after 1965, but the Civil Rights movement had already dissipated and some Black people were content with the social climate because integration, Affirmative Action, and Civil Rights were won (Franklin & Moss, 2000). Ironically, this was also the period when American society became disengaged in general by nature of decreasing participation in civic organizations, and increasing interests in acquiring material items (Putnam, 2000).

Today’s Black youths’ worldview has been influenced by globalization, popular culture, mistrust of the government, public policies that adversely affect Black people, and shifts in quality of life (Kitwana, 2002). Kitwana posits that many Black youth are characterized as individualists who value material wealth over community responsibility. He particularly finds problematic the ways in which Black youths use popular culture such as pop film and music to “strengthen associations between Blackness and poverty, while celebrating anti-intellectualism, ignorance, irresponsible parenthood, and criminal lifestyles” (p. xxi). The above-mentioned dynamics affect how some Black youths perceive their role as responsible citizens to some
degree. If some societal phenomena have blocked their vision of citizenship then they may not truly understand their power to shape the world in civic ways.

Black youths not only have perceptions about how they see the world, but they also have perceptions about other Black people, hence, racial identity. Black racial identity explains the extent to which people who consider themselves Black identify, or do not identify, with other Blacks (Helms, 1990). This racial identity model purports that Black people progress through different stages: pre-encounter, encounter, immersion-emersion, and internalization. Pre-encounter is characterized as glorifying White standards and devaluing one’s own racial group. Encounter is characterized as ambivalence and confusion about one’s commitment to the Black race. Immersion is characterized as one adopting an idealized perception about Blacks and maintaining negative perceptions about Whites. Blacks feeling a sense of solidarity and well being in the presence of other Blacks characterizes emersion. Internalization is characterized by Blacks positively committing to and accepting the Black race as well as other cultures. (Cross, 1991).

This study was conducted with the intent of utilizing the Black racial identity model to provide insight about the civic orientation of some Black students. Specifically, I thought the model could provide information about the relationships between racial identity and some citizenship measures. Given the racial identity model, it could be posited that higher education would ultimately prefer to have Black students as internalized in their racial identity. An internalized racial identity, within a citizenship context, may signify that Black students would be coalition builders and be committed to civic involvement that helps all people. Conversely, a pre-encounter racial identity could signify that Black students may not be involved in civic
activities, and if they were, their involvement may be in organizations that have historically underrepresented and/or oppressed minorities.

There are many approaches that universities can adopt to foster citizenship principles. All students will be affected by an Education for Citizenship approach (Checkoway, 2001); however, this research project focused on Black college students and some of their characteristics that may influence their sense of citizenship. Today’s Black students will be leaders of tomorrow, and some of today’s Black college students will provide leadership to communities upon their graduating or leaving the university community. The extent to which these Black students’ educational environment prepares them for responsible citizenship will affect the ways in which they will become engaged in civic type activities: voting, mentoring, volunteering, involvement in public affairs, and working with those far different from themselves (Astin, 1999; Colby et al., 2003).

Different College Environments

Research is well documented about the extent to which different university environments affect Black students. HBCUs and PWIs have different missions and therefore offer different types of experiences for Black students (Allen, 1992). Black students have been found to have distinct socializing experiences at HBCUs versus PWIs (Allen; Fleming, 1984). Specifically, research has shown that undergraduate experiences affect the moral judgment and future involvement of civic and political participation (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). The current movement to foster citizenship is not limited to any specific type of institution but rather is expanded across all types of institutions (Zlotkowsk, 1998). However, there is a void in the research about how PWIs and HBCUs affect Black students’ sense of responsible citizenship.
Problem Statement

Many higher education institutions are developing their role as community leaders by preparing their students for responsible citizenship through curricular and co-curricular activities such as service-learning and community service. Institutions have committed themselves to fostering citizenship in students, and each type of institution may have distinct civic educational approaches to students. HBCUs and PWIs have been shown to affect Black student differently. Therefore, these institutions may affect these students’ community perspectives and leadership traits that are critical to performing citizenship duties. If it can be determined which citizenship characteristics can be attributed to institutional type then those unique dynamics associated with each could be shared with the academic community, thus enhancing the civic education literature.

Education for citizenship is of importance to Black students because college-educated Blacks had the sharpest decline in civic participation between the 1970s and the 1990s (Putnam, 2000). By exploring the differences between Black students at PWIs and HBCUs, this research provided useful information about citizenship perspectives of Black students, which could eventually lead to developing citizenship models for other segments of the university population. This research has implications for student affairs professionals who design programs for students, as well as for those in academic affairs when conversations occur about expanding citizenship dynamics in curricula.

Need for Study

Putnam (2000) found that college-educated Black people had the sharpest drop of participation in civic activities when compared to non-educated Blacks and educated and non-educated Whites. Today’s Black students are perceived to be individualistic and apathetic
towards community and civic issues (Kitwana, 2002). There is a void in research about citizenship dynamics of Black students. This study provided useful information about the civic orientation of Black students and may lead to contributions for developing Black students and other student groups in civic ways.

Also, the use of the racial identity model revealed information about how Black students associate or identify with other Blacks. By exploring the racial identity model as it relates to citizenship, this research showed some potentially powerful relationships between racial identity and measures of citizenship. It further illustrated the extent to which institution type may affect the level of racial identity.

There are no studies that address the characteristics that may affect citizenship dynamics of Black students which include independent variables such as institution type, racial identity, socioeconomic status, gender, major, and age. No studies have created citizenship factors, nor investigated the relationship between the above-mentioned independent variables. The information yielded from this dissertation could stimulate additional research in the field, provide programmatic insights about ways to help Black students become more civically responsible, and provide information about the campus experiences of Black students.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this research was to conduct an exploratory study about the relationship of the independent variables institutional type, gender, socioeconomic status, major, age, and racial identity stages to citizenship measures such as values, skills, attitudes, and understanding among Black students at PWIs and HBCUs. Another purpose of this study was to build upon the Service Experience (SE) instrument and make it a better measure of citizenship elements.
The research utilized the SE survey and the Black Racial Identity Scale (B-RIAS) instruments for the study. The SE was used to derive factors through factor analysis. These factors served as dependent variables for subsequent regression analyses. The B-RIAS measured racial identity stages, which served as an independent variable in the study.

Research Questions

The following research question guided this study:

1. What is the factorial structure of the Service Experience (SE) instrument?
2. What is the factorial structure of the Black Racial Identity Scale (B-RIAS)?
3. How will racial identity, institution type, gender, major, age, and socioeconomic status predict citizenship factors?
4. Are independent variables significant when controlling for institution type?

Definition of Terms

Responsible citizenship- when people “see themselves as members of a community, as individuals with a responsibility to contribute to their communities” (Colby et. al, 2003, p. 7)

Citizenship Measures- concepts such as values, skills, attitudes, and understanding that are measured by the Service Experience Survey (Eyler & Giles, 1999)

Black college students- Black students who are currently enrolled in a university and who consider themselves as African-American, Negro, or of African descent.

Service Experience Survey (SE)- 105 likert scale itemed instrument that has been reduced to 43 items and measures citizenship measures such as values, skills, attitudes, and understanding (Eyler and Giles, 1999).

Black Racial Identity Scale (RIAS)- 30-item inventory used to measure how Black people measure their racial identity (Helms & Parham, 1985).
CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter is a review of the literature that encompasses the key concepts of this dissertation. The first section will discuss the role that higher education plays in fostering citizenship. The next section will discuss the two prevailing conceptions of citizenship, the government-centered and the shared values and communities approach. The third section will discuss how Black people’s existence in the United States has historically been related to the prevailing definitions of citizenship. The fourth section will discuss Black college students and social phenomena that have affected their citizenship development. This chapter will conclude with a section that describes and justifies the independent variables utilized in this study.

Roles and Challenges for Higher Education

This section will discuss the current roles and challenges of higher education with respect to preparing students for responsible citizenship. It will also illustrate the current civic disengagement in society that has led the higher education community to place more emphasis on responsible citizenship. Last, this section will show how emphasizing civic responsibility enhances the mission of higher education and list some actions that can promote civic engagement of students.

In the United States, many campuses have increasing interests in preparing students for active participation in a diverse democracy, developing students’ knowledge for community improvement, and having students think about the public dimensions of educational work (Checkoway, 2001). Astin (1999) adds “the leadership development challenge for higher education is to empower students, to help them realize that they can make a difference, and to develop those special talents and attitudes that will enable them to become effective social change agents” (p. 42). The above-mentioned scholars’ ideas are in response to civic challenges
pertaining to students and society in general that have been recently debated across scholarly circles. More specifically, American society has become civically disengaged and many scholars believe higher education has the capacity and resources to address these issues through scholarship, facilities, and curricula that could facilitate the development of civic leaders.

The circumstances that surround voting among youth and college students have raised concerns of many educators. Some think the state of American democracy is in jeopardy because, among youth, voter registration continually declines while cynicism about political life increases (Astin, 1999; Boyte & Kari, 2000; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Hollander, 1999). Since 1960, the percentage of eligible voters who voted has declined. In fact, in 1960, 63 percent of vote-eligible Americans voted while only 55 percent of vote-eligible people did so in 1988 (Miller & Shanks, 1996). Sax (2000) notes that in 1996 only 32 percent of people 18-24 voted compared to 50.9 percent in 1964; and she also adds “while voter turnout has also declined in the general population, the proportionate decline for the 18 to 24 age group is 50 percent larger than that of all registered voters” (p. 6). Checkoway (2001) writes that “studies show that the interest of entering undergraduate students in political participation is at an all-time low and that their interest actually declines during the college years” (p.127). The decrease in and negative attitudes about the political system and political participation among students is just one concern of educators.

Another disengaging phenomenon associated with contemporary American culture is excessive individualism. The disposition toward individualism may have begun around the 1960s. During this time many civic organizations were formed and their memberships steadily increased (Putnam, 2000). However, the quickly growing economy allowed people to invest more in physical resources which eventually led to disinvestments in civic engagement. The
median family income rose from $14,000 to $28,000 (in 1984 dollars) between 1947 and 1973, but then declined to $26,433 in 1984 (Shudson, 1998) and continued to decline until the mid 1990s (Putnam). People had less purchasing power, which may have caused some to focus more on attaining quality of life factors that they once enjoyed rather than engaging in civic activities.

Lerner (1999) contends that the motivation of money has caused people to become more individualistic, and these messages are prevalent in the workplace. Phrases such as, “look out for number one,” “take care of yourself,” and “you are all alone in this society” are all promulgated in the workplace (Lerner, p. 67). Lerner believes that the pervasive ultimatum that one has to generate money and power for himself/herself, the boss, or the institution or else he/she will be dismissed from the job is a reality that many employees confront.

A work environment such as this has tremendous implications for responsible citizenship. The habits and attitudes people develop in the workplace are brought into their home environments where other people are also affected. As Lerner notes, people in American society have come to “look at people and wonder ‘What can I get from you?’ ‘How can I use you for advancing myself?’ As these attitudes are inevitably brought home from the world of work, you find a rip-off consciousness that permeates the entire society” (p. 68). Lerner also adds that “this marketplace mentality in relationships results in short encounters that are hurtful, disappointing, and lead people to build deep resistances to each other and to feel more scared and alone” (p. 70).

The commodification of relationships (Lerner, 1999) has caused individuals to focus more attention on acquiring resources for themselves, which leaves less time to focus on responsible citizenship and addressing social problems. Because less attention has been given to addressing social problems, the younger generations are facing extremely difficult and
challenging issues. Eberly (1994) adds that Americans have become selfish and shortsighted by being obsessed with rights and entitlements; the public debate has become angrier; individuals are treating others less respectfully than when they grew up; and concepts such as civility and manners have weakened.

Of course, the decline in civic responsibility is not limited to the younger generations, but also includes older generations. Shudson (1998) provides evidence of what he calls the collapse of civic life, which includes the decline of political parties, the dwindling of newspaper readership, disappearing trust in government and nearly all other major institutions, shrinking voter turnout, citizens’ paltry knowledge of national and international affairs, and the fear of street crime that keeps people behind their locked doors (p. 295). West (1999) believes that “many Americans are concerned more about the low quality of their lives, the constant fear of violent assault and cruel insult, the mean spiritedness and coldheartedness of social life, and the inability to experience deep levels of intimacy” (p. 10). He insists that these are the signs of a culturally decadent civilization, which is experiencing an erosion of systems of nurturing and caring.

The civic decline runs across all socioeconomic levels. Class differences are clearly evident when observing the amount of resources that one has. However, people who belong to all classes are showing signs of individualism. Bellah (1999) states that the family, religious, and community institutions are weakened among the lower class, but for reasons far different from those who belong to higher socioeconomic classes. Wealthier people are becoming more individualistic and their social institutions are weaker because of individual competition. However, the weakening of social institutions exists among the people who belong to lower
classes because they are so concerned with daily survival that civic responsibility becomes secondary at best.

The civic disengagement has caused many in higher education to think about how civic responsibility of the university community could be enhanced. Higher education is an appropriate venue to facilitate civic engagement because the original mission of America’s first higher education institutions, the colonial colleges, was to train privileged and mostly white male students for religious and civic leadership in the seventeenth century (Boyer, 1990). In addition, colleges and universities have many intellectual and professional resources to provide education, multiple insights, and create experiences that center around civic engagement (Hollander, 1999). Lastly, Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) found that the undergraduate experience has a significant socializing effect on political beliefs, maturity of moral judgment, racial and religious tolerance, and civic and political participation.

More emphasis on civic engagement also fosters a positive image of higher education, an image recovering from negative perception, particularly during the 1980s. Thomas (2000) asserts that there was cynicism and public disenchantment of nearly all governmental activities in the 1980s, and higher education was no exception. Higher education was charged with “maintaining ‘Ivory Tower’ aloofness and indifference; producing abstract research unconnected to real-life problems; abandoning the humanities, the classics, and ‘core’ curriculum; and for producing poorly educated students who are not only unprepared for work life but who also have no ‘souls’” (Thomas, 2000, p. 62). Boyer (1996) adds that during this time he perceived higher education as having evolved into a private benefit instead of a public good, and an enterprise that did not address the civic, moral, economic, and social problems of society.
Persons of the higher education community thought about higher education’s image, which led to a reconceptualization about the ways in which students learn in the university environment. Thomas (2000) posits that many of the new approaches were manifested through curricular and co-curricular activities. She adds that institutions responded by “expanding values education courses, interdisciplinary curricula, first-year programs, and capstone courses for graduating seniors; restoring required ethics and philosophy courses; examining the ‘core curriculum’; establishing community service requirements for students; and incorporating service-learning in isolated courses” (Thomas, p. 62).

This movement was within a learning approach, which Checkoway (2001) deems “Education for Citizenship.” Checkoway suggests that education for citizenship entails preparing students for participation in a diverse democracy and helping them develop knowledge for the improvement of society. He adds that this learning approach is challenging because people share different social and cultural characteristics, and asserts that a successfully functioning democracy will be contingent upon students being prepared to “understand their own identities, communicate with people who are different from themselves, and build bridges across cultural differences in the transition to a more diverse society” (p. 127).

In summary, higher education is placing more emphasis on developing undergraduate students for responsible citizenship. This is needed because college students are voting less, participating less in political and civic organizations, and are growing up in an individualistic society. Many scholars and researchers believe that higher education institutions are appropriate venues to address civic engagement because their mission once emphasized it, higher education has the professional and intellectual resources to facilitate civic engagement, and emphasizing civic engagement promotes a positive image for higher education. Some institutions have
incorporated learning approaches such as service-learning, community service, and ethics and philosophy courses in response to some factors of disengagement of students.

Citizenship

This section will discuss the two prevailing conceptions of citizenship, the government-centered approach and the shared values and community approach. The definitions will be provided, while more emphasis will be given to the shared values and community approach because most approaches higher education has adopted parallel this approach. In addition, most citizenship definitions are subsumed under the shared values and community approach. Lastly, this section will briefly discuss how the concept of citizenship has evolved in the United States.

Boyte and Kari (2000) state that there are two prevailing conceptions of citizenship in the United States: (1) the government-centered approach and (2) the shared values and strong communities approach (p. 40-41). The government-centered approach maintains that citizens are individuals who are guaranteed rights under law. Boyte and Kari note that this perspective has implications for the right to protection from unwarranted interference, harassment, or unjust imprisonment. Voting, tax paying, obeying the law, responding to civic tasks such as service in the armed forces during a national crisis, and jury duty are among some duties of citizens. The shared values and strong communities approach stresses a balance between responsibilities and individual rights. Important outcomes are responsibility, mutual regard, and understanding difference. Also, this perspective espouses that the overall goal of politics should be to pursue the common good, and it stresses character education (Boyte & Kari).

Most of the conceptions of citizenship that exist in the academic literature fall under the government-centered or the shared values and communities perspective. My research perceives the government-centered perspective as a vertical structure because the tenets are those that the
government creates and implements for citizens such as voting and tax paying. Citizens could face legal consequences if they chose to forgo some government mandated activities such as paying taxes, refusing to participate in the armed services if called upon, or violating someone’s constitutional rights. My research perceives the shared values and communities approach as a horizontal structure because no citizen is required to engage in this idea. Citizens choose to respect others’ differences and have mutual regard for one another. If they choose not to engage in this approach, then the consequences are social rather than legal.

Most of the citizenship definitions in the literature encapsulate the shared values and community approach perspective. However there are some that parallel the government-centered perspective. For example, Glenn (2002) notes “at the most general level, citizenship refers to full membership in the community in which one lives” (p. 19). Kettner (1978) believes that the concept of citizenship evolved into a universal status where all in the community have identical rights and duties regardless of their characteristics. In this sense, it is important to note that “community is defined less by geography and more in terms of commonality of interests among like-minded people whose membership in organization is temporary and fluid” (Ravitch & Viteritti, 2001, p. 2). Some definitions of citizenship in the literature were reduced to simply mean voting which is government-centered, but Joyce (1994) warns the “citizenship-as-voting notion” could produce an impoverished understanding of what citizenship truly is. Batsone and Mendieta (1999) write that the idea of citizenship goes beyond voting, and is more aligned with the shared values and community perspective, which “stands for the autonomy, self-legislation, and sense of civic solidarity that members of a group extend to one another” (p. 3).

Other definitions of citizenship which encapsulate the shared values and strong communities approach illustrate the idea of actively participating in one’s community. Joyce
(1994) asserts that citizenship is the “active participation in that vast realm of human affairs known as civil society” (p. 4), and describes civil society is described as “all the institutions through which individuals express their interests and values, outside of and distinct from government” (Joyce, p. 4). Active participation in a civil society includes acquiring private property, earning a living, holding a job, and activities in the marketplace. Active participation also includes the dedication and commitments members of society make to their families, schools, churches, clubs, and voluntary and neighborhood associations (Joyce).

Another concept within the shared values and communities perspective, which is the main focus of this paper, is the idea of responsible citizenship. Eberly (1994) believes that a responsible citizen is one that is socially engaged. Colby et al (2003) note that viewing oneself as a member of a shared social structure is a major responsibility of the engaged citizen. They write that trustworthiness, fairness, honesty, and fostering fair dealing are essential to being an engaged participant. They further add that:

“fully effective citizenship requires a well-developed capacity for effective communication, including moral and political discourse; skills in political participation; the capacity to work effectively with people, including those who are different from oneself; and the ability to organize other people for action” (Colby et al, p. 100).

Eyler and Giles (1999) believe that there are five elements of citizenship that one should embody for social responsibility and effective participation (p. 156):

1. Values- having a feeling of social responsibility
2. Knowledge- the expertise and cognitive capacity to make intelligent decisions
3. Skills- practical and interpersonal skills for community organizing
4. Efficacy- the belief that one’s skills will make a difference
5. Commitment- the dedication to engaging in community work

The two prevailing perspectives of citizenship have evolved tremendously. The citizenship definition was once reduced to connote White males in the American historical context in the eighteenth and nineteenth century (Glenn, 2002). Glenn states that “before the late nineteenth century, women, children, and servants were not considered full members of the political community; and full citizenship-legal adulthood, suffrage, and participation governance- was restricted to free white males” (p. 19). Citizens were perceived by society as independent or dependent. Glenn notes that those who were independent did not need to be controlled, but to the contrary, those who were dependent needed to be controlled and governed. During the eighteenth and nineteenth century, all people of color and women were dependent and most white males were independent (Glenn). Now, however, higher education institutions are attempting to develop students as citizens such that their behaviors and perceptions will translate into more egalitarian outcomes and worldviews than did the traditional conception of citizenship.

In summary, the government-centered and shared values and community approaches are the prevailing conceptions of citizenship in the United States. The government-centered idea is a vertical model because the various parts depend on the government whose laws legally govern society. The shared values and community approach is more of a horizontal model because citizens choose to involve themselves in community matters. Within this model are the ideas of responsible citizenship which imply people viewing themselves as members of a shared social structure.

The current ideas of citizenship have evolved from viewing citizenship as specifically voting. The current ideas have also evolved from perceiving citizenship as solely White male.
Other minorities groups have eventually been recognized as full citizens of the United States. This research focuses on Black students whose overall Black community’s battle for citizenship encompasses both prevailing perspectives of citizenship.

Black People and Citizenship in the United States

This section will discuss Black people’s role as it relates to the government-centered and shared values and community approaches to citizenship. This section will give a brief summary of various stages of Black people’s existence in the United States, and show how many Blacks were not fully included within the government-centered approach of citizenship and as a result they placed more emphasis on the shared values and community approach to cope with government intervention. This section will conclude with documenting the changing of values within the Black community, while showing how the shared values and community approach has dissipated.

The government-centered perspective of citizenship guarantees individual rights under the laws that govern a particular society; and the shared values and community perspective stresses responsibilities, mutual regard, and understanding difference. Black people have gone through various phases throughout history, and even within the scope of the United States Constitution. The history of these particular phases illustrates how the government-centered and shared values and community perspective of citizenship intersected with respect to Black people’s experiences in America. Slavery, abolition, reconstruction, segregation, and Civil Rights were all activist approaches that affected many Black people’s position within the two prevailing conceptions of citizenship.

Slavery
Slavery was first acknowledged legally in 1661 by nature of a statute of recognition in Virginia (Franklin & Moss, 2000). This statute “established a precedent for subsequent legislation enacted in most other colonies” (Blackwell, 1975, p. 6). Whites viewed the enslaved people as prized property not worthy of being deemed human, which justified maltreatment such as extreme brutality, sexual exploitation, and physical assault (Blackwell). Blumberg (1991) posits that many Whites justified slavery by constructing a biological inferiority theory based on color, and they believed that it was their Christian duty to take what they perceived as savage Black people and show them different ways of living. Slavery legally lasted from 1661-1865, but the first legal challenge of slavery happened in 1857 when Dred Scott, a Missouri slave whose master had taken him to live free in Illinois, sued for his freedom upon returning to Missouri. The Supreme Court ruled that Dred Scott could not sue for freedom because he was not a citizen (Franklin & Moss, 2000).

While the Dred Scott case was the first legal challenge of individual rights for Black people, other Black people and White people organized and protested in ways that embodied the shared values and communities perspective of citizenship. Slave revolts by Garbriel in 1800, Denmark Vesey in 1822, and Nat Turner in 1831 illustrated the commitment by some Black people to fight for individual rights and help others to become sensitive to Black people’s struggle (Blumberg, 1991). Strong antislavery movements originated in the Northern states, in 1831, were organized by some Blacks such as Frederick Douglass and Sojourner Truth, and some White merchants, religious leaders, and others who belonged to anti-slavery societies (Franklin & Moss, 2000). The antislavery societies marked the first recognized movement of organizations that advocated individual rights and inclusion of Black people.
Eventually, the pressure from Northern states to abolish slavery was mounting, particularly when Abraham Lincoln took office in 1861. Southern states began seceding from the Union because of the North’s anti-slavery sentiments, which was when the Civil War began (Franklin & Moss, 2000). The Civil War was originally thought by Northern Whites as a fight to save the Union, but when Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation on January 1, 1863, which legally freed all slaves, many Northern Whites and soldiers “felt that the war was no longer to save the Union but to free the slaves, and some soldiers resigned rather than participate in such a struggle” (Franklin & Moss). Nonetheless, the Confederate army surrendered in 1865 and the enslaved people were ever more free from bondage.

**Reconstruction**

The Radical Reconstruction period (1867-1877) was a time that America was attempting to re-connect the Southern and Northern states, restore the economy in the South which was previously based on free labor, integrate almost four million newly freed slaves, and continue building America as it rapidly expanded to the West (Franklin & Moss, 2000). Black men were allowed to vote and participate in the political process by nature of the 15th amendment that was passed in 1870, and federal troops were sent to the South to maintain order and to oversee the new laws that were implemented (Blackwell, 1975). The Civil Rights Act of 1875 guaranteed rights and access to government and facilities to all persons regardless of color (Franklin & Moss). Blacks began to serve in legislatures in Louisiana, Georgia, Florida, the Carolinas, as well as other states. In fact, between 1869 and 1901, there were two Black senators and twenty Black members of the House of Representative of the United States Congress (Franklin & Moss).
However, within this time period, Southern Whites also devised a way to control Black people and “ensure their role as a laboring force in the South” (Franklin & Moss, 2000, p. 250) by way of Black Codes. These laws limited the areas in which Blacks could own property, imposed heavy penalties for vagrancy (which forced all Blacks to work), arrested Blacks if they quit their jobs, prevented Black from testifying in court, and imposed fines “for seditious speeches, insulting gestures or acts, absence from work, violating curfew, and the possession of firearms” (Franklin & Moss, p. 251). Hence, there was a contradiction between state and federal law. Federal law freed Black people and allowed them equal rights under the constitution; but various state laws prevented Black people from exercising federal laws.

States rights that disenfranchised Black people became more evident in 1877. Rutherford B. Hayes was running for President, and he promised the Southern states that if elected he would remove the federal troops and help the Southern states reestablish home rule (Blackwell, 1975; Franklin & Moss, 2000). Hayes eventually won the election and the federal troops were withdrawn. Blackwell lists some forms of disenfranchising that were immediately assumed in the South:

1. Blacks were not permitted to vote in many places following changes in state constitutions.
2. The Enforcement Act of 1870 and the Civil Rights Act of 1875 were declared unconstitutional, both of which had protected the principle of universal suffrage.
3. A poll tax was required for Blacks to vote.
4. Literacy tests demanded that potential voters be able to read and write.
5. Gerrymandering redrew voting district lines that did not include large Black populations.
6. Violence by the Ku Klux Klan (KKK) became prevalent (p. 194).
Blumberg (1991) notes that there were inordinate amounts of lynchings during this time. In the late 1880s and early 1890s there was an average of 150 lynchings per year.

**Segregation**

Citizenship status for Blacks worsened after 1877. As America continued building, Black people were continually treated as inferior and this treatment was manifested in laws and practices that segregated Blacks from Whites. The Supreme Court ruling of Plessy vs. Ferguson in 1896 legalized segregation when Homer Plessy contested a fine for sitting in a “Whites only” section of a train (Blackwell, 1975). Segregation practices continued legally for over a half-century. Black people were banned from White restaurants, theaters, hotels, stores, and barbershops (Franklin & Moss, 2000). Separate schools were created and Black students often inherited deteriorating schools that were often overcrowded. Blackwell notes that some Black students had to walk 15-20 miles to schools while buses of White children often passed them.

**Civil Rights**

The Civil Rights movement was a response to the inequities that were pervasive throughout the United States. Civil rights organizations sought “equality, appropriate rewards, and access to the shared values of the nation whether in housing, jobs, income, voting rights, political offices, good medical care and health services, schools, and protection from crime” (Blackwell, 1975, p. 2). One of the first was the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) which was started in 1909, and whose purpose was to “use investigation, education, litigation, lobbying, and publicity to seek federal action against lynching and other abuses” (Blumberg, 1991, p. 22).

The NAACP was instrumental in leading one of the most monumental legal campaigns for Black people in United States’ history. In 1954 the United States Supreme Court in Brown v.
Board of Education declared that segregation of Black and White children was unconstitutional (Kluger, 1975). Blackwell (1975) asserts that “for the first time many Black people had a spark of hope that first-class citizenship was a possibility” (p. 104). However, many Whites were resistant to the Supreme Court decision. Whites immediately began to threaten Blacks and White sympathizers; violence increased against integrationists and their property; some schools closed to prevent segregation; and some states used funds to establish private schools for Whites (Blackwell; Franklin & Moss, 2000).

Many Black people and some White people, used sit-ins, resistance, riots, and marches to protest the lack of governmental enforcement of Brown, and the many cruelties that were inflicted upon Black people. The protesting had a monumental effect on America. Blackwell (1975) writes that “the pendulum began to swing toward increasing desegregation late in 1960” (p. 106). He notes five factors that accounted for this shift:

1. There was national sympathy toward the student sit-in movement and Dr. Martin Luther King’s passive-resistance strategies,
2. The nation literally convulsed at the sight of white Southern brutality and raw violence directed at the CORE-sponsored Freedom Riders throughout the South, particularly Alabama,
3. A sense of moral outrage arose against the ugly faces of bigotry expressed by Southern whites with each effort to desegregate,
4. In Washington, D. C., there was a growing concern with the nation’s image abroad, especially in the newly independent African states and in Europe,
5. The election of President John Kennedy, whose liberalism and sympathy was taken for granted, created a high degree of optimism among Blacks and their supporters (p. 106)
Perhaps one of the most compelling instances illustrating unity and a believe in a shared social structure took place on August 28, 1963 when more than 250,000 people of all races, religions, and ethnic origins joined the protest against segregation and racial discrimination on the march on Washington (Blumberg, 1991).

With increasing pressure from organizations such as the NAACP, Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), The Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLS), in addition to a bomb that killed four Black school girls attending Sunday school in Alabama, and the assassination of President Kennedy, Blackwell (1975) believes that Congress was compelled to pass the Civil Rights Bill of 1964, which had eleven titles attached to it. Blumberg (1991) lists them as follows (p. 127):

Title I: Strengthened the voting law of 1870

Title II: Reenacted and augmented the public accommodations laws of the 1875 Civil Right Act.

Title III: Authorized suits by the attorney general of the United States to desegregate public facilities

Title IV: Authorized authority as in Title III with respect to public schools

Title V: Authorized the attorney general to bring suit for individuals incapable of doing so themselves and established a four-year Commission on Civil Rights

Title VI: Prohibited discrimination in federally assisted programs and provided for withdrawal of federal funds where noncompliance persisted

Title VII: Prohibited discrimination in employment by employers, employment agencies, and labor unions and established an Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

Title VIII: Required compilation of registration and voting statistics by the secretary of commerce
Title IX: Permitted the attorney general to intervene in any civil rights lawsuit of general public import that is begun in a federal court

Title X: Established a Community Relations Service to assist communities or persons involved in civil rights disputes

Title XI: Provided for jury trials and penalties for criminal contempt arising out of enforcement of the act.

Eventually, more laws and executive orders were passed. For example the 1965 Civil Rights Act was passed which “suspended literacy tests as a requirement for voting and authorized the use of federal examiners in the South to protect the rights of potential Black voters” (Blackwell, 1975, p. 202). Affirmative action, an executive order, was mandated in 1963. This order called for public and private sectors and institutions to “set goals and timetables for the attainment of minority representation that fairly reflected the available pool of such applicants” (Blumberg, 1991, p. 187). By 1965, Black people were legally recognized, again, as citizens of the United States and laws and orders were established and enacted which were to protect their freedoms in American society.

Civil Rights Movement and the Decline

The Civil Rights movement was characterized by dynamic leadership, committed organizations, and involved people who saw themselves as a part of a shared social structure. Unfortunately, this movement dissipated as a result of a few factors. Martin Luther King’s death was a major factor. He was one dynamic leader that had the ability to gather people across races, religions, and classes to unite and advocate for social justice (Blumberg, 1991).

As a result of lack of leadership, some Black organizations began to splinter and become disunited. These were the organizations that once formed bonds together and collaborated with
one another to fight for individual rights. Blumberg (1991) notes that the FBI devised and implemented a massive campaign to divide organizations such as SNCC, CORE, Black Panther Party, and NAACP by spreading rumors of adultery, having informants penetrate one organization and then tell lies to other organizations, and making unfounded allegations of Communist activity about members in these organization.

Lastly, because of some legal gains made which benefited some Black people, particularly the middle-class, many became more interested in personal gains and began separating themselves from other Black people (Davis, 1993). The Civil Rights statutes were passed; desegregation and voting rights had been won; and Affirmative action provided some Blacks access to mainstream America. Therefore, many Black people were content and began to focus on other things. Coupled with the above-mentioned factors, the Civil Rights movement lost its momentum.

Impact of Desegregation on the Black Community

The Black community was close during the times when Black people were uniting around the fight for individual rights. The response to White racism and the subsequent historical dynamics of subjugation “moved black people in America to a semblance of unity and cohesive social structure” (Blackwell, 1975, p. xi). Blackwell asserts that because Black people were denied access as equals into mainstream society, they created their own institutions of religion, education, government, economics, recreation, and family. This forced the black community to engage in the shared values and strong community perspectives.

Davis (1993) suggests that there was a particular interest in keeping young Black boys’ esteem high since they were typically expected to bring in the most resources through jobs and be the head of the household. Davis writes that “isolated in segregated neighborhoods, Black
people could use organizations like the YMCA, Boys Clubs, Boy Scouts, and sports teams ranging from baseball to track and field to augment the family’s ability to provide guidance…these activities were used to motivate black children, especially boys from low-income families” (p. 69). These opportunities created instances for the middle-class men who started these programs to interact with the low-income boys. Davis further notes that “desegregation contributed to the separation of low-income boys from these middle-class mentors and from other upwardly mobile individuals who soon found it expedient to leave low-income neighborhoods” (p. 69).

Davis (1993) further discusses how relationships between affluent Blacks and non-affluent Blacks impacted the Black community. He asserts that:

As long as the movement remained focused on removing barriers affluent and nonaffluent blacks could work together; but when the emphasis shifted to individual opportunities, class interests asserted themselves. At that point more affluent blacks felt that they had to sever their connections to the masses to protect their interests. In effect it said to other blacks, “I’m qualified, I alone deserve this success-if the rest of you had my credentials and drive you too could be where I am” (p. 72).

The disassociation of some affluent Blacks from non-affluent Blacks contributed to a weakening of the Black family unit today. Davis (1993) posits that urbanization, upward mobility, racial integration, single-parent families, large impersonal schools, and the seductive power of television have also contributed to weakening the Black family unit.

Economic impacts have also contributed to the weakening Black family unit. Hill et al. (1993) write that “the strong social and economic gains of black families during the 1960s were severely eroded during the 1970s and 1980s” (p. 1). Between 1969 and 1983 the jobless rate of
Black people went from the 6% to 20% (Hill et al). Davis (1993) posits that American society requires people to choose between family and job, and as a result the Black family system has one of the highest divorce rates in the industrialized world, as well as a group of young people who resist marriage altogether.

Currently, the Black community, particularly poor Black communities are plagued with some serious social problems. Franklin and Moss (2000) write that chronic unemployment, rampant violence, drug addiction, HIV infection and AIDS, soaring homicide rates for young black males, and high levels of illegitimate births to young Black females are among some issues that plague Black communities. In addition to these problems, Black youth are currently more concerned with achieving material resources and becoming more individualistic (Kitwana, 2000).

In summary, the intersection of the government-centered and the shared values and community approaches is manifested in the history of Black people’s existence in the United States. Slavery was legal by nature of laws passed and abolition movements subsequently emerged. The Radical Reconstruction period was the first period where Blacks were given rights as full citizens, but these rights were short-lived because of political motivations. Segregation then resumed and Black people were once again relegated to second-class citizenship.

Organizations were formed such as the NAACP that fought for individual rights for Black people, which led to the Brown decision that declared segregation unconstitutional. Factors such as the unfavorable response to Brown by Whites, America’s perception abroad, and sympathetic citizens and political figures led to the passage of the Civil Rights Act which granted Black people, among others, full citizenship rights under the Constitution of the United
States. Statues such as Affirmative Action were established that propelled some Black people into mainstream society.

The Black community remained cohesive during the Segregation and Civil Rights eras. Segregation forced them to create their own institutions such as schools and recreational centers that gave Black people safe places to grow. However, some middle-class Blacks who aligned themselves with lower-class Blacks in the fight for Civil Rights disassociated themselves with the lower-class once some gains were made and they were accepted into mainstream society. Many moved out of the Black communities and adopted negative perceptions of lower-class Blacks.

After segregation the Black family unit weakened due to economic and social forces during the 1970s and 1980s. The Black community is now plagued with some of the highest rates of crime, unemployment, and poverty. In addition, today’s Black youths derive many of their values from rap music and videos. As such, the emerging Black culture has vastly different values from Black people during the Civil Rights movement.

Black College Students and Citizenship

This section discusses the dynamics that affect today’s Black students’ understandings and enactments of citizenship. Kitwana (2002) hypothesized that popular culture, globalization, persisting segregation, public policy, media representations, and shifts in the quality of life have influenced the world view of today’s Black youths. These dynamics provide some insight about the current individualistic nature of some Black youths that Kitwana characterizes as apathetic toward the community. Other dynamics such as individualism and decline in civic participation will also be discussed.
The first major force that has affected the worldview of Black youths is popular culture and the visibility of Black youth within it. Black youths have increasingly turned to rap music, music videos, designer clothes, popular Black films, and television programs for values and identity. Kitwana (2002) notes that this is manifested through advertisements of global products that capture the faces, bodies, attitudes, and language of Black youths. Products such as Coca-Cola, Pepsi, Nike, Reebok, and more have connected some dynamics of Black culture to some of their advertisements. More than anything else, rap music has shaped the hip-hop generation (Kitwana). In fact rap was the fastest growing genre of music between 1997 to 1998, showing a 31 percent increase in sales.

The second major force affecting the worldview of Black youths is the emergence of globalization in the 1980s and 1990s. Kitwana (2002) asserts that the integration of commerce, or mass production, by tens of thousands of corporations has impacted the lives of many. These companies’ biological and digital technologies have appealed to many consumers, some of whom have little resources to spare. However, Kitwana contends that the movement of jobs from urban centers to across seas had the greatest impact on Black youth because it caused “wage stagflation” in many of the Black communities.

The persistence of segregation in an American society that preaches democracy and inclusion is the third major influence. Kitwana’s (2002) assertion that segregation continues to exist are grounded in the idea of not only having separate venues, but a maintaining of social positions in which Blacks, and other minorities receive the lesser of the resources. One example of this is manifested in the workplace dynamics where Kitwana states that Blacks are twice as likely to be unemployed than their White counterparts. He also states that young Blacks with the similar skills, experience and educational background continue to be paid less than whites for the
same job. Lastly, he states that Blacks remain segregated from Whites in housing. For these reasons, many Black youth are resentful about the promise of American democracy.

A fourth impact on affecting the world view of Black youths has been the racial implications of public policy regarding the criminal justice system. From the Reagan administration’s War on Drugs in 1982 to Bush’s Violence initiative in 1992, to Clinton’s Violent Crime Control, federal legislation has created adverse impacts on Blacks. For example, Kitwana (2002) notes the disparity in sentencing for crack cocaine and powder cocaine, when in 1990 most crack cocaine users were white, but 90 percent of those convicted in federal court were Black (p. 14). Also, “various styles of dress, hairstyles, and fashion popular among Black youth have been banned from many of the nation’s schools and in some communities make one subject to arrest” (Kitwana, p. 16).

Media representation of young Blacks is the fifth dynamic that has influenced the worldview of Black youth. Kitwana (2002) believes this began in the 1980s when the media were enamored by the drug war. During this time, the media exclusively showed the urban street scene, and though the vast majority of the drug users were White, “the people who were doing drugs on TV were Black and Hispanic” (p. 18).

Lastly, the overall shift in the quality of life for young Blacks during the 1980s and 90s has affected the world view of Black youth. Kitwana (2002) notes that “by 1999, according to the U.S. Census Bureau, the number of blacks living below the poverty line had dropped to its lowest level in nearly three decades” (p. 20). He adds that the unemployment rates for Black youth remain twice as high as the unemployment rates for White youth. These social factors have led to Black youth’s involvement in the underground economy, and led to high homicide rates by gun of Black men between the ages of fifteen to thirty-four.
A worldview elicits corresponding actions and behaviors. Kitwana (2002) discusses the many positive things that have come about from the generation of Black people after 1965. For example, Black pride is manifested in music as well as traditional hairstyles such as dreadlocks and braids. Also, “the commercialization of rap expanded the definition of hip-hop culture beyond the four elements (graffiti, break dancing, dj-ying, rap music) to include verbal language, body language, attitude, style, and fashion” (p. 8). The global age has given Black youth a broader public platform to mainstream, which better informs society about some dynamics of the Black race.

To the contrary, some Black youth also exhibit some unavailing characteristics. Kitwana (2002) notes that this generation has turned to itself and global images for guidance when the generation before them turned to family, spirituality, and social responsibility for guidance. The level of social responsibility is steadily decreasing by evidence of the declining participation in church, which for a long time was a “community haven of spiritual centeredness and respectable values” (p. 22). In fact, Putnam (2000) found that between the 1970s and 1990s college-educated Blacks had the sharpest decline in civic and religious activities.

Perhaps the most unavailing characteristic of Black youth is the idea that this generation has become obsessed with material possession, and has become so individualistic which have implications for civic responsibility. Kitwana (2002) believes that today’s Black youth value careers over social responsibility. Many Black youth want the “rags-to riches” dream they frequently see on various media.

Today’s Black college students have also grown up outside the confines of legal segregation and have had the privilege of exercising their guaranteed rights under the constitution. As mentioned in the previous section, before 1965, many Blacks faced obstacles to
vote, were forced to attend segregated schools, and were denied access to some public venues (Blackwell, 1975; Blumberg, 1991). Segregation ended in 1954, but because of subsequent resistance from segregationists and the passing of the Civil Rights Act of 1965 which suspended literacy tests for voting, it was not until 1965 that Black people were fully recognized as full citizens in the United States and given opportunities to compete in American society through policies such as Affirmative Action (Blackwell). Today’s Black college students can vote; they have access to many public spaces and institutions; and some have benefited from policies that have taken into account previous discriminations and that are sensitive to minorities such as Affirmative Action. Therefore, today’s Black students may have a more fragmented sense of community than previous generations because they have not been legally forced to segregate. They also take part in and live in a society that has increasingly moved toward individualism (Bellah et al., 1996; Putnam, 2000).

In summary, there are some phenomena that have influenced the world-view of today’s Black college student which have implications for their sense of civic responsibility. Globalization, policies that adversely affect Black people, the hip-hop industry, media representations, and quality of life factors have impacted how Black students view the world. Also, Black students of today have more opportunities than previous generations and are part of a society that is becoming more individualistic. Because of these factors and opportunities, Black students may think less about being part of a shared social structure and becoming involved in civic activities. Putnam’s (2000) finding of the sharp decline in civic and religious activities among Black students lends support to this hypothesis.
Independent Variables

This section will describe and justify the independent variables that were utilized in this study. This study sought to determine how institution type, racial identity, major, gender, classification, age, and socioeconomic status affect the civic orientation of Black students. In previous sections, I have shown the role of higher education in preparing students for civic engagement. I have also described the two prevailing conceptions of citizenship and assessed Black people’s connection to these conceptions. I have shown how the connection between Black people’s involvement and history of citizenship in the United States has impacted the level of civic engagement of today’s Black college student.

Higher education will play a critical role in fostering responsible citizenship among Black students. This study focused on the independent variables institutional type, gender, age, major, socioeconomic status, and racial identity, which may lend themselves to such fostering.

Institutional Type

The campus environment may affect the civic orientation of Black students. Many Black students who attend Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), and those who attend Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs) have very distinct educational and social experiences (Allen, 1992; Fleming, 1984). These two types of institutions were created under different circumstances, and therefore offer different environments and have different missions. HBCUs have a legacy of serving Black students, while some PWIs have been known to create hostile environments for Black students, and have a history of resistance to desegregation (Hurtado et al., 1998).

Most HBCUs developed after the Civil War when slavery was declared unconstitutional. There were a few that existed before the civil war. Cheney State College, being the oldest Black
college, located in Cheney, Pennsylvania, paved the way as it was established in 1837 by the Quakers. Others at that time included Avery College in Allegheny Pennsylvania (1849); the Ashmun Institute which became Lincoln University in Chester County, Pennsylvania (1854); Wilberforce University in Ohio (1855); and an academy for Black girls in Washington, D.C. (1851) which became Minor Teacher’s College in 1860 (Drewry, 2001). These institutions offered preparatory programs and primary-school work for students who aspired to attend colleges. Most of the above-mentioned institutions were located in areas that generally were opposed to slavery such as Pennsylvania and Northern Ohio, with the exception of Minor Teacher’s College (Drewry, 2001).

PWIs have a different history and landscape. The first college created in the United States was Harvard in 1636. The mission of this institution was to prepare mostly wealthy white male students for religious and civic leadership (Boyer, 1990). After the Civil War, the Land Grant Act provided states with federal monies to create public universities to develop the United States by industrial means (Boyer). One of the major shifts came when the idea of research began being sought by many institutions and the focus on teaching the students shifted to the productivity of the professors (Boyer).

Professors’ roles have evolved within PWIs. Professors’ roles, once characterized by guilds, apprenticeships, and mentoring, were redefined when the fascination with research became pervasive throughout many universities in the 1940s (Boyer, 1990). Professors’ role of mentoring and guiding began to shift to central units of the university so that professors could concentrate more on pursuing research. This shift challenged the PWI environment about ways that it educated and prepared undergraduate students (Boyer).
Black Experience in Higher Education

The educational environments for Black students between HBCUs and PWIs have been shown to be different. Hurtado et al. (1998) believe that the historical legacy of inclusion or exclusion influences current practices and determines the prevailing climate. Many Blacks chose to attend HBCUs because they could “create their own social and cultural networks in order to remedy their exclusion from the wider, White-oriented university community” (Allen, 1992, p. 29). The research about Black students on White campuses provides insight on this phenomenon.

Sedlacek’s (1987) literature review revealed many interesting findings about Black students on White campuses in twenty years of research. He found a few studies which supported the idea that Black students’ adjustment and success at White institutions is related to how they feel about themselves. Sedlacek cited studies that suggested that Black students’ cultural adaptation had an influence on self-concept. Sedlacek also found that Black students had poor communication with White faculty members; Black students were less trusting of the institution than White students; Black students reported consistent problems of prejudice toward them by White faculty; Black students had problems with residence halls, fraternities, and campus police; Blacks seem to be more community oriented than Whites; and Black students often believe that they do not belong on predominantly White campuses.

Other studies include Fleming’s (1984) work as she began her study in 1977, which included about 3000 Black students from 15 colleges (seven HBCUs and eight PWIs). Her measurements of Black students’ academic/intellectual and psychosocial levels revealed that students at Black schools exhibited stronger personal attachments to faculty, enhanced involvement in the career process, and greater satisfaction with academic lives, while students at White schools show increasing dissatisfaction with academic life, and negative attitudes to
teachers who use unfair grading practices. Black students in White schools report more negative interaction with instructors, experiences in racial tension, and interpersonal stresses within Black culture. Fleming suggests that the profile for Black males in White schools is grim because most of them “undergo excessively frustrating experiences that thwart virtually every evidence of academic drive” (p. 168).

Fleming (1984) dedicated a section of her book to gender findings. She found that Black women are more likely to be anxious about their competence regardless of attending an HBCU or a PWI. Black women also performed worse on math than men regardless of institution type, but performed well on verbal skills and showed the most improvement on verbal skills from freshman to senior year. Black women who attended PWIs were found to be more assertive than Black women at HBCUs. Fleming attributes this to the lack of Black men on White campuses, which gave these women more space to be more expressive and independent.

More recent studies report similar findings. Flowers and Pascarella (1999) investigated the impact of college racial composition on African American students’ openness during college. This study had four major findings. First, there was an insignificant effect of an openness to diversity in Black students at HBCUs versus PWIs. Second, growth in Black students’ openness to diversity is contingent upon the perceived racial environment of the students’ institution. Third, students’ peer groups have a significant effect on their growth during the college years. Fourth, the effects of college racial composition on Black students’ growth in openness to diversity was contingent upon different precollegiate characteristics.

Berger and Milem (2000) investigated the extent to which self-concept is developed among Black students at HBCUs and PWIs. The results indicate that attending an HBCU was the strongest predictor of psychosocial wellness. Students’ assessment of their academic ability
upon entering college was the strongest predictor of academic success, and students with higher reported GPAs were more likely to report greater self-confidence in academic ability after four years.

Allen’s (1992) study examined the relationship between student outcomes (academic achievement, social involvement, and occupational aspiration), students’ educational backgrounds, educational goals, demographic characteristics, personal adjustment to college, and the college environment of Black students at HBCUs and PWIs. His findings indicate that Black students at PWIs report lower academic achievement and social involvement than Black students at HBCUs. Black females reported higher levels and self-confidence and had higher high school grades than Black males. Black students at PWIs social involvement was most influenced by their relations with White students.

Kim’s (2002) findings refuted Allen’s (1992) academic achievement finding when he analyzed the effectiveness of HBCUs and PWIs in developing the academic and cognitive abilities of Black students. Three academic outcome variables were measured: academic ability, writing ability, and math ability. Kim found that HBCUs and PWIs did not differ significantly on developing academic ability and writing ability among Black students. The author concluded that attending an HBCU does not appear to be more beneficial in developing Black students’ overall academic ability, writing ability, and math ability.

Watson and Kuh (1996) explored the relationships between involvement in campus activities, perceptions of the institutional environment, and educational gains of Black and White students at two private HBCUs and two private PWIs. This study was factor analyzed from 43 items to 12 factors, which represented quality of effort, and environmental and educational gains as latent variables. The authors found the Black students at both types of institutions devoted
more time to academic-related activities than Whites at PWIs. The Black students at the PWI had greater gains in personal and social development compared to Black students at HBCUs and White students at PWIs. The findings also showed that Black students at HBCUs invested much more effort and made gains in all five of the educational gains factors compared to Blacks at PWIs. The authors concluded by suggesting that Black students gain more from studying in an all Black environment.

Outcalt and Skewes-Cox (2002) investigated the relationship between the institutional climate (HBCU vs PWI), Black student involvement, and these students’ satisfaction with the college experience. Findings reveal that students at HBCUs were more involved in academic activities, for example, tutoring, completing homework on time, and were less likely to be bored in class than Black students at PWIs. Students at PWIs tended to belong to more racial/cultural organizations, take ethnic studies courses, and attend racial/cultural workshops than students at HBCUs. The authors suggest that students at HBCUs are less inclined to engage in these type activities because the overall campus environment was more supportive than at PWIs. The findings also show that Black students were more likely to be satisfied with their experiences at HBCUs versus PWIs. HBCU students were less likely to be satisfied with student services such as housing, financial aid, health care, community service opportunities, and career placement than Black students at PWIs. Finally, results show the chances of being satisfied by attending an HBCU double when compared to a PWI.

Fries-Britt and Turner (2002) conducted a qualitative study about successful Black students at HBCUs and PWIs. Data were gathered from 34 Black juniors and seniors. Interviews and focus groups were conducted. The researchers asked the questions: (a) What challenges have you encountered to your academic and social life on campus? (b) Has a topic ever come up in
class that you felt that you couldn’t express your opinion on?  (c) How have you connected socially to the campus? And (d) What do you do when you need academic help?

The authors presented the results in two broad themes: establishing campus support and campus involvement, and effects of interactions on campuses cultivation and diversion of Black students’ energy. There were several students who went to PWIs and then transferred to HBCUs. The students illustrated the degree of peer and faculty support at HBCUs that did not exist to the same extent at PWIs. The authors also suggested that Black students at PWIs often interact socially with Whites and some manifest behaviors consistent with White culture. Some students cited a strong foundation and sense of community at HBCUs. Students who attended PWIs identified ways that the campus worked against them, and did not use the terms “family” or “strong foundation” when describing their experiences. The students at the HBCUs discussed how the HBCU environment increased their exposure to Black history and culture, which translated to greater confidence. In contrast, students at PWIs discussed how their academic energies are sometimes diverted to having conversations with their White peers about Black stereotypes.

While research shows that there is a difference in many outcomes between Black students at PWIs and Black students at HBCUs, there are no studies that investigate the effect of institutional type on measures of citizenship.

Gender

Gender was also an independent variable in this study. Gender is a social construct that is manifested through interactions with others (Ropers-Huilman, 2003). Men and women are encouraged to behave differently from their childhood (Ropers-Huilman) and these relationships between them and the implications for gender have become more complex. In addition, gender
has been a cited difference in studies related to citizenship. Astin and Sax (1998) found that gender was a predisposing factor that contributed to service participation. Hetman and Jenkins (1990) found that women volunteer more than men, and add “studies which further investigated the sex differences between male and female volunteers indicate that females are more empathetic and rate higher on peer ratings for helping responses as compared to male volunteers” (p. 298).

Age

Age influenced measures of citizenship. Storage et al. (2002) study of 1379 college students revealed that older students significantly differed on GPA indices. Older students had higher grades and exhibited greater levels of mastery orientation than younger students. This sample included 756 traditionally aged students (18-22) and 551 non-traditional students (23-39). Eyler and Giles (1999) found that age was significant on leadership skills and identifying social issues in their service-learning study.

Major

One’s major also impacted students’ perception of responsible citizenship. Within an activism contexts, Rains and Barton-Kruse (2001) found that nursing students perceived public policy as a barrier and did not see connections between personal, political, and professional versus political science students. Colby et al. (2003) stat that “the humanities have traditionally been viewed as the academic arena in which moral and civic issues should be central as well as being considered the core of liberal arts education.”(p. xxiii)

Socioeconomic Status

Socioeconomic status (SES) contributed to citizenship measures. As shown before, when Americans began investing more in physical resources, they began to disinvest in civic activities
(Putnam, 2000). There are no studies that use SES and citizenship. However, Paulsen (1991) found that higher socioeconomic levels predicted student political participation in the 1970s. Hackey (1992) found income of Black people to be a significant factor when voting in the 1976 and 1980 presidential election.

**Racial Identity**

Racial identity affected measures of citizenship of Black students. Black racial identity explains the extent to which people who consider themselves Black identify, or do not identify, with other Blacks and/or “adopt or abandon identities resulting from racial victimization” (Helms, 1990, p. 5). The perceptions of Black people and the relationships that Blacks have with other Blacks may provide insight about civic behaviors of Black students.

Racial identity evolves from a belief system in reaction to one’s perceived racial group membership (Helms, 1990). There were two periods of Black racial identity studies (Cross, 1991). The first period, 1939-1960, was characterized by self-hatred by the Negro. The second period, 1968-1980, was characterized by Nigrescence, or the theory of becoming Black. The self-hatred theme was coined because much of the research that was conducted during this period revealed that self-hatred was pervasive in the personality dynamics of the vast majority of Blacks (Cross, p. 41). The Nigrescence period encompasses the psychological investigation of Blacks during two phases: the civil rights phase which lasted from 1954 to Martin Luther King’s death in 1968 and the Black power phase which resulted in a mass movement after King’s death until about the mid-70’s (Cross).

The Nigrescence theory hypothesizes that there are five stages of Black racial identity: (1) Pre-encounter, (b) Encounter, (c) Immersion-emersion, (d) Internalization, and (e) Internalization commitment. Pre-encounter is characterized as glorifying White standards and
devaluing one’s own racial group. Encounter is characterized as ambivalence and confusion about one’s commitment to the Black race. Immersion is characterized as one adopting an idealized perception about Blacks and maintaining negative perceptions about Whites. Blacks feeling a sense of solidarity and well being in the presence of other Blacks characterizes emersion. Internalization is characterized by Blacks positively committing to and accepting the Black race as well as other cultures. Internalization-commitment implies that one has sustained interest after finding Blackness, but there is little difference between Internalization and Internalization-commitment (Cross, 1991).

Preencounter Blacks could possess a range of attitudes toward race which includes low salience, race neutrality, and anti-Black. Blacks who have low salience attitudes did not consider how being Black played a role in their life. Some may also attempt to perceive themselves above race and adopt a race neutral attitude. Also some people may see race as a stigma and expend energies attempting to destroy the stigma associated with Blackness. Preencounter Blacks may loathe other Blacks, view Blacks as their worst enemy, and hold views similar to what a White racist holds toward Blacks (Cross, 1991).

The Encounter stage occurs when a Black person personalizes a racial experience. This experience provokes persons to question their Blackness and their place in society. Cross (1991) writes encounter could happen when “a middle-class person may feel guilty for having denied the significance of race; a lower-class person may feel guilt and shame for having degraded Blackness through street hustle and exploitation” (p. 201). The Encounter Blacks could be met with a range of emotions such as guilt, anger, and depression.

The Immersion-Emersion stage is characterized as the significant transformation into Blackness. The person advances through two stages. The first stage is when Black people
“immerse” themselves in Black culture. They join political and cultural groups. They consume themselves with Black art, music, and films. Their communicated style is labeled as a “Blacker-than-thou” syndrome. The emersion phase is when people emerge from oversimplified ideologies and begin to level off their emotions. This is a sign of growth and commitment to a more serious understanding of Black issues (Cross, 1991).

Internalized Blacks are comfortable with who they are in society and can maintain their Blackness and have meaningful relationships with Whites. Internalized people are no longer concerned about judging people by their race, but rather are concerned with people in general. The internalized person finds value in people different from themselves (Cross).

Helms revised the Cross model conceptually. Cross (1971) originally hypothesized that Blacks must enter the Black identity stages at Pre-Encounter and progress through Internalization if they could progress that far. Through in-depth research, Helms concluded that one could enter the racial identity scale from any stage, and could possibly possess characteristics in other stages but one will be dominant (Helms, 1995).

Researchers have investigated the racial identity model as it relates to students on college campuses (Parham & Helms, 1985; Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997; Taylor & Howard-Hamilton, 1995; Watson & Kuh, 1996; White, 2000; Wilson & Constantine, 1999). This growing body of research about Black racial identity is contributing immensely to understanding the psyche of Black students.

There have been many studies that investigate the relationships between racial identity and other factors that do not relate to citizenship measures. Parham and Helms (1985) investigated the relationship between racial identity and self-concept. Brookins (1994) examined the relationship between Afrocentric beliefs, African self-consciousness, and racial identity

There are several studies involving racial identity that indirectly relate to citizenship participation. These focus on relationships between racial identity and student involvement and campus participation. Being involved and participating are imbedded in the concepts of civic responsibility and citizenship. Mitchell and Dell (1992) investigated the relationship between racial identity attitudes and campus participation for Black students. The sample was 55 females and 46 male, Black undergraduates at a large PWI on the West Coast. The Personal Data Questionnaire (PDQ) and the Racial Identity Attitude Scale (RIAS) were administered. The PDQ measured the cultural and non-cultural involvement in activities. Multiple regression analyses revealed that racial identity attributed to 11% of the variance. The strongest result was that internalization was significantly positively related to participation in noncultural campus activities.

Taylor and Howard-Hamilton (1995) explored the relationship between student involvement and racial identity attitudes among Black men who were and were not involved in fraternities. This study utilized the Student Involvement Survey (SIS), and the Racial Identity Attitude Scale (RIAS). The responses from the sample of 117 revealed that Internalization and Immersion-Emersion contributed the most to the regression model. In fact, the Black males who belonged to a Greek organization scored higher on the RIAS than the non-Greek members.

Wilson and Constantine (1999) explored the relationship between racial identity, self-concept, and perceived family cohesion. Ninety-four Black students who attended a university in the southwest region participated in the study. Participants completed the RIAS, the
Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (TSCS), the Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales III (FACES III), and a demographic questionnaire.

Pearson correlation analyses revealed that pre-encounter and encounter attitudes were negatively related to self-concept. Internalization was positively related to family cohesion and self-concept. Perceived family cohesion and self-concept were also positively correlated with each other. Multiple regression analysis indicated that self-concept significantly related to pre-encounter, encounter, and internalization attitudes.

There are also a few racial identity studies that show the differences between Blacks at HBCUs versus PWIs. Cokely (1999) conducted a study examining the impact of HBCUs and PWIs on racial identity and African self-consciousness. The HBCU sample was 112, and the PWI sample was 92. This study utilized the Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity (Sellars, Rowley, Chavous, Shelton, & Smith, 1997) and the African Self-Consciousness scale. Black students at HBCUs experienced significantly higher levels of African self-consciousness, but there were no significant differences on the racial identity measures.

Alexander-Snow (2003) qualitatively captured the experiences of two Black women who attended a historically White boarding school in the North and then went to a PWI in the South. This research focused on the social integration of both women. The study was conducted at a private PWI in the South. Four students participated in this project and this research focused on two seniors: Lisa and Monica.

Monica was shocked by the Black and White world that existed when she came to college. She realized that she was conspicuous around Whites and did not fit in with her Black peers. Monica also stated that she had no interest in interacting with Black students after arriving on campus. She encountered criticisms from her Black peers because of how she talked
and dressed. She attended an HBCU after two years as part of an exchange program, and stated that she became culturally enlightened, alert, and aware.

Lisa did not interact with Black or White students when she went to college. She claimed to not socialize with anyone with any frequency. Lisa stated that she took a color-blind approach to life, and stated that some Black students used race as an excuse for the inability to adapt socially or academically. She stated that Black students were under greater stresses than non-Black students, and also stated that the Black students should just deal with it. She stated that she would like to become involved in Black organizations but they conflicted with her academic work.

Alexander-Snow (2003) concluded that the boarding school prepared them very well academically. Both students had high grade point averages: 3.5 and 3.8. However, the author mentioned that these boarding schools did not prepare them to successfully adjust to the two different worlds that met them in the university. This scenario has tremendous implications for Black students’ racial identity development and pre-college environment.

In conclusion, research has shown that institutional type, age, gender, SES, major, and racial identity affect students. Institutional type and racial identity are the variables of most concern in this dissertation and several studies have reported the differences that these two variables have on Black students. Studies show the relationship between the proposed independent variables and many areas. However, there are no studies that are framed within a citizenship context.

Citizenship Related Studies

This section will discuss the research that involves citizenship through case studies or measuring dynamics of citizenship that includes some type of intervening service experience.
such as service-learning or volunteering. For example, Astin and Sax’s (1998) longitudinal study of 3450 students who were involved in federal community service programs revealed that the most predisposing factor to service participation was whether the student volunteered in high school. And all 35 outcome measures were influenced by service participation, which includes citizenship outcomes such as leadership ability, ability to think critically, ability to get along with people of different races and cultures, and understanding of problems facing the community. The only negative predictor was the importance that students gave to making money for attending college.

Eyler and Giles (1994) conducted an experimental study by administering pre-and post-tests to 72 students who took a one credit community service laboratory. They found that this service positively increased attitudes about measures of social responsibility such as community involvement importance, becoming a community leader, importance of influencing politics and social values, and making a difference in general.

Other studies have shown that service which includes various forms of community service and service-learning as an intervening variable has positive effects on citizenship measures of college students’ understanding of social issues (Batchelder & Root, 1994; Markus, Howard, and King 1993), empathy for others (Giles & Eyler, 1994), and civic responsibility measures (Grey et. Al, 1999).

Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, and Stephens (2003) described 12 colleges and universities that took different approaches to educating students for moral and civic responsibility. It documented the curricular and co-curricular activities that these 12 institutions adopted as well as how various leadership aspects contributed to changing the campus culture. Some institutions adopted a moral and civic virtue approach while others adopted a social justice
approach. This work truly illustrates the various ways in which colleges and universities could approach citizenship.

The Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning is a journal that publishes scholarly empirical and theoretically based articles related to service-learning, and moral and civic development. This journal has been in existence since 1994. Articles published in journals provide a wide scope of disciplinary differences and pedagogical approaches related to service learning and civic responsibility. This journal is based out of the University of Michigan.

*Citizenship Studies* is a journal that publishes articles about how the concept of citizenship is manifested in various environments. This international journal is based in the United Kingdom its articles contain scholarly works that focuses on citizenship aspects from Europe to China. These works are placed in contemporary as well as historical contexts. This journal provides studies for those who wish to ascertain a broader conception of citizenship as defined by the international community.

As there are many citizenship related studies, there are no studies that investigate the citizenship measures of Black students specifically. Eyler and Giles (1994) state that “sustained citizenship participation is thought to rest on values, attitudes, and beliefs about service that make up social responsibility “ (p. 328). More specifically, Eyler and Giles (1999) believe that citizenship measures consist of values, skills, attitudes, and understanding. Black students may differ on these constructs based on institutional type, gender, major, socioeconomic status, classification, and racial identity.

**Conclusion**

In summary, the review of the literature has shown that higher education is placing more emphasis on cultivating citizenship due to societal factors such as individualism and declining
political participation. The emphasis is manifested through activities such as service-learning and community. These activities fall under the category of the shared value and community approach, which is one of the prevailing conceptions of citizenship, the other being the government-centered approach about which Boyte and Kari (2000) write.

The review of the literature has also shown Black people’s experience with the two conceptions of citizenship. Previous generations of Black people constantly fought for civil rights in the United States, but while doing so they were committed to each other through community building. Segregation forced Blacks to create their own civic institutions. After segregation, many events influenced the Black community to the extent that its civic infrastructure became fragmented and civic activities decreased.

The literature shows that some of today’s Black youths are apathetic toward community issues, which is the converse of the generation that preceded them. Research showed that the Black educated populace had the sharpest decline in civic activities of any other group. Today’s Black college students will influence their respective environments upon graduating and the literature has shown that the college environment will affect them in some capacity.

Literature has given support to the idea that independent variables institution type, gender, major, age, SES, and racial identity may affect the civic orientation of Black students. The review of the literature has also revealed a void in citizenship studies. Most citizenship studies utilized intervening variables such as community service or service-learning to assess the effect of these activities on students. The literature reveals that now is the most opportune time to conduct citizenship research given the changing nature of higher education and its emphasis on citizenship. The next section will discuss the methods to address the research questions posed.
CHAPTER 3 METHODS

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationships between independent variables such as institution type, racial identity, gender, age, major, and socioeconomic status (SES) and citizenship factors (Skills, Community Orientation, Political Participation, Voting Behavior, Empathetic, Apathetic, and Community-Minded Activist) associated with Black students. This section will describe the participants, sampling procedure, instruments, research questions, hypotheses, and limitations of the surveys.

This dissertation had four main goals. The first was to conduct an exploratory study to determine the relationships between citizenship predictors and citizenship factors, which both lend themselves to explaining the civic orientation of Black students. The second goal was to build upon the Service Experience (SE) instrument, which purportedly measures some citizenship characteristics that people should embody to perform civic functions such as mentoring and working with people who are far different from themselves (Eyler & Giles, 1999). The third goal was to determine to what extent racial identity contributed to citizenship dynamics. The last goal of this dissertation was to determine how attending a historically Black college and university (HBCU) affected Black students’ civic orientation versus those Black students who attended a predominantly White institution (PWI).

Participants

Four institutions were utilized in this study and Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was granted at all of these institutions for this study. The sample consisted of 379 Black students who attended one of these four institutions. Two of these institutions were PWIs and two were members of HBCUs. These institutions were selected based on their Carnegie classification. In this study, there were two large public doctoral-extensive institutions (1 HBCU
and 1 PWI), and two large public master’s and college university (1 HBCU and 1 PWI). All institutions were located in the South.

The sample was selected based on student attendance in selected English and History classes. These disciplines fell under the Colleges of Arts and Sciences/Liberal Arts at all institutions. This was done to ensure an interdisciplinary mix of students. Target classes were classes with large numbers of African American students. A convenience sampling approach was employed to select the classes.

Data Collection

Data were first collected at the doctoral-extensive institution HBCU. The total sample from this institution was 93. Data were collected in three classes. The first two classes were English classes that were taught by the same professor. These were the same classes but two different sections. The professor agreed to give each person five bonus points for taking the survey. I administered the survey towards the end of each class. The third class was a History class. I administered the surveys in the beginning of the class. After the surveys were completed in this class, I conducted a raffle for those who participated in the study and four winners were given $5 each.

The master’s college and university HBCU was the second institution from which data were collected. The total sample from this institution was 95. Data were collected from four different classes (2 History and 2 English). The History classes were taught by the same person, and the English composition classes were taught by the same professor. Survey administration was done in the same manner in all four classes. I gave the class instructions about the survey and administered them. Both professors gave students bonus points for completing the survey.
The large public doctoral-extensive PWI was the third institution from which data were collected. The total sample from this institution was 117. Data were collected from 5 different classes at this institution. Four history classes were utilized at this institution. In all classes, students were administered the surveys toward the end of the class. The remaining class was a Biological Science class. These students were solicited outside a science building after their class ended. Eight students agreed to take the survey home and bring it back in two days. Four students referred me to twelve other science majors, who I contacted by phone. I delivered the surveys to the students, and at different times, these twelve met me at a coffee shop to return the surveys. They received a cup of coffee and cookies for their participation.

The master’s college and university PWI was the last institution from which data were collected. The total sample from this institution was 74. Five classes were utilized at this institution. Two classes were English classes (one English Composition and one remedial class). The three other classes were History classes. These classes were also part of a general education requirement and thought to high percentages of Black students. At the end of the class, each student received two pieces of candy for their participation. In the fifth class, the teacher dismissed all White students from the class, and the Black students stayed and completed the survey. Theses students also received candy upon their completion.

Demographics

The total sample across all four institutions was 379 students. The sample was 34% male (129) and 66% female (250). Table 1 gives the frequencies per classification of age, classification, and major by institution type for the total sample. Major was defined by four categories, which were derived from Becher’s (1994) typology. Hard-Pure Sciences represented disciplines such as Chemistry, Math, Physics, Biology etc. The Hard-Applied Sciences
represented disciplines such as Architecture, Agronomy, Computer Science, Medicine related fields, all types of Engineering etc. The Soft-pure represented disciplines such as Anthropology, English, Foreign languages, History, Philosophy, and Sociology. The Soft-Applied represented disciplines such as Business, Communications, Education, Law, Nursing, Theater, Social Work, etc.

Table 1 Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HBCU-Doctoral Extensive</th>
<th>HBCU-master’s university</th>
<th>PWI-Doctoral Extensive</th>
<th>PWI-master’s university</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 yrs. old</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 yrs old</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 yrs. old</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 yrs old</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 yrs old</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 yrs old</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 yrs old</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 yrs old</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 yrs old</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-39 yrs old</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 and over</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Student-non matr.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard-Pure Sciences</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard-Applied Sciences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft-Pure Sciences</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft-Applied Sciences</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table shows that over 80% of the sample was between the ages of 18 and 23. Over 77% of the students belonged to the soft-pure science and soft-applied science majors. More specifically, 35% belonged to a soft-pure science major, and 42% belonged to a soft-applied science. Fourteen percent of the sample belonged to a hard-pure science, while 8% belonged to a hard-applied science. The majority of the sample were seniors (35%), while freshmen, sophomores, and juniors accounted for 19%, 21%, and 22% of the sample respectively.

Instruments

Revised Service Experience Survey

Students took the Revised Service Experience (RSE), which is a shorter version of the Service Experience (SE), and the Black Racial Identity Scale (R-BRIAS). The SE was developed by Eyler and Giles (1999) for a service-learning study to measure students’ citizenship understanding, values, skills, and attitudes. The SE has a pre- and posttest. I utilized the pretest, which contained items about the perceptions of civic and social dynamics.

The pre-test was originally 105 items, which was too long. Through a content analysis approach, the RSE was reduced to 43 items. The original SE had sections such as: college service experiences, types of previous service, opinions (social and political), skills and activities, describing yourself, questions about you (demographic). The SE is assessed by a Likert scale, which asks respondents to “check their level of agreement” (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996). The sections on the SE were measured by different scales. For example, in the Your Opinions section respondents have the option of selecting 5=strongly agree, 4=agree, 3=uncertain, 2=disagree, or 1=strongly disagree. In the Skills and Activities section, respondents have the option of selecting 5=much better than most, 4=better than most,
3=about the same, 2=not as good as most, or 1=much worse than most. In the Describing yourself section respondents have the option of selecting 5=describes me very well, 4=somewhat well, 3=uncertain, 2=not well, 1=not at all well.

The Opinion section, which has 29 items, illustrates statements about some social-related issues. For example, statements range from opinions about benevolent gestures of adults to the duties of the government and social service agencies, future goals, perceptions of others’ destiny, and perceptions about community service. These statements are answered by indicating strongly agree to strongly disagree. For example some statements are: adults should give some time for the good of the community; government should get out of the business of solving social problems; and the most important community service is to help individuals.

The Skills and activities section, which has 22 items, asks students to rate themselves on abilities such as thinking, communicating, identifying problems, and leadership. Students rate if they are much better than most to much worse than most. For example some statements are: respecting the views of others, identification of social issues and concerns, and tolerant of people who are different from me. The Describing yourself section, which has 19 items, asks students to evaluate themselves based on statements about discussing current affairs awareness, involvement in political campaigns, and decision making tendencies. Respondents have the option of marking describes me very well, somewhat well, uncertain, not well, and not well at all. Some examples of statements are: I often discuss political issues with my friends; I try to keep up with local and national news; and I often participate in advocacy or political action groups.
The Questions About You, section, which has 16 questions, asks demographic information (gender, age, classification, ethnicity, family income and education history, major, hours).

Content Analysis

Utilizing four raters, through a content analysis approach, the SE was reduced to 43 items to shorten the survey, and to establish a foundation for creating another citizenship instrument. The process of reduction was done in a way that ensures content validity, which is “the degree to which the scores yielded by a test adequately represent the content, or conceptual domain, that these scores purport to measure” (Gall et al., 1996, p. 250). The SE purportedly measures students’ attitudes, values, skills, and understanding, which are critical elements for a responsible citizen to employ (Eyler & Giles, 1999). The purpose of item reduction in this instance was to create a shorter instrument to which students can respond.

Reduction of items was accomplished through a systematic process. Specifically, three people who work directly with students through programmatic functions or classroom teaching were asked to rate the items according to their perceptions about where category items belonged. For example, item 21 states that I feel social problems are not my concern. The raters were asked to place this item under a category: attitudes, values, skills, or understanding. Each person’s item assessment was then compared to others including my item assessment to make a total of four comparisons. All items were kept that fell under categories about which all four persons agreed. For example, all four persons placed item 45, which stated, “I feel positive about my community’s ability to solve its social problems”, under the Attitudes category. Also, all items were kept that fell under categories about which three persons agreed. As a result of this systematic procedure, 43 items were kept and comprise the instrument that was
administered. Appendix A.1 shows the raters’ assignment of each item to the four categories that they were given (Skills, Values, Understanding, and Attitudes).

The Revised Service Experience (RSE) instrument contains three sections: Your opinions, Self-Perception, and Activities. The Opinion scale had twenty items that relate to various social and community perspectives (e.g. I feel that social problems are not my concern; The most important service is to help individuals). The Opinion scale is measured by 5-point Likert scale from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). The Self-perception scale has 13 items that ask students to rate themselves on various dimensions (e.g., thinking critically, ability to compromise, ability to lead a group). The Self-perception scale is measured by a 5-point Likert Scale from 1 (Much worse than most) to 5 (Much better than most). The Activities scale has 10 items that relate to participation in various social and political activities (e.g., I always vote in state and local elections, I am active in campus politics).

Eyler and Giles (1999) reported the reliability coefficients that were associated with the different subscales. The items relating to the assessment of their leadership skills were adopted from a project initiated by the Walt Whitman Center for the Culture and Politics of Democracy at Rutgers University in 1993 (p. 212). Eyler and Giles state that the Cronbach alphas associated with this scale ranged from .71 to .80. The values outcome, ability to identify social issues, and critical thinking skills were measure by single items. A scale that had items that focused on students’ commitment to systemic change yielded an alpha of .72. Last, the scale that measures students’ tendency to reach closure quickly yielded an alpha of .50.

The subscales’ reliability coefficients associated with the SE had a variety of ranges. The commonly accepted benchmark for many in the academic community is .70. A few of the scales had reliability coefficients less than .70, which is one reason why it was important for me to
utilize this instrument. The more the various indicators are reported in the literature about this instrument, the better the research community could better understand what dimensions truly underlie this instrument. Also, the literature did not make many references to the sample of students who participated in the studies; therefore, this dissertation study will add more examples of how Black students score on this instrument, which will lend itself to different types of analyses, for example invariance testing, some time in the future.

Black Racial Identity Scale

The Black Racial Identity Scale (B-RIAS) was also administered. Its theory suggests that Blacks progress through four distinctive psychological stages: Pre-Encounter, Encounter, Immersion-Emersion, and Internalization (Helms, 1995). This instrument is a 30 item self-report measure, where students responded to questions on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Pre-Encounter is a stage where Blacks devalue Black culture and perceive White culture as superior (e.g. item 8, I believe that White people look and express themselves better than Blacks). Blacks who hold encounter attitudes are confused about the association with the Black race (e.g. item 24, I feel guilty or anxious about some of the things I believe about Black people). Blacks who possess Immersion-Emersion attitudes glorify Black culture and disparage White culture (e.g. item 26, I speak my mind about injustices to Black people regardless of the consequences). Blacks who are internalized are committed Blacks but also embrace aspects of other cultures (e.g. item 7, A person’s race does not influence how comfortable I feel when I am with her or him).

There have been several studies that conducted the internal consistency of each subscale which addresses reliability issues of the RIAS-B. Internal consistency “is an approach to
estimating test score reliability in which the individual items of the test are examined” (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996, p. 256). Fraenkel and Wallen (2003) suggest that .70 is a commonly accepted benchmark for reliability estimates. Helms (1990) reported reliability estimates for the four stages as follows: Preencounter = .70, Encounter = .51, Immersion/Emersion = .67, and Internalization = .80. Helms and Carter (1991) reported reliability estimates of .69, .50, .67, and .80. Helms and Parham (1996) reported reliability estimates of .76, .51, .69, and .80. Carter, et al. (1997) reported reliability estimates of .77, .41, .59, and .79 respectively. Therefore, some studies utilizing the B-RIAS have yielded acceptable reliability coefficients while others have not.

Limitations of Surveys

B-RIAS

The racial identity scale was very useful in identifying the racial identity stages of Black students. However, there are some limitations to this instrument. While the scale is insightful, the B-RIAS is only one instrument of a few that represents racial identity stages. Sellers et al. (1998) developed an African American racial identity scale named the Multidimensional Model of Racial Identity (MMRI). This scale measures four dimensions of racial identity: Racial Salience, Centrality, Regard, and Ideology. Racial salience refers to how race is relevant in particular situations, for example being the only Black in a class. Centrality refers to how Blacks identify with themselves with regard to race. For example, people may define themselves more by their sexual orientation, educational attainment or race. Regard refers to positive or negative feelings individuals possess about being Black. The Ideology dimension classifies Blacks as assimilationists, nationalists, oppressed minorities, or humanists (Sellers et al., 1998). The MMRI is 53-item self-report measure.
The B-RIAS was selected over the MMRI for three reasons. First, the B-RIAS is conceptualized as a stagewise process that is developmental and linear unlike the MMRI. Hence, with the present study, students’ racial identity could be measured and targeted goals of reaching the internalization stage could be assessed and operationalized. Second the B-RIAS is shorter, which allows for less time for students to take and may translate into more honest answers. Finally, the B-RIAS is the most commonly used racial identity scale (Ponterotto et al., 1995), which allows the results to be compared to other racial identity studies that have been conducted that utilized the B-RIAS.

The Service Experience Survey

The SE was used because this research attempts to create a model for developing civically responsible Black students and this instrument is grounded in some elements of citizenship (Eyler & Giles, 1999). There are no other instruments that assess citizenship. The United States Department of Education’s National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) encompasses a few items that address citizenship. This national longitudinal survey asks questions about some political and social attitudes, but is restricted to students in secondary schools. The Social Responsibility Scale (Berkowitz & Daniels, 1964) measures what it means to be a socially responsive person, but this instrument has only 8 items, and does not provide enough information to assess students’ citizenship dynamics. Last, no studies have been found that utilize the SE with just a Black population.

Results from the SE have not been widely published. In fact, the only results that were found were published Eyler and Giles’ (1999) where the survey was retrieved. Therefore, a limitation is that this survey has not been validated in the academic community as others have. However, this instance does not affect this research because this study will only utilize the pre-
test of the instrument to extract factors and will reduce the items that do not pertain to this study from 105 to 50.

Variables of Interest

Citizenship factors, racial identity, age, institution type, major, socioeconomic status (SES) and gender were the variables of interest in this study. Citizenship factors, identified through exploratory factor analysis, were used dependent variables in this study. All other variables represented independent variables of this study. The independent variables chosen for this study were selected based on their relationships with citizenship related studies, as reported in chapter 2 (Literature review).

Research Design

This study was correlational by design because it incorporated factor analysis and multiple regression. Correlational research is utilized to determine relationships between two or more variables. Gall, Borg, and Gall (1996) explain that determining this relationship is often called exploratory research because the researcher is attempting to identify the pattern of a relationship. Gall et al. express that correlational research allows the researcher in a single study to analyze the relationships among a large number of variables. And, it allows the researcher to measure variables at the same point in time or at different points in time. Last, correlational research gives the researcher an indication about the degree of the relationship between variables.

It is important to note, however that correlation research does not establish a cause and effect relationship. If two variables are found to have a strong positive relationship, the basis for causation could be a third variable that has not been considered. Gall, Borg, and Gall (1996) also note that another limitation is the tendency for researchers to break down many complex abilities
and behavior patterns into simpler components. When researchers do this they run the risk of excluding many other explanations and may overlook some other relationships that may influence the dependent variable.

Factor Analyses

Citizenship factors were extracted from the SE instrument via factor analyses. Factor analysis is a scientific method whose aim is to, “summarize the interrelationships among the variables in a concise but accurate manner as an aid in conceptualization” (Gorsuch, 1983, p. 2). Before conducting a factor analysis, researchers begin with a data set comprised of multiple items. The items should all be measured on the same scale, and there should be limited problems with analyses if the data are continuous (Benson & Nasser, 1998). Continuous data is data where it “can be divided into an infinite number of fractional parts” (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2000). All items of the SE are not measured on the same metric. To place data on a common metric, the data were standardized so that they could be measured on the same metric and could be easily converted into correlations, which is the basic input for factor analysis (Benson & Nasser, 1998).

The goal of factor analysis is to find factors underlying data (Benson & Nasser, 1998; Gorsuch, 1983). Several criteria should guide researchers in finding factors such as having high loadings and few cross loadings, setting parameters for interpretations, knowing one’s level of acceptability of a factor’s percent of variance explained, and achieving simple structure which “is based on the premise a variable should associate with as few factors as possible” (p. 26). Hence, there should not be many loadings that associate highly with more than one factor. There are a few options that researchers have to achieve these criteria, and some initial considerations before conducting the factor analysis will assist in achieving the criteria.
The first consideration when conducting factor analysis, which is conceptual, is choosing the factor model of choice between exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and component analysis (CA) (Benson & Nasser, 1998). “EFA is correlation-oriented and aims to reproduce the intercorrelations among the original variables from the set of factors” (Benson & Nasser, 1998, p. 14) while, “CA is variance-oriented and aims to reproduce as much of the total variance in the original variables from the set of components” (Benson & Nasser, p. 14). The main difference between the two is the EFA includes error and the CA does not.

The variance in EFA is decomposed into common and unique variance. Benson and Nasser (1998) note that the unique variance is further decomposed into random error in each variable and variance specific to each variable. They also add that the EFA model is highly recommended by researchers because the obtained coefficients are less biased because only common variance is modeled (Benson & Nasser).

The SE was factor analyzed employing principal components model and the B-RIAS was factor analyzed using EFA. The principal components model was more appropriate for the SE because the factors were utilized as dependent variables. Principal components is commonly applied to data sets when researchers intend on using the factors as dependent variables (Field, 2000). EFA was more appropriate for RIAS-B because the purpose of this analysis is to find the underlying structure of this instrument. EFA provides the mechanism to study the structure of constructs, which are the relationships between items and factors (Benson & Nasser, 1998). Studying the structure of the concepts in the RIAS-B in a non-biased manner is the purpose of this particular analysis.

Selecting the rotation method is the next important decision in factor analysis. Items are rotated to “bring psychological meaningfulness to the extracted factors” (Benson & Nasser,
Rotation allows the loadings of the variables to become maximized on a factor (Field, 2000). There are two types of rotation methods: oblique and orthogonal.

The oblique rotation method allows the factors to correlate. The orthogonal rotation method restricts the factors from correlation, thus leaving them independent of one another (Benson & Nasser, 1998). Theory should guide the choice of rotation method (Field, 2000; Benson & Nasser). There is limited research about the correlations of citizenship factors as described by Eyler & Giles (1999), and there are conflicting reports about the intercorrelations between the racial identity stages (Lemon & Waehler, 1996). Both rotation methods were employed to explore all possibilities. The SE was rotated obliquely while the racial identity scale was rotated orthogonally. The SE was initially rotated orthogonally and these results suggested that some of the items correlated with one another based on the correlation coefficients. The B-RIAS was rotated orthogonally because there were no indications based on the results that the factors highly correlated with one another.

The next consideration was the number of factors to extract. There are several approaches to determining the number of factors to extract. Field (2000) and Benson and Nasser (1998) maintain that the scree plot, which plots a graph of the eigen values, should be observed to determine how many factors are in the model. An eigen value explains the amount of variance contained by a factor (Benson & Nasser). Field cites that the cut-off point for the number of factors to be selected should be at the inflexion curve on the scree plot where the eigen values that contribute the most to the model are shown. Selecting eigen values over 1 is another method for choosing the number of factors (Field; Benson & Nasser) where eigen values over 1 represent a substantial amount of variation (Field). This project extracted eigen values over 1 and
compared them to the scree plot in order to select those factors that are meaningful and contribute to the model.

Factor analysts suggest that every factor should have at least three to five items, and suggest that fewer than three do not give an adequate representation of the construct (Benson & Nasser, 1998). The factors in this study had at least three items per factor. Another requirement for this study is that every loading should define its corresponding factor with a minimum loading of .30. Factor loadings are essentially regression coefficients. The goal is to include items that explain a large amount of variance between an item and a factor, and .30 will explain at least nine percent \((.3)^2\) of the shared variance of a factor. Benson and Nasser note that many factor analysts suggest a minimum loading of .30.

Before dependent and independent variable factors can be inserted into subsequent analyses, they must first be transformed into variables that are compatible with other methods. Factors found on both instruments were transformed into sum scores. Sum scores are derived by adding each item associated with its corresponding factor (Gorsuch, 1983). Field (2000) notes that the scales of measurement will influence the scores, and sum scores on different scales of measurement cannot be compared. The items on the B-RIAS for independent variables are measured on the same scale. The items on the SE were not measured on the same scale. Therefore, the SE items were standardized and then transformed to sum scores to be used as dependent variables.

Multiple Regression

Multiple regression was the second method of data analysis used. Pedhazur asserts that the goal of regression, “is to determine how, and to what extent, variability of the dependent variable depends on manipulations of the independent variable” (p. 17). An example of
phenomena that one may wish to determine through regression as it relates to this study is: determining the effects of age on the willingness to work with people who are different than oneself.

Multiple regression occurs when there is more than one independent variable that explains the variance in a dependent variable. The multiple regression model is: \( Y = b_o + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + \ldots + b_kX_k \). The \( Y \) is variable that is studied and thus is called the criterion variable. \( b_o \) and \( b_1, b_2, \) and \( b_k \) are the mathematically calculated values from the original scores. These values are constant for any given set of data (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). Each \( b \) value is a regression weight which is “a multiplier term added to each predictive value of the variables” (Gall et al., 1996). The beta weight indicates the relationship between an individual’s score and the criterion variable. The beta weight is interpreted by the direction, magnitude, and significance of it to the criterion variable.

There are certain assumptions about the data that were addressed before conducting multiple regression. First, the data must be normally distributed, which means that the distribution of scores will resemble a symmetrical shape with the greatest frequency of scores in the middle (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2000). One can check for normality by observing a Q-Q plot to ascertain the shape of the data. Normally distributed scores would fall along a straight line, which will indicate their z-scores transformation. Also, observing the kurtosis value would give an indication about the normality of data. If in any event the data or not normal then the log or square root can be applied to the data to transform the data.

Another assumption is that the relationship between \( X \) (independent variable) and \( Y \) (dependent variable) is linear. In other words, the “population means of the Y’s at each level of X are assumed to be on a straight line” (Pedhazur, 1997, p. 33). Using SPSS, a linear
relationship can be checked by plotting the standardized residuals and observing the pattern. In the event that the relationship is not linear then they can be transformed into such a relationship by squaring or cubing the data (Berry, 1993).

The independent variables must also be independent of one another. In other words, there should be little to no relationship, or colinearity, between the independent variables. If there is colinearity the results may be uneasily interpreted because one may not discern what variable contributed which portion of the variance (Berry, 1993). Colinearity could be checked in SPSS by running a colinearity statistic such as the variance inflation factor (VIF). The VIF should be run on all variables independently to determine how the scores vary. A research project could also lessen the chances of colinearity by using independent variables that make theoretical sense. Hence, theory should be a significant consideration when selecting independent variables (Berry). In the event that the independent variables are collinear then one could get more data or even combine independent variables.

The last assumption that must be met is the data must be homoscedastic. This means the variance of errors of independent variables are all at the same level, or the conditional distributions are equal. Using SPSS, homoscedasticity can be checked by plotting the standardized residuals to determine if there are constant patterns. The errors of one Y score should also not be correlated to errors in any other observation (Pedhazur, 1997). This can also be checked by plotting the standardized residual and observing the patterns. If problems arise with homoscedasticity then the data will be checked for influential points outliers using Cook’s D and residual information (Berry, 1993). Once having checked and addressed the assumptions, the regression analysis can be conducted.
Research Questions

Given the above-mentioned the following questions guided this research:

1. What is the factorial structure of the Service Experience (SE) instrument?
2. What is the factorial structure of the Black Racial Identity-Scale (BRIAS)?
3. How will racial identity, institution type, gender, major, age, and socioeconomic status predict citizenship factors?
4. How will racial identity, institution type, gender, major, age, and socioeconomic status predict citizenship factors when controlling for institution type?

Hypotheses

Ho:1 Values, Skills, Attitude and Understanding will be the four factors that emerge the revised Service Experience instrument (RSE) instrument. Eyler and Giles (1999) purport that the SE measures these constructs. Because this is a revised version, it is of interest to determine if these four factors are present.

Ho:2 Pre-encounter, encounter, immersion-emersion, and internalization stages will be the factors discovered on the B-RIAS. Studies utilizing the B-RIAS have reported inconsistent findings about the intercorrelations of the racial identity stages. Studies have also found different factor structures when using B-RIAS.

Ho:3 The combination of independent variables will yield significant variables in terms of significant beta coefficients. More specifically, racial identity will be significant in all models and have the largest impact in terms of the standardized beta coefficients in multiple regression. All other variables will be significant in at least one of the models.

Ho:4 When controlling for institution type, students at HBCUs will have higher citizenship scores than those students at PWIs. HBCUs were grounded in a civic mission and the
dynamics at these institutions will yield more civically disposed students. More specifically, the master’s college HBCU will have higher citizenship score than those at the PWI because this institution requires community service as a requirement to graduate and students will be more cognizant of their civic responsibility than the students at the PWI.

Analysis Strategy

Question 1 was determined through factor analysis. The goal was to uncover the factor structure and utilize the factors as dependent variables. As such, the principal components model was employed to reduce the data and maximize the variances of the factors. An oblique rotation was employed to rotate the factors obliquely. The criteria that guided factor selection were: at least three factors per item, theory, item must correlate with its factor at a minimum of .30, as items below this cutoff point will be ignored. Factor analysis was the most useful technique because there are no studies that report and this approach was the most optimal to create subsequent dependent variables.

Question 2 was also determined through factor analysis. The same criteria were applied in this question as was done in Question 1. However, principal axis factoring (PAF) model was applied to this question as well as an orthogonal rotation. Items with correlations below .30 were ignored and items that cross-loaded on other items were ignored. A factor analysis was necessary for the B-RIAS because of the inconsistent factor and correlation findings reported in previous studies. Helms and Parham (1985) provide a prescribed scale for users to create racial identity stages. However, the inconsistent reporting compelled me conduct my own factor analysis to ascertain the factors that truly underlie the data.

Question 3 was discovered by multiple regression. Block-wise analyses were utilized to determine which blocks had significant impacts on the various models. This question was
assessed by interpreting the significant regression coefficients and their corresponding p-values. Also, the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient ($R^2$) was noted to determine the total variance of the model. Regression was the most useful technique because this was an exploratory study and regression shows the relationships between predictor and criterion variables and the variance that predictor variables attribute to criterion variables.

Question 4 was answered by controlling for institution type and running a regression analysis. Block-wise analyses were utilized to determine which blocks had significant impacts. Blocks were entered the same as in Question 3. This question was assessed by interpreting the significant regression coefficients and their corresponding p-values. Regression was the most useful technique because it illustrated the relationship between independent variables and institution type, which also gave indication about the variances that were attributed to the model. The goal was to determine if Black students had significant differences in civic responsibility perceptions and independent variables based on the institution they attended.
CHAPTER 4 RESULTS

This chapter shows the results to the research questions that guided this study. This research is an exploratory study that sought to uncover the relationships between citizenship factors and independent variables that are associated with Black college students. This study is unique given that no other study has been found that utilizes the Service Experience (SE) survey and racial identity measures, among other independent variables, to determine the corresponding relationships associated with Black college students. The following paragraphs will show the results of research questions,

Question 1
What is the factorial structure of the SE?

The Service Experience (SE) survey was originally created by Eyler and Giles (1999) to measure the impact of students’ service-learning experiences. This instrument was a pre- and post test. The pretest measured students’ citizenship values, skills, attitudes, and understanding (Eyler & Giles); the post-test measured the same concepts but questions were tailored to the activities in which students participated. My study utilized the pre-test because no activity took place. The original pretest of the SE was 105 items, however, for this study, the SE was reduced to 43 items. As noted in chapter 3, this was done to shorten the survey, and to establish a foundation for creating another citizenship instrument.

As stated in chapter 3, there are several criteria that guided the decision about the number of factors to extract. The first was a conceptual decision about the factor model of choice. The principal components model was chosen because this approach lends itself to data reeducation (Field, 2000). Simple structure is a goal, which means that the optimal solution would have a group items having strong associations with one factor but not other factors. Therefore, items
must have a minimum loading of .30. There must be at least three items per factor. Last, theory must guide the factor selection.

The orthogonal rotation (varimax) was applied because I found no research to suggest that the factors that purportedly underlie the SE correlate with one another. After obtaining the optimal solution, I found that some of the factors were related with one another based on the correlations that factors had with one another. For example one factor strongly correlated with two other factors (.578 and .939). A different factor moderately correlated with two factors (.386 and .391); therefore, the oblique rotation was applied.

The Promax rotation method was employed to maximize the relationships among factors because this method keeps high loadings high and low loadings low (Gorsuch, 1983). Some of the items on the SE had negative relationships with factors, and even after reverse coding the items they were still negative. The promax raises factor loadings to a higher power, for example squaring the loadings, which ensures that all loading will be positive. Gorsuch suggests that the promax leads to a greater absolute difference and better simple structure.

The first factor solution was run based on the eigen value over 1 model, which is the default on SPSS. This solution produced 13 factors, 5 factors of which did not meet all criteria. Three factors had two items per factor, which excludes them based on my criteria. One factor had three items, but one item cross-loaded with another factor (.337 and .447) respectively, which means these items were higher correlated with the same construct. Another factor had three items, but one item cross-loaded with another factor (-.305 and .699 respectively). I then ran factor models extracting 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 factors. I did not run anymore models because the ten-factor model produced at least three factors that did not meet my criteria.
Based on all prescribed and met criteria, a 7-factor solution was considered optimal. Overall, the 7-factor solution accounted for 45.56% of the variance. This seven-factor solution was also a good match to theory and all factors were thought to measure some aspect of citizenship. Appendix B shows the original item and the items’ new name. Table 2 shows the factors and their corresponding items, as well as the extracted communalities ($h^2$), which shows the relationship between a given item and the remainder of items.

**Reverse Coded Items**

Four items were reverse coded after the EFA to ensure that all items loaded in the same direction. To maximize reliability, items’ relationship with their factor should load in the same direction (negative or positive). Items 17 and 20, which are associated with the Community Orientation factor were recoded (My problems are too large for me to give time to helping others, I feel uncomfortable working with people who are different from me in such things as race, wealth, and life experiences.). One item associated with Apathetic was recoded (Having an impact on community problems is within the reach of most individuals.) Last, one item associated with Community Activist Minded was recoded (I usually take a long time to consider things before I make up my mind). The reverse coding of these items ensured that the reliability coefficients were not negative.

The 7-factor solution was optimal. Each factor will be discussed in the following sections. I will briefly discuss the items that comprise the factor and the overall meaning of the factor. I have also listed the reliability coefficient of each factor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Community Orientation</th>
<th>Political Participation</th>
<th>Voting Behavior</th>
<th>Empathetic</th>
<th>Apathetic</th>
<th>Community-Minded Activist</th>
<th>H2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SK1</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK2</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK3</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK4</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK5</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK6</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK7</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK8</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.544</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.592</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.587</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.565</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO5</td>
<td></td>
<td>.755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO6</td>
<td></td>
<td>.454</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO7</td>
<td></td>
<td>.414</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO8</td>
<td></td>
<td>.583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO9</td>
<td></td>
<td>.568</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO10</td>
<td></td>
<td>.380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.430</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.721</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.733</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.822</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.881</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.871</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.524</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.536</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.386</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.509</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.388</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.496</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.388</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.433</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAM1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAM2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.361</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAM3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.608</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAM4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.607</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Factors

Skills
Factor 1 was named “Skills.” This 8-item factor measures some characteristics that civically responsible citizens are thought to possess. This factor is also consistent with what Items and Table 3 Corresponding Factors

Community Orientation

With ten items, the second factor is named “Community Orientation.” This factor was named such because the common theme of items under this factor is students’ perceptions about the positive disposition that they, the government, and others should possess toward community involvement. Examples of some of the items are: (1) Adults should give some time for the good of the community, (2) I feel that I can have an impact on solving the problems in my community, (3) Having an impact on community problems is within the reach of most individuals, and (4) I feel positive about my community’s ability to solve its social problems. This scale had a reliability coefficient of .758 and contributed 8.23% of the variance to the factor model.

Political Participation

The third factor is “Political Participation.” This four-item factor was named such because the combination of items represents a politically active person. The items that represent the politically active person are: (1) I am active in political campaigns, (2) I am active in campus politics, (3) I often participate in advocacy or political action groups, and (4) I feel positive about my community’s ability to solve its social problems. This scale had a reliability coefficient of .749 and contributed 6.37% of the variance to the factor model.

Voting Behavior

Factor four was named “Voting Behavior.” This three-item factor represents the tendency for students to vote in state and nation election. The three items are: (1) I always vote
in state and local elections, (2) I always vote in national elections, (3) Did you vote in the last
election. This scale had a reliability coefficient of .811 and contributed 5.10% of the variance to
the factor model.

**Empathetic**

“Empathetic” is the fifth factor. This six-item factor reflected respondents’ sensitivity to
working with and understanding others. Four of these items were self-ratings (e.g., Ability to
compromise, Listening Skills, Ability to see consequences of actions, Thinking about others
before myself). The other two items represented the ability to place others first (e.g., I try to
understand my friends better by imagining how things look from their point of view, Before
criticizing somebody, I try to imagine how I would feel if I were in his or her place). This scale
had a reliability coefficient of .680 and contributed 4.21% of the variance to the factor model.

**Apathetic**

The sixth factor was named “Apathetic.” This 5-item factor reflects students’
indifference towards and disconnect from community involvement (e.g., Social problems are not
my concern; Government should get out of the business of solving social problems.) These
students also were more likely to change their opinion after hearing others talk. This scale had a
low to moderately acceptable reliability coefficient of .440 and contributed 3.84% of the
variance to the factor model.

**Community Activist Minded**

The final factor reflected respondents’ thoughts about their and the community’s
responsibility to solve social problems. This four-item factor was named “Community Activist
Minded”. Items on this dimension captured the importance of effectuating change (e.g., The
most important community service is to change public policy, It is important to me personally to
influence the political structure), and the ability to identify social issues. This scale had a reliability coefficient of .396 and contributed 3.59% of the variance to the factor model.

**Relationship Between Factors**

The Direct Oblimin rotation method allowed the factors to correlate. Table 3 illustrates the factor correlation matrix, which shows that some factors have relatively weak relationships with one another. However, some relationships indicate that factors overlap or are interrelated. Specifically, the Skills factor has positive relationships the Empathetic (.243) and Community Activist Minded (.253) factors. This means that the more civic skills that these students possess the more likely they are to empathize with others and have a community-activist mindset. Conversely, the Apathetic factor was negative with not only the Skills factor, but all other factors as well. This means that the more apathetic a student is the less likely they will possess civic skills and have characteristics of the other factors.

These relationships do not establish a cause and effect dynamic. However, given the substantive meanings of the factors, these relationships give valuable insight about the dynamics that affect citizenship behavior. With respect to the skills, many agree that there are a certain set of skills that one must possess in order to effectively participate as a responsible citizen (Colby et al., 2003). Future research needs to further explore these relationships within the Black student population, as well as in other student populations to ascertain if these patterns are constant.

**Reliability**

The reliability coefficients were stated above in the description of the factors. Reliability coefficients give indications of the degree of error in the scores (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 2002). In other words, how often will the similar results occur if the same population was given the same instrument again? The coefficients range from 0 (when the measurement is all error) to
1 (where there is no error in measurement). The commonly accepted benchmark for reliability estimates is .70 (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003), and “a test is reliable to the extent that the scores made by an individual remain nearly the same in repeated measurements (Ary et al.). All but three factors had reliability coefficients of .70 and above: Empathetic, Apathetic, and Community Activist Minded all had coefficients below the accepted cutoff. Inferences were still made about these factors that had low reliabilities coefficients in the discussion section. However, the reader is warned to interpret the results cautiously because of these low reliabilities. Future research may want to conduct in depth analysis and add additional items to measure these constructs and develop more stable civic indicators.

**Table 3 Factor Correlation Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Community Orientation</th>
<th>Political Participation</th>
<th>Voting Behavior</th>
<th>Empathetic</th>
<th>Community Activist Minded</th>
<th>Apathetic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>-.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Orientation</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>-.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Participation</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>-.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathetic</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>-.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Activist Minded</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>-.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apathetic</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 2**

What is the factorial structure of the Black Racial Identity Scale (B-RIAS)?

The B-RIAS was factor analyzed because of the inconsistent factor analysis findings of this scale. The same criteria were applied to this factor model as was applied with the Service Experience (SE) survey: three items per factor, simple structure, at least .30 minimum loading,
and factor model selection based on theory. However, the data from this survey were analyzed using the principal axis factoring model (PAF). PAF seeks to uncover the factors that underlie the data, while principal components, as was applied to the SE, is commonly used for data reduction. The varimax rotation was applied to this analysis to rotate the factors orthogonally.

As was done with the SE, the Eigen value over 1 default of SPSS was the first model that was run, and this model produced nine factors when observing the scree plot. I then ran solutions where I selected 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, and 3 factor solutions. The model that met all criteria was a three-factor solution. This model accounted for 32.64% of the variance. To achieve simple structure, the item with the strongest relationship was interpreted and this item was ignored on the other factor. Appendix C illustrates the old racial identity items and their new items. Table 4 shows the new racial identity items and their loadings with corresponding factors.

The first factor was named “Pre-encounter.” This factor has 11 items. This factor was named such because it reflects a Black person holding anti-Black people and/or Pro-White people attitudes (I believe that large numbers of Blacks are untrustworthy, I believe that White people look and express themselves better than Blacks, I feel uncomfortable when I’m around Black people). This is consistent with how the pre-encounter stage is conceptualized by Helms (1990). This factor had a reliability coefficient of .722, showing acceptable consistency and contributed 12.57% of the variance to the factor model.

With 13 items, the second factor was named “Emersion/Internalization.” This factor was named such because the items encompass meanings ascribed to both the emersion stage and the internalization stage (Helms, 1990). Emersion implies that Blacks feel a sense of solidarity and well being in the presence of other Blacks, while Internalization is characterized by Blacks positively committing to and accepting the Black race as well as other cultures. Examples of
items are: (1) I feel an overwhelming attachment to Black people, (2) I involve myself in causes that will help all oppressed people, (3) I believe the world should be interpreted from an Afro-centric perspective, (4) I find myself reading a lot of Black literature and thinking about being Black. This factor had a reliability coefficient of .744 and contributed 9.32% of variance to the factor model.

**Table 4 Racial Identity Items and Factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Pre-encounter</th>
<th>Emersion-Internalization</th>
<th>Immersion</th>
<th>H2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE1</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td></td>
<td>.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE2</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td></td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE3</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td></td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE4</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td></td>
<td>.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE5</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td></td>
<td>.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE6</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td></td>
<td>.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE7</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td></td>
<td>.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE8</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td></td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE9</td>
<td>.487</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td></td>
<td>.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE10</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td></td>
<td>.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE11</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.321</td>
<td></td>
<td>.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.328</td>
<td></td>
<td>.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.449</td>
<td></td>
<td>.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.385</td>
<td></td>
<td>.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE5</td>
<td></td>
<td>.407</td>
<td></td>
<td>.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE6</td>
<td></td>
<td>.573</td>
<td></td>
<td>.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE7</td>
<td></td>
<td>.391</td>
<td></td>
<td>.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE8</td>
<td></td>
<td>.356</td>
<td></td>
<td>.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE9</td>
<td></td>
<td>.423</td>
<td></td>
<td>.293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE10</td>
<td></td>
<td>.599</td>
<td></td>
<td>.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE11</td>
<td></td>
<td>.528</td>
<td></td>
<td>.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE12</td>
<td></td>
<td>.540</td>
<td></td>
<td>.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE13</td>
<td></td>
<td>.323</td>
<td></td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>.273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last factor had three items and is named “Immersion.” This factor reflects a Black person being immersed in Black culture and are indifferent towards White culture. This is also
consistent with Helm’s (1990) conceptualization, but the immersion stage in her model was connected to the emersion stage. Therefore, this factor has not been studied independent of the emersion stage, and in this instance, is thought to hold distinct interpretations. The items associated with this factor are (1) I am increasing my involvement in Black activities because I don’t feel comfortable in White environments, (2) A person’s race does not influence how comfortable I feel when I am with her or him, and (3) I feel good about being Black, but do not limit myself to Black activities. The latter two had negative relationships with this factor. This factor had a reliability coefficient of .452 and contributed 3.57% to the factor model.

Question 3

What is the relationship between citizenship factors uncovered on the SE to racial identity stages, institution type, major, classes taken in community service, classification, socioeconomic status, age, and gender?

Multiple regression was the data analytic technique employed to answer research question 3. Chapter 2, the literature, discussed how the independent variables in this question related to some elements of citizenship. Studies were cited that found significant differences with these independent variables as they related to citizenship, providing support for the use of these variables in my citizenship study. Therefore, this study sought to explore the relationships between these independent variables and citizenship factors, which have not been documented before.

Independent variables in this study were continuous, meaning that they could take on a value of any scale of measurement, usually known as quantitative variables (Hinkel, Wiersma, & Jurs, 1998). The independent variables were racial identity stages, institution type, major, classes taken in community service, classification, socioeconomic status, age, and gender. Some of the
independent variables were recoded into dummy variables that dichotomize a variable with two or more categories. For example, gender was recoded into a dummy variable (male 1, female 0). Institution type and major were also recoded into dummy variables. Regarding major, students had the opportunity to select a major, which were coded as one of four types of majors (Hard-applied science, Hard-pure science, Soft-pure science, and Soft-applied science). Major was recoded into Hard-sciences (1) and Soft sciences (0). Hard sciences included majors such as Chemistry, Biology, Astronomy, Math, and Physics, while Soft sciences included majors such as English, Sociology, Communications, and Education.

Blockwise selection was used to enter variables into the regression equation. This procedure allows the independent variables to be grouped in blocks based on theoretical considerations (Pedhazur, 1997). Blockwise selection also allows a clear indication of how each block contributes to the dependent variable. When the first block is entered, the other blocks are not considered into the equation. However, when the second block is entered the first block remains and the contribution of the second block is illustrated through the difference in the change of $R^2$. This procedure is completed until all the blocks are entered.

There are several indicators if the models are significant and if any models have significant variables. The following tables give values of $R^2$, adjusted $R^2$, $R^2$ change, p-values, and standardized and unstandardized regression coefficients. The $R^2$ is given after each block is considered in the equation, and it represents the amount of variance the combination of independent variables contributes to the model. The adjusted $R^2$ provides a conservative estimate of the variance attributed to the dependent variable based on the relationship between the combination of independent variables. The adjusted $R^2$ is mostly useful when there are large number of predictors and small sample size. Since this sample size is larger than 100, the $R^2$ is
an acceptable indicator (Hinkel, Wiersma, & Jurs, 1998). The value of the $R^2$ change indicates the amount of variance that each block contributes to the model. The p-values are the probability values associated with the F-test that indicate if the inclusion of a block of independent variables provides a significant change in the model.

Unstandardized and standardized beta coefficients of the independent variables are also provided in the table below. The unstandardized betas are given first and the standardized betas, offset by the slash symbol (/), are given second. The asterisks (**) indicate that the independent variable significantly contributed to the model.

There were five blocks of independent variables utilized in this study. The predictor variables that are hypothesized to contribute the most to the dependent variables should be entered first (Pedhazur, 1997). Since racial identity was hypothesized to contribute most to citizenship factor, the three racial identity constructs that underlie the data set comprised the first block. Institution type was also hypothesized to contribute to citizenship factors; therefore, the four institutions in this study comprised the second block. The third block comprised of college characteristics (number of community classes taken, major, and classification) because these are educationally related variables and higher education is the focus of the study. The fourth block was SES because many studies show how this variable is influential. Demographics characteristics (gender and age and region of country born) comprised the fifth block.

The following tables show the regression results of the seven citizenship dependent variables and independent variables (racial identity, institution type, classes taken in community service, classification, major, socioeconomic status, age, and gender).
Dependent Variables

The dependent variables in this study were the factors that were uncovered from the Service Experience (SE) instrument. In order for the factors to be entered into regression equations, they were transformed into sum scores by adding items that corresponded with their primary factor. For example, the factor Skills had eight items; therefore, eight items were added together to create the Skills sum score.

In order to reduce error and maximize prediction, standardized residuals that were above and below 3 cases were deleted. 2 cases were deleted that the Skills factor (-3.14, -3.153). 3 cases were deleted on the Community Orientation factor (-3.28, -3.42, and 3.37). 1 case was deleted on the Political Participation factor (-3.074); and a case was deleted on Voting Behavior. There were no cases deleted on the Empathetic and Community Activist factors. 1 case was deleted on the Apathetic construct (-3.324).

Results

Table 5 shows the results of the dependent variable Skills. Racial identity was significant in block 1. There were no additional significant independent variables in block 2. Classification was significant in the third block. Block 4 shows that the addition of socioeconomic status (SES) was significant. Age was significant in block 5.

Racial identity was significant in block 1, but more specifically Black students who hold Emersion/Internalization attitudes have higher citizenship skills scores than the other two stages. Also, students who had had higher rank in classifications had higher Citizenship scores. Students who belong to higher SES levels have higher citizenship skills scores. Last, older students had higher citizenship skills scores than younger students.
Table 6 shows the results of the Community Orientation dependent variable. Block 1 indicates that racial identity was significant. There were no additional significant variables in blocks 2, 3, or 4. The addition of Gender was significant in block 5.

Two racial identity stages were significant in block 1. Black students possessing preencounter attitudes had lower scores on the Community Orientation factor. Conversely, those students who possessed Emersion/Internalization attitudes had higher scores on the Community Orientation. Also, males had lower scores on the Community Orientation factor than females.

**Table 5 Regression Results for Skills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Block 1 (Betas/Std Betas)</th>
<th>Block 2 (Betas/Std Betas)</th>
<th>Block 3 (Betas/Std Betas)</th>
<th>Block 4 (Betas/Std Betas)</th>
<th>Block 5 (Betas/Std Betas)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preencounter</td>
<td>-.025/-.029</td>
<td>-.024/-.028</td>
<td>-.018/-.021</td>
<td>.001/.001</td>
<td>.002/.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion</td>
<td>.182/.064</td>
<td>.194/.068</td>
<td>.201/.070</td>
<td>.175/.061</td>
<td>.173/.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emer/Internation</td>
<td>.194/.270**</td>
<td>.191/.266**</td>
<td>.167/.232**</td>
<td>.159/.220**</td>
<td>.162/.225**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>-.024/-.028</td>
<td>-.028/-.028</td>
<td>-.018/-.021</td>
<td>.001/.001</td>
<td>.002/.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service Class</td>
<td>.375/.036</td>
<td>.066/.006</td>
<td>.058/.006</td>
<td>.013/.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>.278/.066</td>
<td>.338/.080</td>
<td>.279/.066</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HardSciences</td>
<td>.784/.181**</td>
<td>.790/.182**</td>
<td>.570/.131**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>-1.260/-1.02</td>
<td>-1.286/-1.04</td>
<td>-1.062/-1.086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.650/.168**</td>
<td>.728/.189**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.145/.142**</td>
<td>.145/.142**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R-Squared</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared change</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-value</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 shows the results from the Political Participation construct. Racial identity was the only variable significant in this model. More specifically, Preencounter and Emersion/Internalization were both positively related. Hence, students who possessed these identities had high scores on Political Participation scores.
Table 6 Regression Results for Community Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Orientation</th>
<th>Block 1 (Betas/Std Betas)</th>
<th>Block 2 (Betas/Std Betas)</th>
<th>Block 3 (Betas/Std Betas)</th>
<th>Block 4 (Betas/Std Betas)</th>
<th>Block 5 (Betas/Std Betas)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preencounter Immersion</td>
<td>-.251/-.292**</td>
<td>-.250/-.290**</td>
<td>-.254/-.295**</td>
<td>-.250/-.291**</td>
<td>-.217/-.252**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emer/Internalization</td>
<td>.170/.062</td>
<td>.201/.073</td>
<td>.189/.069</td>
<td>.182/.066</td>
<td>.188/.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.214/.314**</td>
<td>.206/.303**</td>
<td>.215/.315**</td>
<td>.213/.312**</td>
<td>.218/.319**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>.854/.086</td>
<td>.965/.098</td>
<td>.980/.099</td>
<td>.848/.086</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service Class</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.010/.003</td>
<td>-.002/.000</td>
<td>-.045/.011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.290/-.069</td>
<td>-.294/-.070</td>
<td>-.098/-.023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HardSciences</td>
<td>.640/.054</td>
<td>.634/.053</td>
<td>.642/.054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td></td>
<td>.138/.037</td>
<td>.174/.047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.068/-.070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.1965/-.188**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R-Squared</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared change</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-value</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 shows the results from the Voting Behavior dependent variable. In block 1, racial identity was significant. There were no additional significant variables in block 2. Block 3 shows that the addition of classification and major were significant. There were no additional significant variables in block 4. The addition of age in block 5 was significant.

The Emersion/Internalization stage was the racial identity stage significant in block 1. Students at this stage had high Voting Behavior scores. In block 3, students who belonged to higher ranks of classifications had higher Voting scores; and students who belonged to a hard science major had lower voting behavior scores than students who belonged to a pure science major. Last, older students had higher voting behavior scores than younger students.
Table 9 shows the results of the Empathetic factor. There were no significant variables in block 1. The addition of institution type was significant in block 2. There were no additional significant variables in blocks 3 and 4. The addition of gender was significant in block 5.

Institution type was significant in block 2. Specifically, Black students who attended an HBCU had higher Empathetic scores than those Black students who attended a PWI. Gender was also significant; males had lower scores on the Empathetic scale than females.

### Table 7 Regression Results for Political Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Participation</th>
<th>Block 1 (Betas/Std Betas)</th>
<th>Block 2 (Betas/Std Betas)</th>
<th>Block 3 (Betas/Std Betas)</th>
<th>Block 4 (Betas/Std Betas)</th>
<th>Block 5 (Betas/Std Betas)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preencounter Immersion</td>
<td>.079/.152**</td>
<td>.079/.151**</td>
<td>.079/.151**</td>
<td>.077/.148**</td>
<td>.080/.152**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emer/Interna</td>
<td>-.117/-.070</td>
<td>-.121/-.072</td>
<td>-.140/-.084</td>
<td>-.138/-.082</td>
<td>-.139/-.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>.157/.371**</td>
<td>.158/.373**</td>
<td>.162/.383**</td>
<td>.163/.385**</td>
<td>.164/.388**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service Class</td>
<td>-.123/-0.20</td>
<td>-.127/-0.21</td>
<td>-.125/-0.21</td>
<td>-.141/-0.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>-.230/-0.90</td>
<td>-.231/-0.90</td>
<td>-.254/-0.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HardSciences</td>
<td>-.112/-0.15</td>
<td>-.110/-0.15</td>
<td>-.078/-0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>-.053/-0.23</td>
<td>-.037/-0.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.017/.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.159/-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R-squared</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared change</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-value</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>.806</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8 Regression Results for Voting Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voting Behavior</th>
<th>Block 1 (Betas/Std Betas)</th>
<th>Block 2 (Betas/Std Betas)</th>
<th>Block 3 (Betas/Std Betas)</th>
<th>Block 4 (Betas/Std Betas)</th>
<th>Block 5 (Betas/Std Betas)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.036/.029</td>
<td>.044/.036</td>
<td>.045/.036</td>
<td>.044/.035</td>
<td>.043/.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.046/.151**</td>
<td>.044/.143**</td>
<td>.034/.110</td>
<td>.033/.109</td>
<td>.037/.119**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table cont.)
The results for the Apathetic dependent variable are shown in table 10. Racial identity was significant in block 1. The addition of institution type was significant in block 2. Block 3 shows that the addition of classification was significant. The addition of SES, in block 4, was significant. The addition of age and gender was significant in block 5.

Preencounter and Emersion/Internalization were significant. Black students who possessed Preencounter attitudes had high Apathetic scores, while Black students who possessed Emersion/Internalization attitudes had low Apathetic scores. Students who attended a HBCU had low Apathetic scores versus those who attended a PWI. Students who belong to higher ranks of classifications had lower Apathetic scores. Students who came from higher SES backgrounds had lower Apathetic scores. And, males had higher Apathetic scores than females.

Table 9 Regression Results for Empathetic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empathetic</th>
<th>Block 1 (Betas/Std Betas)</th>
<th>Block 2 (Betas/Std Betas)</th>
<th>Block 3 (Betas/Std Betas)</th>
<th>Block 4 (Betas/Std Betas)</th>
<th>Block 5 (Betas/Std Betas)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preencounter</td>
<td>-.023/.036</td>
<td>-.021/.033</td>
<td>-.026/.040</td>
<td>-.029/.045</td>
<td>-.015/.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion</td>
<td>.170/.082</td>
<td>.201/.097</td>
<td>.195/.094</td>
<td>.200/.097</td>
<td>.188/.091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table cont.)
### Table 10 Regression Results for Apathetic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apathetic</th>
<th>Block 1 (Betas/Std Betas)</th>
<th>Block 2 (Betas/Std Betas)</th>
<th>Block 3 (Betas/Std Betas)</th>
<th>Block 4 (Betas/Std Betas)</th>
<th>Block 5 (Betas/Std Betas)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preencounter Immersion</td>
<td>.180/.362**</td>
<td>.179/.360**</td>
<td>.179/.360**</td>
<td>.169/.340**</td>
<td>.158/.317**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emer/Internation</td>
<td>-.088/-1.27</td>
<td>-.085/-1.22</td>
<td>-.074/-1.10</td>
<td>-.071/-1.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.291/-1.20**</td>
<td>-.294/-1.21**</td>
<td>-.436/-1.79**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HardSciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.460/-1.065</td>
<td>-.384/-1.054</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.331/-1.52**</td>
<td>-.336/-1.55**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R-Squared</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared change</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-value</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Question 4

What is the relationship between citizenship factors to racial identity stages, major, classes taken in community service, classification, socioeconomic status, age, and gender when controlling for institution type?
Institution type was significant in two models (Community Orientation and Voting Behavior). Many results remain constant from question 3 to question 4. Therefore, results and tables are given below for those models that have institution type as a significant variable, and are different from those of question 3.

The Community Orientation results are presented in table 11. Results show that racial identity is significant in block 1. The addition of institution type was significant in block 2. There were no additional variables that were significant in blocks 3 or 4. The addition of gender was significant in block 5.

As was the case in research question 3, Black students who possessed preencounter attitudes had low scores on Community Orientation, while those students who possessed Emersion/Internalization attitudes had high scores. Students who attended the doctoral-extensive HBCU had significantly higher Community Orientation scores than those students who attended the doctoral-extensive PWI. Last, Black males had lower Community Orientation scores than Black females.

Table 12 shows the results of the Voting Behavior with controlling for institution type. With respect to Voting Behavior, students who possessed Emersion/Internalization attitudes had significantly higher scores than other racial identity categories. Students who attended the masters’ college and university HBCU had significantly higher scores on Voting Behavior than those students who attended the doctoral-extensive PWI. And, students who belonged to higher classifications had higher scores than students who belonged to lower classifications.

The regression analyses provided some interesting relationships. The next section will discuss each of the significant models that were found.
### Table 11 Regression Results of Community Orientation (Controlling for Institution Type)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Block 1 (Beta/Std Betas)</th>
<th>Block 2 (Beta/Std Betas)</th>
<th>Block 3 (Beta/Std Betas)</th>
<th>Block 4 (Beta/Std Betas)</th>
<th>Block 5 (Beta/Std Betas)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preencounter</td>
<td>-.230/-.260**</td>
<td>-.198/-224**</td>
<td>-.204/-231**</td>
<td>-.202/-229**</td>
<td>-.176/-199**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion</td>
<td>.158/.056</td>
<td>.223/.079</td>
<td>.204/.072</td>
<td>.200/.071</td>
<td>.206/.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DE-HBCU</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MC-PWI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MC-HBCU</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Class</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>- .302/- .070</td>
<td>-.306/- .071</td>
<td>-.311/- .072</td>
<td>-.310/- .071</td>
<td>-.314/- .072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R-</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared change</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-value</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>.725</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12 Regression Results Voting Behavior (Controlling for Institution Type)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Block 1 (Beta/Std Betas)</th>
<th>Block 2 (Beta/Std Betas)</th>
<th>Block 3 (Beta/Std Betas)</th>
<th>Block 4 (Beta/Std Betas)</th>
<th>Block 5 (Beta/Std Betas)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavior</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preencounter</td>
<td>.008/.022</td>
<td>-.002/-006</td>
<td>.003/.008</td>
<td>.005/.012</td>
<td>.014/.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion</td>
<td>.047/.038</td>
<td>.037/.030</td>
<td>.043/.035</td>
<td>.039/.032</td>
<td>.040/.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emer/Inter</td>
<td>.041/.133**</td>
<td>.047/.154**</td>
<td>.036/.116**</td>
<td>.035/.115**</td>
<td>.038/.122**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DE-HBCU</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MC-PWI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MC-HBCU</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Class</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>.281/.151**</td>
<td>.278/.150**</td>
<td>.276/.150**</td>
<td>.274/.150**</td>
<td>.272/.150**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HardSciences</td>
<td>-.610/-113**</td>
<td>-.610/-113**</td>
<td>-.609/-113**</td>
<td>-.608/-113**</td>
<td>-.607/-113**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table cont.)
|       |                  |                  |  |                  |  |
|-------|------------------|------------------|  |------------------|  |
| SES   |                  |                  |  | .133/.080        |  |
| Age   |                  |                  |  | .112/.253        |  |
| Male  | -.459/-.098      |                  |  |                  |  |
| R-squared | .022  | .070 | .118 | .120 | .179 |
| R-squared change | .022  | .049 | .048 | .001 | .059 |
| P-value | .097  | .002 | .002 | .498 | .000 |
CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION

This chapter discusses the findings of the study. This chapter has four sections which expound upon the four propositions hypothesized for this study. Each hypothesis will have its respective subsections. The purpose of this dissertation was to explore these unique relationships and provide a new model from which other researchers can build. The hypotheses will be written in bold and their analyses, which focuses on how these findings support or contrast other studies, will follow.

Hypothesis 1
Values, Skills, Attitude and Understanding will be the four factors that emerge the revised Service Experience instrument (RSE) instrument. Eyler and Giles (1999) purport that the SE measures these constructs. It is of interest to determine if these four factors are present, because this is a revised version.

This hypothesis was not fully supported. Eyler and Giles suggest that the SE measured students’ citizenship values, skills, attitudes, and level of understanding. The revised Service Experience instrument (RSE) yielded seven factors (Citizenship Skills, Community Orientation, Political Participation, Voting Behavior, Empathetic, Community Activist Minded, and Apathetic). The following paragraphs discuss factors’ match to previous research, reliability and the relationship between factors. I also explain how the uncovered factors may be a part of a second-order factor structure.

Match to Previous Research

In addition to the RSE, an example of a scale that measures some aspect of citizenship would be one that was developed by Weber et al. (2004). Their Civic Participation and Self-Efficacy Toward Service construct closely resembles the Community Orientation factor. The
items that measured Civic Participation were (1) I am concerned about local community issues, (2) I should volunteer my time to support my community, (3) I want to work toward equal opportunity for all, (4) People should find time to contribute to their communities, (5) I want to support those less fortunate, and (6) Involvement in programs to improve my community is important. The items that measured Self-efficacy Toward Service were: (1) I can have a positive impact on social problems, (2) I can help people with handicaps, (3) I have confidence in my ability to help others, (4) I can make a difference in my community, and (5) Each of us can make a difference in the lives of the less fortunate. The difference between the two constructs is that the former has a passive tone, while the latter has a more active tone. The community orientation factor shares qualities of both.

Some items on the Political Participation resemble the items on the Adult Political Participation scale created by Cole and Stewart (1996). Some items on this scale are: (1) took an active part in a political campaign, (2) participated in a political party between elections, (3) kept informed about politics, (4) sent messages to political leaders when they were doing well or poorly. Some institutes include similar items on their instruments, for example, the College Student Survey and the Freshmen survey, sponsored by the Higher Education Research Institute at University California-Los Angeles, ask questions about the frequency that students discuss politics or voted in a school election (HERI, 2004). The General Social Science Survey (GSS) sponsored by the University of Michigan, also asks some questions about political participation.

Empathy is a construct that has been studied in many contexts utilizing factor analysis. It has been studied utilizing religion (Walker & Gorsuch, 2004), personality (Vand der Zee, Zall, & Piekstra, 2003), and emotional intelligence (Tapia, 2001) to name a few. One study described empathy as a “distinct socio-emotional experience that involves the effort to understand the
internal mental and emotional events of other human beings” (Schieman & Van Gundy, 200, p. 152). The empathy items on their scale were: (1) I tend to get emotionally involved with friends’ problems, (2) I don’t get upset because a friend is troubled, (3) When a friend starts talking about his or her problems, I tend to steer the conversation to something else, (4) Sometimes I don’t feel sorry for other people when they are having problems, (5) Other peoples problems usually don’t disturb me a great deal, (6) I am usually aware of feelings of other people, (7) I feel that other people ought to take care of their own problems themselves, and (8) Many times I have felt so close to someone else’s difficulties that they seemed as if they were my own. There were no studies found that utilize an empathetic construct in a citizenship context, which makes my Empathetic factor qualitatively different from other studies.

The items on the Community Activist Minded factor somewhat relate to the Community Activist factor found by Fendrich and Lovoy (1998). Items under their factor were: (1) Be a candidate for office, (2) Work with others on local problems, (3) Form a group work on other problems, (4) Contact local officials on social issues, (5) Contact local, state, or federal official about a personal problem, and (6) go with a group to protest to a public official. These items represent action that people have taken. The Community Activist Minded factor was named such because no action has been taken, but the thoughts of being a community proponent are present.

Apathy has also been studied utilizing factor analysis. This construct has been studied in a multitude of contexts. The Apathy factor has been found in research involving psychiatric ratings (Thomas, Donell, Young, 2004), personality studies (Stout, Ready, Grace, Malloy, & Paulsen, 2003), and Alzheimer’s disease (Strauss & Sperry, 2002) to name a few. However, no studies of the construct being utilized in a citizen context have been found previously.
The Service Ethic Scale (Tang & Weatherford, 1998) relates to cultivating citizenship skills. However, this survey is a 10-item instrument that assumes that people already engage in service. A sample of 150 school administrators were given this instrument, as this was the beginning stages of development for this instrument. Items are measured on a 5-point Likert scale from Strongly agree to Strongly disagree. Items are: (1) Service to others gives me an opportunity to give help to other people, (2) Service to others is honorable, (3) Service to others gives me a feeling of worthwhile accomplishment (4) Service to others gives me a feeling of self-fulfillment, (5) Service to others provides an opportunity for personal growth and development, (6) Service to others increases my self-esteem, (7) I feel I am a better person when I help others, (8) Service to others makes me feel that I am an important part of the community (9) Service to others provides an opportunity to develop close friendships, and (10) Service to others gives me a feeling of prestige and I gain respect in the eyes of others.

This instrument does not relate to the Service Experience Survey, but could be useful after students have gone through a service-learning program or some other service activity. This instrument would not be very useful if applied to persons not involved in a formally recognized service program, as is was utilized in this study, because everyone may not believe that their everyday actions are related to service. However, this instrument may still by useful when assessing the student perceptions of their civic responsibility.

Reliability

There were seven factors that emerged from the SE instead of four. Four of the factors (Skills, Community Orientation, Political Participation, and Voting Behavior) had commonly accepted reliability coefficients of .70 and above. Three of the factors (Empathetic, Apathetic and Community Activist Minded) had reliability coefficients below .70. Empathetic was on the
margin with a .680 coefficient. Coefficients above .70 suggest that there is a strong intercorrelation between items that associate with a particular construct, providing an indicator of construct validity of a factor. Coefficients below .70 suggest that the intercorrelation between items that associate with a particular construct is not a very strong measure of what that construct represents. The seven factors found in this study are utilized as dependent variables in subsequent regression analyses. Therefore, when interpreting results the reader must exercise caution when he/she does so with the factors that have reliability coefficients of less than .70.

Possible Second Order Factors

My study found seven factors. Eyler and Giles (1999) stated that the SE represents four factors (Attitude, Understanding, Skills, and Values). I found no studies that reported the factor structure of the SE. The seven factors I found may be sub-factors of a larger factor, or second-order factors. Second order factors occur when one or more factors that have confirmed structures, determined by fit indices, correlate with a higher order factor (Schumacker & Lomax, 1996). For example, factors found in this study such as Political Participation and Voting Behavior may be part of a higher order factor named Values, which is one construct that Eyler and Giles purport the SE measures. Further research should confirm the factors that underlie the SE to determine if the extent to which factors found relate and correlate with one another. Then, advanced techniques such as structural equation modeling (SEM) could determine the overarching dimensions that underlie this instrument. This process would ultimately lead to better measures of citizenship behaviors of students.

Relationship Between Factors

The relationship between factors suggests that the factor model was developed correctly. For example, there are moderately strong relationships between the Skills factor and all other
factors except Apathetic. I have neither found any published studies that have factor analyzed the SE, nor have I found studies that report the correlations between the factors found on the SE. The finding that Apathetic is negatively related to all other factors, provides an indicator that the system of constructs relates to one another in logical ways.

Hypothesis: 2

Pre-encounter, encounter, immersion-emersion, and internalization stages will be the factors discovered on the B-RIAS. Studies utilizing the B-RIAS have reported inconsistent findings about the intercorrelations of the racial identity stages. Studies have also found different factor structures when using B-RIAS.

This hypothesis was rejected. Helms and Parham (1985) suggest that the Black Racial Identity Scale (B-RIAS) measures four racial identity stages (pre-encounter, encounter, immersion-emersion, and internalization). I only found three factors (Pre-encounter, Immersion, Emersion/Internalization).

Match to Previous Research

The three factors found in this research are consistent with finding in previous research. Ponterotto and Wise (1987) and Yanico, Swanson and Tokar (1994) both found three factors when they conducted exploratory factor analyses on the B-RIAS. They found support for pre-encounter, immersion-emersion, and internalization. They did not find support for the encounter stage. The encounter stage was also not found in this data set. It may be the case that the Encounter stage is not easily identifiable or only lasts very briefly. Parham, White and Ajamu (1999) write that encounter is “characterized by an individual experiencing one or many significant (shocking) personal and social events that are inconsistent with his or her frame of reference” (p. 47). The example they give was if a Black person who did not view his/her race
as important was denied access to an exclusive neighborhood because of race. This “encounter” may be brief but the subsequent behaviors may be Immersion and/or other stages. Therefore, it stands to reason that Encounter will be difficult to uncover as a factor because its characteristics may be too fleeting.

Besides the two studies stated above, I found no other factor analysis studies that factor analyzed the Black racial identity scale. It is because of this lack of finding that I conclude that other studies created racial identity subscales from the prescribed subscales stated by Helms and Parham (1985). For example, Helms and Parham state that Pre-encounter measures 9 items. In the data set for this study, Pre-encounter measured eleven items, nine of which corresponded with the authors’ conceptualization. Helms and Parham purport that seventeen items measured both the Immersion (8) and Internalization (9) stages. Emersion/Internalization found in this study most closely matches Helms and Parham’s Internalization stage. Seven of Emersion/Internalization’s thirteen items loaded on Helms and Parham’s Internalization factor. Last, the Immersion stage for this study had three items, one of which loaded on the original scale’s Immersion factor.

This study found qualitatively different factors than what was purported by the original authors. This may be the case because the language on the scale, which was created in the 1980s, is far different than what is the commonly spoken today in the Black community. Constructs change meaning over time, and some meaning could be lost in the items by Black people of today because they may not truly understand the combination of words on particular items in the survey. New racial identity measures should contain items that reflect the language of today’s Black community in order to create stronger and more valid measures of racial identity.
Reliability

Two of the three factor found on B-RIAS had acceptable reliability coefficients of .70 or higher. The Pre-encounter construct for this study reported a coefficient of .722. The Emersion/Internalization construct’s reliability estimate was .744. The Immersion factor for this study had a reliability coefficient of .452. Most of the previous research that reported reliability coefficients on the B-RIAS have done so from the four-factor model (Helms, 1990; Helms & Carter, 1991; Helms & Parham, 1996). Therefore, it is difficult to compare reliability estimates of four factor models to three-factor models. However, most of the four-factor coefficients ranged from (1) pre-encounter .69 - .77, (2) encounter .41 - .51, (3) immersion-emersion .59-.69, and (4) internalization .79 - .80. The four-factor estimates suggest that the four-factor structure gives relatively good indicators of Black racial identity. My study gives the racial identity stages new meaning because items correlate differently than the four-factor model. Therefore, my study provides a new way of looking at racial identity to the research community that should be expounded upon.

Related Research

Aside from the studies that utilize the B-RIAS, there are prior instruments that measure or discuss Black identity of Black people. The Multidimensional Model of Racial Identity (MMRI)(Sellars, Rowley, Chavous, Shelton, & Smith, 1998) is the only other instrument that measures racial identity. The MMRI proposes four dimensions or racial identity for Blacks: (1) Identity salience- the extent to which a person’s race is a relevant part of her or his self-concept at a particular moment in time, (2) Racial ideology-the individual’s set of beliefs, opinions, and attitudes with respect to the way he or she feels members of his or race should act, (3) Racial
regard- a person’s affective and evaluative judgment of their race, and (4) Racial centrality- the extent to which a person normatively defines herself or himself with respect to race (p. 806).

The MMRI is conceptualized as three scales: Centrality, Regard, and Ideology. Many items of the MMRI are similar to the ones on the B-RIAS. The Centrality scale represented the extent to which individuals’ normative perceptions of self with respect to race across of number of situations (e.g., In general being Black is an important part of my self-image, My destiny is tied to other Black people, and Being Black is an important reflection on who I am.) The Regard scale represented individual’s positive and/or negative affective and evaluative judgment about being Black (I feel good about Black people, I believe because I am Black, I have many strengths). And the Ideology scale consists of four subscales: Assimilation (e.g., Blacks should strive to be full members of the American political system, Blacks should feel free to interact socially with White people); Humanist (e.g., Blacks should have the choice to marry interracially, People regardless of their race have strengths and limitations); Oppressed Minority (e.g., Blacks should try to become friends with people from other oppressed groups, Blacks should learn about the oppression from other groups); and Nationalist (e.g., Blacks would be better of if they adopted Afrocentric values, Whenever possible, Blacks should buy from other Black business). This scale is not widely published because of its newness as it was published in 1998.

Neal (2002) proposed a typology of Black students as being either Activist, Strivers or Cross-overs. He states that “activists are most aware of their racial heritage, generally as a response to their campus environment, the influence of their parents, or a genuine desire to know about themselves” (p. 179). Activist range from seeking to participating in Afrocentric activities
to dressing in Afrocentric clothing and wearing Afrocentric hairstyles. This type of Black students fits the description of one who is at the Immersion-Emersion stage of racial identity.

Neal’s (2002) contextual analysis suggests that the Strivers make up the largest percentage of Black students. These are Black students who “aspire to middle-class futures as lawyers, dentists, financial planners, and software designers…many of them are pressured to re-create middle-class lifestyles, some come from solid working-class and working poor environments” (p. 180). Neal believes that race matters to Strivers but not enough to jeopardize their careers. He also states that the extreme case for Strivers are Black students who “exude a sense of difference toward other black students that parallels the sense of difference that many Whites have toward Blacks” (p. 181). That sentiment resembles the anti-Black definition of the Pre-encounter Black.

The last group is the Crossovers. Neal says the typical crossover may listen to White music, wear Wranglers while holding hands with a White partner. Some of these students may be products of interracial parentage. Neal also suggests that these Black students are at the forefront of campus politics. He adds that Crossovers “are often lauded by their white peers for being model minorities…meanwhile, black students, Activists and Strivers alike, often view the black student who the crossovers as examples of cultural ignorance and racial self-hatred” (p. 182). Neal states that Crossovers should expect to subject to some sort of exile. Neal does not enough information about type of student to relate him/her to the racial identity stages. They could be Internalized or Pro-White Pre-encounter from the previous version of the B-RIAS.

Hypothesis: 3
The combination of independent variables will yield significant variables in terms of the t-statistic. More specifically, racial identity will be significant in all models and have the largest
impact in terms of the standardized beta coefficients. All other variables will be significant in at least one of the models.

This hypothesis was supported. Racial identity was significant in five of the seven models. A racial identity stage had the largest standardized coefficient among all other variables in three of the seven models. The Emersion/Internalization stage correlated to civic variables in ways that higher education would ultimately prefer these relationships to be, positively. Conversely, the Preencounter stage correlated with dependent variables in ways that higher education would find undesirable in a citizenship context, negatively. Given the theoretical framework, the findings with respect to racial identity and civic indicators are intuitive.

Skills

The finding that Black students who possessed Emersion/Internalization attitudes had significantly high scores on the Civic Skills factor lends support to the racial identity theory. To be a coalition builder and an effective citizen, one would have the ability to engage in discussion with others, communicate ideas, and possess the types of civic skills necessary to communicate with those different than him/herself (Colby et al., 2003). The Emersion/Internalization lends itself to these principles because it allows space for a Black person to civically engage with other races, which necessitates some civic skills that members of the academic community deem imperative to be civically responsible.

Community Orientation and Racial Identity

Racial identity was also significant in the Community Orientation (CO) model. Preencounter negatively related to CO, while Emersion/Internalization positively related to it. This finding also supports the theory of Black racial identity. Community Orientation represents the perceptions about the positive disposition that students, government and others have toward
society (I positive about my community’s ability to solve its social problems, I feel I can have an impact on my community). Some Preencounter Blacks may loathe other Blacks and view Blacks as their worst enemy, or engage in “street hustling” or exploiting them (Cross, 1991). The dynamic of this personality does not lend itself to positive community involvement perceptions. The internalized personality, conversely, does lend itself to positive community involvement perceptions. Internalized people are concerned with people in general and value people different from themselves (Cross). Therefore, Blacks who possess these attitudes are more likely to perceive a more positive role toward community involvement.

Political Participation

The racial identity findings in the Political Participation model must be interpreted cautiously. The Preencounter and Emersion/Internalization stages are both significant and positive. The Political Participation construct represents activity in campus politics and political and advocacy groups in general. The standardized beta associated with Emersion Internalization is .388, while the standardized beta associated with Preencounter is .152. Racial identity contributed 16.3% of the variance in a model that has a total variance of 17.3%. Therefore, Emersion/Internalization explains most of the variance within the racial identity model, which suggest that higher racial identity scores lead to more political participation.

These Preencounter findings suggest that those who possess Preencounter attitudes are more likely to involve themselves in political activities that are pro-White, anti-Black, or race-neutral organizations. For example, a Pre-encounter Black may subscribe to a predominantly European perspective to affect social change or not consider how race affects environments when proposing changes. Conversely, the findings could suggest that Blacks at the Emersion/Internalization stage may involve themselves in organizations/activities that promote
social justice through bridge building and consider how race affects society from an Afrocentric perspective. No other study has found that both Pre-encounter and Internalization positively related to political participation. However, Mitchell and Dell (1992) found that Internalization significantly and positively related to participation in non-cultural campus activities, which relates to the political participation definition in this study.

**Voting Behavior and Racial Identity**

Only one of the racial identity stages was significant in the Voting Behavior model. The Emersion/Internalization was positive. Voting behavior is a concern for many scholars and educators (Astin, 1999; Boyte & Kari, 2000; Hollander, 1999). Since 1960, the percentage of eligible voters actually voting has declined (Millar & Shanks, 1996). Many in academia would appreciate that Black students who are high in their racial identity are the ones most likely to vote. The students who possess high levels of identity probably are more likely to vote because they are able to make long-term commitments (Cross, 1991). Since they are conscious about how race affects society, they may be more politically conscious as was the Civil Rights generation, and believe they can effectuate change through voting. No studies have been documented that investigate racial identity and voting behavior. Hence, future studies should be conducted to further explore this relationship.

**Apathetic and Racial Identity**

Preencounter and Emersion/Internalization were significant in the Apathetic model. Preencounter was positively related and Emersion/Internalization was negatively related to the Apathetic construct. Preencounter had the largest standardized beta (.317) and Emersion/Internalization’s standardized beta was (-.109), suggesting that most of the variance in this block was explained by Preencounter. High Preencounter scores on the Apathetic factor are
consistent with the other findings in this study and fits within the theory of racial identity. The reader should keep in mind that the Apathetic construct had a low reliability estimate (.440); therefore, interpretations must be made cautiously.

The Apathetic construct in this study represents students’ indifference towards and disconnect from community involvement. Cross (1991) postulates that some Preencounter Blacks engage in self-hatred. If so, then this finding supports the racial identity theory. If a person hates themselves, or holds anti-Black or pro-White attitudes, they are less likely to perceive him/herself as a member of a shared social structure and more likely to espouse apathetic perspectives about community involvement. This finding could also indirectly relate to Wilson and Constantine’s (1999) results that found preencounter negatively related to self-concept. A negative self-concept probably leads to an apathetic disposition towards community responsibility. If a person has low opinions of him/herself, he/she is probably more likely to operate from a negative communal framework than a positive (How can I help someone else if I can’t help myself?). Thus, perceiving oneself as a member of a community is less likely. The relationship between preencounter and self-concept has not been studied in a citizenship context. More advanced analysis procedures such as structural equation modeling (SEM) may provide a clearer view of the constructs.

**Other Significant Findings**

While racial identity was hypothesized to contribute the most to the citizenship models, there were other findings in this study that deserve attention. The following paragraphs will briefly elaborate on the significant results, other than racial identity, that were revealed in the study. I will discuss them each citizenship factor separately.
Skills

Socioeconomic status was significant in the Skills model. This variable had a positive relationship with Skills, suggesting that students who came from higher SES levels had higher Skills scores. This finding lends support to other scholars that write about the civic decline in the Black community after the Civil Rights movement (Davis, 1993; Franklin & Moss, 2000). They contend that the affluent Blacks started the civic organizations in the segregated communities, which necessitated civic skills. They also contend that during integration some affluent Blacks left Black neighborhoods and took their civic organizations with them. This idea also shows how class affects citizenship skills because there was a perceived decline in civic organizations during this time (Putnam, 2000), which is directly linked to the mobility of affluent Blacks who introduced the non-affluent to these civic organizations. Putnam also believes that some people who belong to lower classes are not civically responsible because their primary concern is daily survival. This relationship between citizenship skills and SES needs to be further explored.

Classification was also significant on the Skills dependent variable. This relationship was positive, suggesting that students at higher ranks had significantly higher scores than students at lower ranks. Classification is also directly related to age. Given that, the finding in this study supports Eyler and Giles (1999) research that found age was significant and positive with indicators such as leadership skills and identifying issues when they assessed the effects of a service-learning class.

Community Orientation

Gender was the only other significant variable, besides racial identity, in the Community Orientation model. In fact, males scored significantly lower Community Orientation scores when compared to females. This finding is consistent with other research that found women to
be more civically disposed than men. Eyler and Giles’s (1999) found that women were more likely to score higher on interpersonal and critical thinking outcomes than men. Hetman and Jenkins (1990) found that women volunteer more than men. These findings may have something to do with the socialization processes of men and women. From early in children’s lives, boys and girls are socialized to take on different roles in society (Renzetti & Curran, 1992; Ropers-Huilman, 2003). Some girls are encouraged to be caregivers and child-rearers, while some boys are encouraged to be bread-winners and not to show emotions. Moreover, that socialization continues in college and university environments (Banks, 2003) as evidenced by the findings in this study which show that women have a greater disposition toward community orientation than men. Future studies should further explore these gender differences and delve deeper into this phenomenon.

Voting Behavior

Age was significant in the Voting Behavior model. Findings of this study suggest that older people are more likely to vote than younger people, which are consistent with previous studies (Gimpel, Morris, & Armstrong, 2004; Miller & Shanks, 1996). Messner and Polborn (2004) suggest such findings may be consistent because of the positive relationship between age, income, and paying taxes; therefore, the older people become the more stake they have in the system which compels many to vote.

Major was also significant on the Voting Behavior factor. Specifically, Black students who belonged to a hard science major (examples) had significantly lower scores than those who belonged to a pure science major. Becher (1994) found that there are distinct differences between disciplines because of different disciplinary languages, practices, and environments. Becher devised a four-category typology (Hard-pure science, Hard-applied science, soft-pure
science, and soft-applied science). This study grouped the hard sciences together and the soft sciences together.

I found no studies that investigated the differences between voting behavior and major. However, the hard sciences may have lower scores on voting behavior because of the nature of the discipline versus the pure sciences. The hard sciences include disciplines such as Astronomy, Chemistry, Physics, and Engineering. These majors do not lend themselves to the consistent study of people in society and their social and economic circumstances. Conversely, the soft sciences, which comprise Anthropology, English, Sociology, Education, and Social Work, are more likely to study people in society and their social conditions and circumstances. Therefore, students who belong to soft sciences majors may be more likely to vote because they are more aware and close to society’s civic issues than hard science majors. Colby et al. (2003) even suggest that students who belong to the humanities, which is a pure science, are exposed to moral and civic issues more so than other majors.

Empathetic

Institution type and Gender were the only significant variables in the Empathetic model. More specifically, Black students who attended HBCUs had higher Empathetic scores than those Black students who attended PWIs. With respect to gender, males scored significantly lower Empathetic scores than females.

The Empathetic factor measures students’ sensitivity to working with and understanding others. HBCUs and PWIs have been found to affect Black students differently (Allen, 1992; Fleming, 1984). Black students at PWIs have often been met with unsupportive and hostile climates (Hurtado et. al, 1998). HBCUs were founded on a civic mission that focused on uplifting the African American community. Hence, Black students at HBCUs may have more
opportunities to develop empathetic perspectives toward community issues than Black students at PWIs. This idea will be elaborated upon in the next part of the discussion section of this dissertation.

The gender finding parallels the other gender finding in this study. As stated before, men and women have different socializing experiences (Ropers-Huilman, 2003). Black women have even more unique circumstances because they have a different struggle than most women, which may have socialized them to be more empathetic. When the Civil Rights movement evolved and minority voices were challenging the traditional White patriarchal models of justice, Black women’s issues were not brought to the forefront because Whites thought Blacks were inferior, and they thought “black women were even more morally defective” (Cole & Guy-Sheftall, 2003, p. 76). Given the patriarchal attitudes of society in general, including Black men, the Black women liberation movement, during the mid-1960s created a sense of community among many Black women, which may have inspired more sense of community and empathy in their offspring. Many women today may have strong influences from their mothers given that a large percentage of Black children live in single-parent, largely female-headed households (Cole & Guy-Sheftall). More studies should investigate civic dynamic differences between White and Black women, as well as Black women and Black men to better understand these relationships.

Apathetic

Institution type, classification, SES, age, and gender (besides racial identity) were significant in the Apathetic model. More specifically, Black students who attended the HBCUs had significantly lower Apathetic scores than those who attended the PWIs. Higher classifications had lower Apathetic scores than lower classifications. Black students who belonged to higher SES categories had lower Apathetic scores than those who belonged to lower
SES categories. Older students had higher Apathetic scores than younger students. And, males had higher Apathetic scores than females.

It is not surprise that Black students at HBCUs had lower Apathetic scores than Black students at PWIs. As stated above in the Empathetic section, HBCUs were founded with a civic mission and many started with a community service and teaching function (Drewry, 2001).

Classification and age are directly linked to each other, however they had opposing relationships in the Apathetic model. Classification was negative, while age was positive. These findings must be interpreted cautiously because the Apathetic factor had a reliability of only .440, which suggests it is not very stable. Also, classification had a larger standardized beta (-.179 versus .038), which could suggest that classification contributed more to the model.

Despite the low reliability of the construct, classification could have been negative because Apathetic represents statements such as ‘social problems are not my concern,’ and ‘government should get out of the business of solving social problems.’ Juniors and seniors may be more inclined to be more disposed toward volunteerism. Sax (2000) found that even though political participation is waning among students, volunteerism is on the rise. Also, juniors and seniors may be more aware of their capacity to change society from the continuous empowering messages that are conveyed throughout their college years.

Gender was also significant on the Apathetic variable. Males scored significantly higher on this variable than women. This finding is consistent with other studies that report gender findings. Males volunteered less than women (Hettman & Jenkins, 1990) and were less empathetic than women when responding to volunteerism. This finding may also be linked to the socialization process. Boys are encouraged not to show emotions (Renzetti & Curan, 1992; Ropers-Huilman, 2003). Since this socialization continues in college (Banks, 2003), men are
probably less likely to emotionalize social problems and more likely to perceive social problems as issues that should be addressed by someone else when compared to women.

Age is positive on the Apathetic factor and this may be because of the older students who are in the data set. There are 30 Black students in this data set who are 30 and older. These students are probably working, attending school, and raising families. Studies have found that the older people become, the more conservative they become. These older people may believe that people should not depend on the government, or their lives may be so consumed with day-to-day survival (Putnam, 2000) that they may not care about others’ issues besides theirs.

**Community Activist Minded**

Age was the only significant variable in this model, and this relationship was positive. This factor represented respondents’ thoughts about their and the community’s responsibility to solve social problems. I found no studies that suggest age has a positive relationship with perceptions of community responsibility. This finding must too be interpreted cautiously because, similar to the Apathetic construct, this construct had a low reliability estimate (.396). The next time students take this survey this factor could have a totally different qualitative meaning.

Hypothesis: 4

When controlling for institution type, students at HBCUs will have higher citizenship scores than those students at PWIs. HBCUs were grounded in a civic mission and the dynamics at these institutions will yield more civically disposed students. More specifically, the master’s college HBCU will have higher citizenship score than those at the PWI because this institution requires community service as a requirement to graduate and students will be more cognizant of their civic responsibility than the students at the PWI.
This hypothesis was somewhat confirmed. There were two models in which institution type were significant (Community Orientation and Voting Behavior). The following paragraphs will discuss the finding with respect to institution type. Please keep in mind that the reference group for all institution type models was the doctoral-extensive PWI. This institution was utilized as the reference group because there has been much discussion in the literature about the civic mission of research universities, and comparisons to other institutions that have a history of a civic mission would give some indications about the civic dynamics of the research university.

**Community Orientation**

Institution type was significant in the community Orientation model. Specifically, the doctoral extensive HBCU had significantly higher Community Orientation scores than the doctoral extensive PWI. There could be several explanations for this. One explanation is the institutional culture at this HBCU, which is similar to other HBCU cultures. Another is the institutional culture at this PWI, which is similar to other research universities.

HBCUs have different histories than PWIs. Many HBCUs were founded to educate Black people who were not allowed to attend White institutions, and to educate newly freed slaves. This HBCU has a similar history to other HBCUs. This university was founded in the 1800s as an institution to train Black clergy to uplift the nearly 250 million emancipated slaves.

HBCUs, versus PWIs, offer different type of environments for Black students, which may explain why Black students at HBCUs have significantly higher Community Orientation scores than those at PWIs. HBCUs have been found to offer more educationally and socially supportive environments for Black students than PWIs (Allen, 1992; Fleming, 1984). Outcalt and Skewes-Cox (2002) also found that Black students at HBCUs were more satisfied with a
sense of community. The HBCU environment may provide more of a community atmosphere which may translate to a disposition towards community orientation.

Another proposition about the Community Orientation findings relates to a previous finding in this study. Socioeconomic status (SES) was positive and significant on the Civic Skills variable. The relationship to Civic Skills and Community Orientation is moderate, according to the Pearson correlation coefficient (.20). After further investigation, Black students from the doctoral-extensive HBCUs had a greater proportion of students who belonged to higher SES categories ($75,001 and above) than Black students at PWIs (44% versus 27%). Therefore, higher SES levels may lead to greater levels of Community Orientation. This relationship has not been found in previous studies. Future studies should explore these relationships and determine how class affects orientation towards community. Structural equation modeling (SEM) or path modeling would give some indication about the direct and indirect relationships between Community Orientation, Civic Skills, and SES, among other related variables.

The culture at research PWIs offers a different dynamic for Black students than that of a HBCU. First, many Black students were not welcomed to some PWIs until after 1964. Many times Blacks students were met with hostile, unfriendly, and sometimes abusive behavior by Whites at PWIs (Allen, 1992; Fleming1984). It could be the case that community orientation is not reinforced in this environment for Black students because they are concerned with survival that their sense of community be placed in the background. Black sororities and fraternities, however, have created sense of community. Future research should explore this dynamic as well as student groups in general to study the relationships between community orientation and student group participation.
A hostile climate coupled with implications of the research model that places responsibilities on professors to publish may affect community orientation disposition. Many times classes are very large at research institutions reducing many undergraduates to social security numbers in large lecture seminars. Large classes do not lend themselves to a personalized learning environment. This detached learning may affect community orientation disposition, as Black students may feel isolated socially and academically, which may prevent them from thinking in communal terms because the environment does not reinforce communal messages.

**Voting Behavior**

Institution type was significant in the Voting Behavior model. The master’s college and university HBCU had significantly higher scores than the doctoral-extensive HBCU. This phenomenon may be the case because of a fundamental difference in educational approaches at the two institutions. The HBCU requires students to complete 60 clock hours of community service before they graduate. The doctoral-extensive PWI has no community service requirements its students. Astin and Sax (1998) found that community service participation during the undergrad years substantially enhances students’ life skill development and sense of civic responsibility. The requirement for the HBCU may allow students to develop a greater sense of civic responsibility and voting may be a byproduct of that. I have found no studies that investigate the relationship between institution type and voting behavior. Future studies should focus on the voting dispositions of students who attend institutions that require community service, or service-learning, to institutions that do not.
CHAPTER 6 ENHANCING THEORY AND PRACTICE

This research has implications for theory and practice related to cultivating civic responsibility in college students, and particularly in Black students. In this final chapter, I discuss some of the themes that exist within the citizenship education literature as well as how the findings of this study contribute to these themes. I also consider how the findings of this study help guide practitioners work, on college campuses. Last, I discuss the limitations and provide final thoughts.

Informing Theory

There are several themes that exist in the civic engagement literature that center around the manifestation of civic dynamics within and outside of university. When talking about the declining civic engagement aspects of society in general, these works have focused on cultural indicators that affect a growing economy, for example, individualism (Eberly, 1994); the decline of voter registration and increase in cynicism about public life (Astin, 1999; Boyte & Kari, 2000; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Hollander, 1999); and the collapse of civic life (Shudson, 1998; West, 1999). This literature also focuses on the weakening of family, religious, and social institutions, all of which contribute to civic disengagement in society (Bellah, 1999).

These scholarly writing have also focused on the importance of civic involvement in a diverse democracy and the public dimensions of educational work (Astin, 1999; Checkoway, 2001). In addition, scholarly works have focused on the roles that colleges and universities could play in facilitating this civic responsibility (Boyer, 1990; Colby et al, 2003; Thomas, 2000). While many histories, analyses, and examples have been provided about how to prepare students for civic responsibility, the literature is devoid of an exploration of how racial identity may influence citizenship measures.
Importance of Racial Identity

Racial identity explains the extent to which Blacks identify or not with other Black people. One’s racial identity affects Black students’ desire to be involved in activities that result from the developing university/community partnership agenda, as well as casual interactions as they go about their daily agendas. My research shows that racial identity stages explain a significant amount of variance in citizenship models. This adds a new way of thinking about citizenship in the literature.

Black students will encounter diverse groups of people outside of the walls of academia. Their perceptions about other people, particularly Black people, will affect how these students will engage these community members. My study shows that higher racial identity levels correlated positively with civic constructs. A Black student with a highest level of racial identity would be more likely to engage community members in ways that result in reciprocal and worthwhile experiences for both partners than would a Black person who possesses a lowest racial identity. Conversely, my study shows that lower racial identity levels correlate negatively with civic constructs. A Black student with a low racial identity would be more likely to engage community members in ways that were condensing, anti-social, and/or paternalistic. These interactions that could reinforce negative perceptions that already exist in students who how have low racial identity levels.

As there are many propositions that could be offered when coupling racial identity with a citizenship context, the important idea is that high racial identity suggests a strong racial identity and coalition building across other races, while low racial identity suggests weak racial identity while holding inferior perceptions about Blacks. Conventional wisdom suggests that if higher education wants to educate Black students to contribute to and participate in a global society and
workforce, then it would want its students to possess the highest level of racial identity. If so, and if educators were to craft experiences based on the Black racial identity theory, then their approaches to civic education would lend themselves to cultivating the internalization stage. Universities should also offer ways that would increase the probabilities of increasing racial identity.

Adopting a Multicultural Curriculum

One possible way to increase the racial identity levels of Black students, and all students, is to expose them to a multicultural curriculum. The more information students have about their culture and other cultures, the more opportunities they have to understand the preconceived or socialized conceptions that are embedded in their consciousness. Within the black racial identity model, higher education would prefer Black students to be Internalized in their racial identity.

A multicultural curriculum would challenge many assumptions that students have formed based on their education that was probably facilitated through a Eurocentric canon, whose tenets reflect White male supremacist ideology (O’Grady, 2000). A multicultural curriculum would particularly be beneficial for those Black students who possess pre-encounter attitudes. This type of curriculum may facilitate the racial identity growth of the type of students who possess pro-White or anti-Black attitudes.

O’Grady discusses five approaches to multicultural education that institutions adopt, and the Social Reconstructionist Multicultural education would be the most likely to increase the probability of Black students becoming internalized in the racial identity.

According to O’Grady (2000), the Social Reconstructionist Multicultural educational approach teaches directly about oppression, discrimination, social justice, and explains how to take action against these dynamics. This type of approach would increase the probability of
achieving the internalization of Black students because it emphasizes those changes necessary to achieve social justice and equity, which includes understanding and working with others who are different. O’Grady also notes that this form of multicultural education goes beyond a curriculum focus by “examining the societal structures that limit the freedom to learn” (p. 5). This examination increases the probability of Black students achieving internalization by exposing them to those oppressive dynamics that have limited many members of society. This allows them opportunities to understand people’s social, political, and economic position in a society that was probably influenced by policies centered around middle-class, European-American values.

The Social Reconstructionist approach is one of five methods that O’Grady (2000) illustrates. This approach would be optimal when considering the other four options. The Teaching the Culturally Different approach focuses on the perceived needs of children of color or others who do not fit the standard cultural norm and emphasizes assimilation as a desirable goal; the Human Relations approach emphasizes intergroup dynamics and ‘getting along’ with others while avoiding broader issues of conflict; the Single Group Studies approach teaches about a specific group’s history and culture and includes such programs as Black studies and women’s studies; and the Multicultural Education approach advocates reform of school processes to meet the interests of a pluralistic society, but may overlook issues of conflict caused by structural power and oppression.

Each of the above-mentioned provides a different lens to study multicultural education. The Teaching the Culturally Different and Human Relations approaches originated from a unitary perspective as they seek to unite individuals under an umbrella of common interests; and they view conflict as negative and ignore power differences that mainstream, privileged groups
have over those who belong to non-mainstream groups (O’Grady, 2000). While these approaches have some educational value, they do not lend themselves to guiding students to internalization. Instead, these approaches would more likely perpetuate the dominant paradigm, which centers around middle-class, Eurocentric values because they fail to recognize power differences and avoid conflict. Students need to understand the various ways that positions of power have influenced others’ social positions to better understand their environments and their own social positions.

The Single Group Studies and Multicultural Education approach add valuable dimensions to multicultural education as they emphasize the importance of recognizing diversity to understand diverse individual and group interests (O’Grady, 2000). These approaches originated from the pluralist political view and perceive conflict as potentially powerful. These approaches also emphasize the role of power as it relates to the perceived conflicts. However, these approaches are limiting because they do not promote radical changes in the social structure to achieve social justice.

The Social Reconstructionist approach encompasses dimensions from each of the four multicultural philosophies and adds a unique dimension. It relates to the Teaching the Culturally Different by focusing on the marginalized groups in general and how these groups could function in society based on their needs. It relates to the Human Relations approach by emphasizing the importance of interpersonal dynamics in creating equitable relationships. It relates to the Single Group Studies by capturing the unique stories and histories of particular marginalized groups. It relates to the Multicultural Education Approach by promoting a pluralistic society though reform processes that are facilitated through schooling. The unique dimension that the Social Reconstructionist approach perceives conflicts as inevitable and
constructive, and promotes radical changes in the social structure to achieve equity and social justice. Therefore, the Social Reconstructionist would be the optimal multicultural approach that would guide Black students to internalization because it provides opportunities to pull from elements of the other multicultural educational approaches as well as explains how to take action.

The Social Reconstructionist approach could be facilitated through many areas of the university. One way is through learning communities. Gabelnick, MacGregor, Matthews, and Smith (1990) discuss how learning communities have evolved in higher education. One particular type, the Freshman Interest Group (FIG), would be particularly useful. Students should be exposed to these concepts as soon as they enter the university and this particular type of learning community link three freshmen courses together by theme. The authors note that the Freshman Interest Groups are particularly useful for large universities because many of them could be offered simultaneously. According to the FIG model, these groups are linked around academic majors and include a peer advising component where freshmen can discuss work and problems adjusting to college (Gabelnick et al.). Therefore, different majors would have classes that centered around various histories of marginalized groups that related to their major and learn how to address the inequities that exist within these majors.

Another way of facilitating the Social Reconstructionist Multicultural education approach is through residential life. Students could be constantly met with images that relate to inclusiveness and community, for example the popular bumpersticker ‘Eracism’ could be placed strategically where students will most likely see them. Also, departments of residential life could send electronic-newsletters that highlight a particular groups’ story and history, and this newsletter could make recommendations about how to take action against social inequities in
students immediate environment in hopes that these actions would sustain after leaving the university environment. These are just some examples, but administrators and faculty must begin conversations about promoting throughout the entire university, and when there is a committed goal then innovative ways to promote it could be generated collaboratively.

Informing Practitioners

This study also has implications for practitioners who crafted service components students. Students may be involved in service-learning classes, volunteerism, or community service projects through classes in which they enroll, student organizations to which they belong, or through which they work independently, or as part of an institutional collaboration. Institutions may want to institute service components as a goal to increase the possibility of civic engagement of their students. The following sections will discuss how the gender, major, and institution type findings of this study inform practitioners about certain dynamics that could shape experiences for students.

Gender

Gender was significant on the Community Orientation variable and the Empathetic dependent variable. Males scored significantly lower on each of these two variables than women. This finding has meaning for the types of concepts that are exposed to students. If females are more likely to be civically disposed then those dynamics that socialize them towards such should be integrated into educational approaches for all students.

Many females have been socialized to be caregivers through certain expectations placed upon them (Cole & Guy-Sheftall, 2003; Renzetti, & Curran, 1992; Ropers-Huilman, 2003). Many have developed a strong sense of caring and civic engagement through their experiences,
which is reflected in research that found women had stronger interpersonal skills and were more likely to volunteer than men (Eyler & Giles, 1999; Hetman & Jenkins, 1990).

The elements of women’s socialization can be applied by intervention through coursework and readings when crafting service experiences for students. This approach is considered a caring approach or ethical caring (Noddings, 1984). Noddings suggest that subject matter should be very broad if educators want students to understand concepts at deep levels. She recommends that each subject be laid out along the entire range of human experience so that students may make multiple and potentially meaningful contacts with it. To lay out a subject along the entire range of human experience means, at least to consider its history and applications, its potential personal and recreational uses in both child and adult life, its epistemological problems and typical modes of resolution (Noddings, p. 191).

This is one idea that persons who craft educational approaches could consider in their pedagogy.

Another idea is Rhoads’ (1997) ethic of care, which relates to community service in higher education. Rhoads believes because of the socialization process of women, they are more likely “to depend on issues of caring when facing moral dilemmas” (p. 50). This ethic of care centers around building and maintaining connections with others, and getting to know the other to better know him/herself.

This ethic of care could be particularly useful for teachers and practitioners as they develop and assist in community service classes/activities for students. There are many dynamics that elements of care could address when working with communities. Many students who are involved with community service or service-learning do so with no prior experience of working with communities and come with preconceived notions or have bad experiences (Green, 2001).
Rhoads (1997) suggests that community service approaches should involve a degree a mutuality that includes a reciprocal relationship between community members and students. He adds that, “too often, service is undertaken as a patronizing endeavor in which community members—those designated to receive—rarely are consulted about what their real needs are” (Rhoades, p. 150).

Major

The significant findings on the Major and Voting Behavior dependent variables have implications for creating practical experiences for students. Black students who belong to the hard sciences had significantly lower voting behavior scores than those who belonged to a soft science. The hard sciences comprised majors such as Astronomy, Chemistry, Physics, and Engineering. Soft sciences comprise majors such as Anthropology, English, Sociology, Education, and Social Work. The soft sciences lend themselves to studying social, political, and economic aspects of society, which may lead to a higher propensity to vote. Given this, then what could the teachers and practitioners of the hard sciences do if they would like to see an increase in civic responsibility from its students?

Service-learning is one approach that would integrate theory, practice, and community into the sciences. One of the most widely utilized definition of service-learning definition is that it is a credit-bearing educational experience in which students participate in organized service activity that meets identified community needs and reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996, p. 222).
Service-learning has been applied to nearly all disciplines (Zlotkwoski, 2004) and the hard sciences are no exception. Campus Compact has many examples of how service-learning is implemented across disciplines, including the hard sciences. For example, a chemistry class collected paint samples from house in an urban Salt Lake City, Utah neighborhood to determine to what extent lead was prevalent in the samples. A biological engineering class at Louisiana State University instituted a service-learning component whereby students of the class designed a playground for a nearby elementary school. In Connecticut, a Physics class designed a channel restoration plan for restoring a channel near a campus that could eventually be damaged by human land-use and disturbance. These are only few examples among a multitude that involve service-learning and the hard sciences. Campus Compact is another resource that provides a multitude of examples about service-learning and how to integrate it into the curriculum.

Service-learning may be more difficult to integrate into the hard sciences than other disciplines. Service-learning requires a different approach to learning for professors by abandoning the traditional lecture style format and adopting a format whereby students participate in the creation of the syllabus and are assessed by reflection. It requires more time to develop and prepare for a service-learning class for professors, which is one of the major challenges for those who teach in the hard sciences. Many professors in the hard sciences are funded by grants.

One approach to promote service-learning in the hard sciences is to tie civic engagement/service-learning to grants. Funding agencies often set certain criteria and benchmarks that must be met by funding recipients for future funding considerations. One criterion of receiving funding could be the demonstration of students’ civic learning and community enhancement, which includes educating community members. This approach would
change the civic landscape of the hard sciences tremendously as faculty who apply for grants would strongly consider the implications of civic engagement.

**Institution Type**

The findings related to institution type have implications for advising and creating service experiences for students. It is important to remember that HBCUs have a different history and mission than many PWIs. HBCUs were founded to provide Blacks educational opportunities that were not afforded to them when enslaved. Thompson (1978) notes that the central mission of HBCUs was to transform socially and academically handicapped Black youth into leaders, business, competent professionals, and productive citizens. Black colleges continue to serve such a need today (Berger & Milem, 2000), and service sits at the core of this mission.

This type of service is not confined to just serving the community. This type of service is also expected of the faculty through advising, which is one reason I think Black students from the doctoral extensive HBCU had significantly higher Community Orientation scores. This study surveyed students who took classes in English and History classes, which are both part of Arts and Sciences. In the College of Arts and Science, at the doctoral extensive HBCU, the faculty are required to be the academic advisors of the students. At the PWI, academic advising is done through counselors and most departments have assigned a faculty advisor to whom students can talk. The mentoring of students by professors that is expected by HBCUs may help students obtain a stronger sense of purpose and direction with respect to community. An alternative explanation may be that students at the doctoral-extensive HBCU may have more opportunities to be mentored by a black faculty member versus a non-Black faculty, which may have implications for community orientation.
Voting Behavior Finding

Black students at the Master’s college and University had significantly higher Voting Behavior scores than Black students at the PWI. It may be the case that this particular HBCU is fulfilling its mission by fostering students’ sense of civic responsibility. One approach that this HBCU has adopted, which may be influential, is that it requires all students to render a certain amount of clock hours of community service before they graduate. The experiences may cause some students to feel apart of the change process, which may inspire many to vote. Astin and Sax (1998) found that undergraduates who participate in service are more likely to develop a sense of civic responsibility.

The main implication from the institution type findings is that institutions should strongly consider involving faculty more and communalism in their approach to student learning as HBCUs have done. Specifically, institutions should consider how students are advised. The doctoral-extensive PWI utilized in this study once required professors to advise students but as the more emphasis was placed on research this university moved toward a centralized advising system. Valuable lessons could be learned from HBCUs. Institutions should consider formalized faculty advising and this advising should be considered in the tenure and promotion as many research institutions value empiricism over student learning. Professors would probably be better advisors to students than professional counselors because they interact with students constantly in class and they have a better understanding of the strengths and weakness of students.

Institutions should also consider requiring students to engage in a community service activity before they leave the university. I propose that this should be done through a general education requirement class. The master’s HBCU required its students to engage in a certain
number of community service hours before they graduate. This may not be the best option for all institutions. However, those involved in conversations about undergraduate education must consider the significance of community engagement in college as plethora of research studies have shown its positive effects. Activities could be done through learning communities. Residential life could create an atmosphere that lends itself to increasing the civic capacity of students through neighborhood projects that could be sponsored by each dorm. There are many ways to increase the civic capacity of students, and all it requires is interested parties having conversations related to such, and research is need to explores the various dynamics surrounding these activities to ascertain a deeper and better understanding of these approaches.

Future Research

Based on the findings in this study and related literature, I offer recommendations for future exploration:

1. This study needs to be replicated to see if the explained variance of racial identity stages is unique to the population of students in this study, or is representative of the larger Black student population.

2. Racial identity and civic orientation measures should be further explored through qualitative measures by administering the racial identity scale and interviewing those students at each stage about aspects of civic engagement. This approach would provide personal accounts of these dynamics, which will add more substance to the civic education and racial identity literature.

3. The research community should use this study to think about how racial identity is operationalized. There should be more conversations that center around racial identity
theory, racial identity item development, and reliability to create or modify constructs that adequately represent racial identity stages.

4. More studies need to further determine the differences in civic attitudes between those students who belong to soft sciences versus hard sciences. In this same disciplinary context, more studies should be conducted that also show the differences in civic attitudes between professors who teach in the soft sciences versus the hard sciences as this dynamic may also influence the facilitation of civic concepts.

5. Future research should explore the extent to which centralized advising versus decentralized advising structures affect students’ sense of civic responsibility. In addition, future studies should attempt to ascertain the extent to which the race of the professors who is advising affects students’ sense of civic responsibility.

6. More research needs to investigate the effects of students who attend institutions that require community service versus those who do not have such a requirement.

7. More research should consider about how civic orientation concepts are defined, which will lead to expanding theories better representations of civic-related constructs.

8. More research to investigate other measures of Black racial identity to ascertain if other conceptions of Black racial identity stages correlate highly with civic related variables. If other Black racial stages do correlate with such variables then more research should attempt to develop more adequate measures of racial identity to broaden the scope of how the educational community thinks about racial identity.

Limitations of Study

There were several limitations of this study. The major limitation of this study is that results can not be generalized outside this particular population of students and institutions.
Over-generalization of this research to other populations of Black students who attend other HBCUs and PWIs should be executed with caution. There are over 4,000 higher education institutions in the United States and this study used only 4 of those institutions to study. These results are based on a select group of Black college students who attended classes in Arts and Sciences. Therefore results can only be generalized to this particular population of Black students.

The results of this study may have been different if another sample of Black people was utilized. The sample selected for this study was a select group of Black college students. Members of the larger Black population who have not attended post-secondary institutions may have different citizenship and racial identity perspectives. People’s attitudes are shaped by particular associations in which they are involved. Those who attend post-secondary institutions are more likely to have similar associations, such as social, economic, and/or political, versus those who do not attend post-secondary institutions. Different segments of Black college students will yield different results as well, for example those who attend community colleges and trade schools. However, the variance of scores for the sample selected for this study are more likely to be similar because they all attend four-year institutions and they all attended classes that were part of a general education classes, which had a diverse representation of majors.

Another limitation of the generalization of racial identity stages to Black students. This study utilized one of several theoretical frameworks that measure Black racial identity. Therefore, the racial identity results are only relevant to the Black Racial Identity Scale (B-RIAS), and must only be generalized to the population of Black students who were involved in this study.
Conclusion

This study documented the relationships of variables that affect the civic orientation of Black students. It provided several indicators that were correlates of civic related dependent variables. Results of this study have implications for theory and practice, and should be expounded upon to add new aspects to the civic education and racial identity literature.

Today’s Black students will be those that provide leadership models for future generations during and after their college years. Their civic orientation will affect how these students interact with members of society and determine to what extent they will be engaged in civic related activities such as mentoring, voting, and community-building. Their racial identity will affect how these students will identify with members of their own race, as well as how they will interact with other. The combination of these two concepts will affect how the Black community will mobilize and become more empowered.

The Black community has changed since integration when the Black affluent disassociated themselves from the Black non-affluent. The Black community is less communal than the Civil Rights era and many of its members are at the lowest levels of the social and economic strata of society. The Black community is plagued with some of the highest rates of crime, joblessness, high school dropouts, and disease (Wilson, 1996). Black students will play an integral role in providing leadership to these communities through independent activities or through functions associated with colleges and universities. Their perceptions about their civic responsibility and racial identity will guide their thinking and behavior. Higher education has the physical and intellectual resources to guide students towards becoming civically responsible such that all members of society will benefit from their presence. It was my intent that this study contributed to this critical dialogue about the ways in which this could be made possible.
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## APPENDIX A Raters’ Assignment of Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Attitudes</th>
<th>Understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SK1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO3</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO5</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO6</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAM1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAM2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAM 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAM4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B SERVICE EXPERIENCE SURVEY OLD TO NEW ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Item</th>
<th>New Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE21</td>
<td>Thinking Critically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE22</td>
<td>Community my ideas to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE23</td>
<td>Engaging in discussion with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE27</td>
<td>Ability to Take action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE28</td>
<td>Effective in accomplishing goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE31</td>
<td>Ability to speak in public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE32</td>
<td>Knowing where to find information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE33</td>
<td>Ability to lead a group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE1</td>
<td>Adults should give time for good of their community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE9</td>
<td>Most import community service is to help individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE11</td>
<td>Communities should provide soc. services for their members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE12</td>
<td>I feel I can have impact on solving my comm. Problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE14</td>
<td>It is imp’t for me to volunteer my time to help people in need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE15</td>
<td>It is imp’t for me to be very well off financially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE16</td>
<td>High school students should be required to do comm.service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE18</td>
<td>It is imp’t for me to have a career helping people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE17</td>
<td>My problems are too large for me to give time to help others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE20</td>
<td>I feel uncomfortable working with people different from me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE19</td>
<td>I feel positive about my comm. Ability to solve its soc. Prob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE36</td>
<td>I often participate in advocacy or political action groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE42</td>
<td>I am active in political campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE43</td>
<td>I am active in campus politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE39</td>
<td>I always vote in state and local elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE40</td>
<td>I always vote in national elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM8</td>
<td>I voted in the last presidential elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE24</td>
<td>Ability to compromise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE25</td>
<td>Listening Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE29</td>
<td>Ability to see consequences of actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE30</td>
<td>Thinking about others before myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE35</td>
<td>Try to understand friends by imagining from their viewpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE37</td>
<td>Before criticizing, I try to imagine how I would feel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE2</td>
<td>I feel social problems are not my concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE3</td>
<td>Having an impact on community problems in reach of most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE4</td>
<td>People who work in soc service can do little to help people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE5</td>
<td>Gov’t should get out of business of solving social problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE38</td>
<td>I often change my opinion about soc prob when I hear others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE10</td>
<td>Most imp’t comm. Service is change public policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE13</td>
<td>It is imp’t to me to influence political structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE34</td>
<td>I usually make up my mind right away about something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE41</td>
<td>I usually take a long time to consider things before making mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Item</td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>I believe that large numbers of Blacks are untrustworthy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>I believe that White people look and express themselves diff than Blacks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9</td>
<td>I feel uncomfortable when I am around Black people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R12</td>
<td>I believe that being Black is a negative experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R17</td>
<td>I believe that Black people should learn to think and experience life in ways that are similar to White people’s ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R19</td>
<td>I am changing by style of life to fit my new beliefs about Blacks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R21</td>
<td>I believe that Black people came from a strange, dark, and uncivilized continent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R22</td>
<td>People, regardless of their race, have strengths and limitations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R24</td>
<td>I feel guilty about some of the things I believe about Black people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R25</td>
<td>I believe that a Black person’s most effective weapon for solving problems is to become part of the White person’s world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R29</td>
<td>I believe that White people are more intelligent than Blacks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>I believe that being Black is a positive experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>I know through personal experiences what being Black in America means.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>I feel an overwhelming attachment to Black people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>I involve myself in causes that will help all oppressed people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R14</td>
<td>I frequently confront the system and the (White) man.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R15</td>
<td>I constantly involve myself in Black political and social activities (such as art shows, political meetings, Black theater, and so forth).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R16</td>
<td>I involve myself in social action and political groups even if there are no other Blacks involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R18</td>
<td>I believe that world should be interpreted from a Black or Afrocentric perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R20</td>
<td>I feel excited and joy in Black surroundings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R23</td>
<td>I find myself reading a lot of Black literature and thinking about being Black.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R26</td>
<td>I speak my mind about injustices to Black people regardless of the consequences (such as being kicked out of school).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R28</td>
<td>I am determined to find my Black identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R30</td>
<td>I believe that I have many strengths because I am Black.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>I am increasing my involvement in Black activities because I don’t feel comfortable in White environments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>A person’s race does not influence how comfortable I feel when I am with her or him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10</td>
<td>I feel good about being Black, but do not limit myself to Black activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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