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This dissertation is dedicated to Native students and educators.

For Native Students: It is my hope that one day the barriers Native students experience will cease to exist. Until then, be strong and continue to fight for the survival of our people.

For educators: As educators we must never forget that it is the education system, not the race or ethnicity of the student that has placed the student at a disadvantage (Villalpando, 2004).
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BARRIERS AND BRIDGES: AMERICAN INDIAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENT RESILIENCY AND SUCCESS

by

Tamara Christine Cheshire

This mixed methods study determined self-perceived needs, barriers, and resiliency characteristics that impact the academic success of American Indian community college students at Sacramento City College. The study was done to provide community colleges with further insight into the American Indian student experience to create an avenue for sustained institutional change to positively impact student success rates. Tribal Critical Race Theory and Reziliency Theory were combined to create a comprehensive theoretical framework through which to understand the experiences of American Indian students. For this study, success is defined as meeting the needs, eliminating the barriers, and reinforcing resiliency characteristics of American Indian students working toward the completion of a desired academic goal.

Quantitative data came from student surveys with questions focusing on needs, barriers, and resiliency characteristics. Qualitative data came from follow-up focus groups to obtain deeper insight into the three previously mentioned variables.

The researcher found that American Indian student needs fell into one of three categories: family support, financial support, or college support/services. Support from
family members attending college, financial support and advising, and college support in
the forms of academic counseling, cultural competency training, caring professors,
Native student recognition, outreach and programming, Native student recruitment and
retention, support for Native student organizations, involvement and networking with the
external Native community, drug and alcohol counseling, and services like RISE and
EOPS who provide advising, labs and other resources were found to be significant needs.

Internal and external barriers exist for Native students. Internal barriers are
controllable through the college and include a system linked to the perpetuation of racial
stereotypes, which specifically result in making Native students invisible on campus; an
inaccurate course curriculum or content reinforced by culturally incompetent, uncaring
professors; bureaucratic or restrictive admissions practices; bureaucratic financial aid
services; limited number and variety of course offerings; condescending tutors; the costs
and availability of books; and transportation issues. External barriers over which the
institution has no control include a lack of tribal support, lack of financial
resources/support or inadequate finances, lack of family support, too many family
demands, and how Native students feel about asking for help. It is important for the
institution to be aware of the external barriers because they impact student needs within
the internal academic environment. Interconnection between barriers prevents students
from achieving success.

Resiliency is defined as the skills or processes by which people cope with
oppressive conditions. Native students have unmet needs and have experienced barriers
rooted in racism and oppression; therefore, they have had to develop coping mechanisms or resiliency characteristics to survive and be successful. Resiliency characteristics were scholarship/financial support, spiritual support, social/community support, friend or peer/mentor support, community as family or sources of motivation and support, mentoring, friend and peer support, support services that teach resiliency characteristics like RISE and the Native American Studies Program, caring professors and counselors, as well as acts of resistance or survivance.

A Student Success Equation was created. Furthermore when the equation was applied, a Student Success Model was produced incorporating factors that impact student success. Conclusions drawn from this research provide an applied context by which community colleges can enact transformative and transformational change to increase American Indian student success.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

It is this spirit of hope, determination, bravery, courage, and ferocious love that creates resilient people and resilient recovery from loss and trauma. It is this spirit that will help American Indian people today and tomorrow. (Belcourt-Dittloff, 2006, p. 107)

Native Americans¹, whose voices have been widely ignored as involuntary minorities (Ogbu & Simmons, 1998), have faced unmet educational needs and have experienced substandard educational conditions (Young, 2010). Oppression and discrimination have led to an educational deficit spanning generations, resulting in institutionalized barriers, disadvantages, and the limited success of Native American students (Young, 2010).

American Indian community college students are some of the most underrepresented and underserved groups in higher education (Huffman & Ferguson, 2007; Starks, 2010; Thomason & Thurber, 1999; Tierney, 1992). The purpose of this study was to determine the self-perceived needs, barriers, and resiliency characteristics impacting the academic success of American Indian community college students at Sacramento City College. This study provides further insight into the American Indian community college student experience.

¹ For the purpose of this study, the terms American Indian, Native people, Native American, Native, Indigenous, and Indian are used interchangeably and refer to a person having origins in any of the original homeland locations now located within the United States proper or a person who maintains cultural identification through tribal affiliation, enrollment, or community recognition (Stoney Brook, 2011).
The legacy of American Indians in the United States is one of extreme dichotomous stereotypes or invisibility. Not only have historians condemned Native people to a death somewhere in the past, but the true stories, the voices of Indigenous people from the past to the present, are absent. American Indians in the United States remain invisible because of their small population size and the ingrained racist stereotypes that have tainted their image and have impacted the identities of Indigenous people through time (Loo & Rolison, 1986; Milem, 2000). Native people continue to face overt and covert oppression in their daily lives to the point where their invisibility can be utilized as a somewhat useful tool to avoid the actual physical danger of overt racism (Sherover-Marcuse, n.d.). But this invisibility has had negative consequences. Indigenous children remain invisible in elementary, junior high, and high schools and this follows them into the community college and beyond into higher levels of postsecondary education (Cole & Denzine, 2002; Young, 2010). Because Native students make up a small population, they remain demographically invisible to educational institutions, which correlates with Native student needs not being met and has a direct negative impact on student success rates (Cole & Denzine, 2002; Starks, 2010). When data driven decisions are significant to changes in policy, and there is little to no data collected or reported on American Indians, then positive change cannot take place and Native students remain underserved.
National Data

According to the 2010 U.S. Census Brief *Overview of Race and Hispanic Origin* (Hume, Jones, & Ramirez, 2010), there are approximately 5.2 million self-identified American Indians and Alaska Natives (either claiming one ethnic group alone or in combination with other ethnic groups), which equates to 1.7% of the total U.S. population of approximately 310 million people. Of the total 5.2 million, 2.9 million were American Indian and Alaska Native only (meaning they claimed no other racial or ethnic group in conjunction with their Native identity), while 2.3 million were American Indian and Alaska Native in combination with one or more other races (Hume et al., 2010). According to Hume et al.’s Census Brief, between the 2000 Census and the 2010 Census there was a population increase of 1.1 million American Indian and Alaska Natives alone and in combination with one or more races, or a 26.7% increase compared to the overall population growth of 9.7%. In 2010, Starks found American Indians were underrepresented in terms of representation as per their population size in two- and four-year public and private institutions of higher education nationwide. Data reveal that in 2009, Natives comprised approximately 1.1% or 181,100 of the 18 million students enrolled in higher education in the United States (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2009). Also in 2009, only 7.5% of all American Indian College students were enrolled at tribal colleges while American Indians made up 0.9% of four-year college students (NCES, 2009).
Researchers for over 10 years, between 1995 and 2008, documented that more than half the American Indian students attending college (55%) were enrolled at the community college level (American Association of Community College, 2008; Babco, 2005; Carney, 1999; Dodd, Garcia, Meccage, & Nelson, 1995; Oosahwe, 2008). But according to Carney (1999), Native Americans are often regrouped with other minority groups in research because their numbers are too small to be statistically significant. As a consequence, few studies have been done on American Indians in higher education, specifically at the community college level.

Within the last few years, Moran, Rampey, Dion, and Donahue (2008) reported the dropout rate of Native American students in the K-12 system to be 33%, twice the national average and the highest rate of any ethnic group in the United States at that time. Furthermore, Moran et al. (2008) found some Native students dropped out of school because their needs were not being met. In 2007, the American Indian College Fund found that 28% of American Indians did not graduate from high school compared to the national average of 15%. This statistic definitely impacts the number of American Indian students eligible for enrollment at the college level. The American Indian College Fund (2007) also found that in 2007, only 42% of American Indian eligible students pursued any higher education compared to the national average of 53%.

On a more comprehensive note, the 2008 U.S. Census Bureau publication, the *American Community Survey*, revealed that 20-25% of the American Indians aged 25 years and older had less than a high school education, approximately 30% had obtained a
high school diploma, between 30-35% had an Associates Degree, and only 14% had obtained a Bachelor’s degree or higher (NCES, 2008). More recent data from the 2011 U.S. Census Bureau News Profile, American Facts for Features reveals that the percentage of Natives obtaining a Bachelor’s degree or higher had decreased to 13%.

In reviewing research studies more than several years old, a complete picture can be seen. Jackson, Smith, and Hill (2003) found that 54% of Native students in four-year colleges and universities exited after their first year compared to 32% of the general population. In 2002, Cole and Denzine stated, “American Indian students typically have the lowest [college] retention and graduation rates of any ethnic minority group in the country” (p. 2). With high dropout or stopout rates in conjunction with low retention and graduation rates, Indigenous student success is threatened.

Looking back 20-30 years, a study by Ponterotto (1990) revealed that the number of Native students who obtained undergraduate degrees was disproportionate to the representation of their population in the U.S., a trend that still continues (Starks, 2010). However, Hoover and Jacobs (1992) found more startling data, “seventy-five percent of the [American Indian] students who began college unfortunately left prior to graduation” (p. 1). Reyhner (1992) documented that some Native students were being pushed out of education because they protested how they were being treated. In addition, Native students usually attended more than one college in their efforts to earn a degree and have one or more stop outs during this timeframe (Red Leaf, 1999; Tierney, 1992). Villegas (1988), who documented Native students dropping out of school in the late 1980s,
claimed the actual act of dropping out of school was an act of resistance to the oppressive conditions of the dominant culture. Contemporary scholars such as Young (2010) argue that this behavior was counterproductive in that it continued the cycle of oppression, further disempowering this minority group because of the lack of educated adults with economic stability to make greater socioeconomic change. As early as the 1980s, Astin (1982) estimated that six out of every 100 American Indian students in college would graduate and only two of the six would obtain a postgraduate degree. These were dismal numbers indeed.

Because the trend continues that over half of all Native students are enrolled at community colleges (American Association of Community College, 2008; Carney, 1999; Dodd, Garcia, Meccage, & Nelson, 1995; Oosahwe, 2008), it is important to obtain information about this demographic in order to meet their needs and address barriers to their success.

California Data

California has the largest number of Natives in the United States with approximately 723,000 American Indians who primarily live in urban areas (Hume et al., 2010).
Figure 1. Percentage Distribution American Indian and Alaska Native Population by State: 2010

Even though Los Angeles County continues to have the largest concentration of American Indian residents based on the Census 2010 Redistricting Data Summary File (California Department of Finance Demographic Research Unit, State Census Data Center [CDF], 2011), the majority of American Indians who live in northern California (42,917) populate Fresno, Sacramento, and Santa Clara counties (CDF, 2011).
Figure 2. Ten Places with the Largest Number of American Indians and Alaska Natives: 2010

Being that a large number of Native Americans (14,308) populate Sacramento County (CDF, 2011), it is fitting that this study’s focus is on American Indian community college students at Sacramento City College.
Statement of the Problem

Too few American Indian community college students achieve academic success.

Even though student success has been defined in a variety of ways, incorporating many different factors from grade point average to degree obtainment, for the purpose of this study, student success is defined as meeting the needs, eliminating the barriers, and reinforcing the resiliency characteristics of students working toward the completion of a desired academic goal.

Over the past 12 years, a broad range of studies has been done on American Indians in higher education. Some of these studies have focused on models for Native student success specifically utilizing grade point average (GPA) as a guiding factor.
(Smith Bontempi, 2006), or the focus was on student success in conjunction with gender (Bitsoi, 2007) as well as success in specific areas like writing (Komlos, 2011). Oosahwe’s (2008) focus was on motivation, coping skills, and strategies for academic success. Other studies on Native students in higher education have concentrated on student involvement (Garland, 2010); recruitment (Starks, 2010); attrition, persistence, or retention (Beaulieu, 2000; Chee, 2008; Cole & Denzine, 2002; Drummer, 2009; Garland, 2010; Gloria & Robinson Kurpius, 2001; Guillery, 2002; Kelly, 2008; Powless, 2008; Starks, 2010; Young, 2010; White, 2007); the importance of maintaining a Native identity while obtaining an education (Capurso, 2008; Lomay, 2004); motivation (Guillery, 2008); satisfaction (Huffman & Ferguson, 2007); and resiliency (Belcourt-Dittloff, 2006; Montgomery, Miville, Winterowd, Jeffries, & Baysden, 2000).

Recent studies done on tribal colleges have centered on educational attainment (Reese, 2011); the connection between tribal college mission statements and the curriculum offered, as well as the greater relationship to issues of tribal sovereignty (Riding, 2010); and the complete history of tribal colleges (Raymond, 2004); as well as the link between family support and attending tribal college (Rousey & Longie, 2001). Many studies give great praise to tribal colleges for their high success rates (Raymond, 2004; Rousey & Longie, 2001), but in recent studies (Reese, 2011; Riding, 2010), and in a specific study by White (2007) persistence and graduation rates of Tribal colleges compared to community colleges found this broad claim of student success at Tribal colleges unsupported by the data.
Even though a great number of studies have been reviewed for this dissertation, literature on Native students at the community college level is sparse. Much of the literature that exists is either dated (Viri, 1989), focuses on many ethnic minority groups, or takes place at tribal colleges or at four-year colleges and universities. The number of studies completed within the last 10 years focusing specifically on American Indian community college students (Baxter, 2009), their success, barriers, and persistence is minimal.

**Academic Attainment and Persistence**

According to Garland (2010), Starks (2010), The National Center for Education Statistics (2009), and Cole and Denzine (2002), Native American students have been and continue to be the least successful ethnic group in academic attainment and persistence. Older research by Benjamin, Chambers, and Reiterman (1993), Cummins (1992), and Tierney (1992) allowed this researcher to historically link the finding that American Indian students disproportionately experienced failure in mainstream higher education systems. Statistics in the early 1990s and again in the early 2000s revealed a trend that while up to 64% of American Indian students enroll in college, evidence shows they have had some of the highest dropout rates with up to 75% of the students enrolled leaving during their first year (Hoover & Jacobs, 1992; Saggio, 2004). In addition, Native students persistently have had some of the lowest graduation rates of any ethnic minority group in the U.S. (Cole & Denzine, 2002; Gloria & Robinson Kurpius, 2001; Kidwell, 1994; O’Brien, 1990; Reddy, 1993). Contemporary and historical oppression have had a
tremendous impact on American Indians, their academic achievement, poverty rates, income, and unemployment, as well as health and death rates.

Poverty

According to Belcourt-Dittloff (2006), poverty itself as one outcome of oppression has had a harsh effect on Natives. In 2010, 28.4% of American Indians and Alaska Natives (percentage is alone, not in conjunction with any other racial group) were living in poverty compared to the nation as a whole with the corresponding rate of 15.3% (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012).

Income

The median income of American Indian and Alaska Native (alone, not in conjunction with any other racial group) households in 2010 was $35,062 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). This compares with $50,046 for the nation as a whole (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). The Federal government recently defined the poverty line for a family of four as $22,314 (Censky, 2011).

Connections must be made between these high rates of poverty and historic socioeconomic oppression experienced by Indigenous communities because of lack of higher education. Belcourt-Dittloff (2006) discussed the impact of long-term risk factors like poverty and how families are at an increased threat of “exposure to stressors and...contemporary traumatic life experiences” (p. 7).

Education is the key to obtaining higher paying jobs and moving out of poverty (Jez, 2008; Nevarez & Wood, 2010; Thompson & Carter, 1997). According to Shotton
(2008), the lifetime earnings for those with a higher education are significantly higher than that of a person with a high school diploma. Mortenson (2000) documented lifetime earnings for men with a bachelor’s degree to be $1.163 million higher than for men with just a high school diploma. Women college graduates were $602,680 higher than for their counterparts with only a high school diploma. In her article, Perna (2003) cites a studying showing that earnings for women with a college degree were 92% higher than those with a high school diploma, whereas men in the same situation had 58% higher incomes (National Center for Education Statistics, 2002, p. 137). According to Crosby (2001), 1998 statistics for median earnings of full-time workers increased by education level with bachelor degree holders earning 61% more, master’s degree holders earning 95% more and doctorate degree holders earning 142% more than those with just a high school diploma. Shotton (2008) clearly pointed out that higher education is essential for American Indians to move out of poverty.

Unemployment

Unemployment levels for Natives have been recorded as some of the highest of any ethnic group in the United States, especially on reservations (Arrieta, 2011; Belcourt-Dittloff, 2006; Brod & McQuiston, 1983; Census, 2008). In the first half of the year 2007, the unemployment rate for Native people was approximately 7.7% (Arrieta, 2011). In the first half of 2010, the unemployment rate for Natives was an appalling 15.2% compared to 9.1% unemployment for Whites (Arrieta, 2011). The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (2003) documented excessively high unemployment rates ranging between
30% and 80% both on and off the reservation in the year 2003 and prior, which is a direct outcome of historic trauma, leading to pervasive poverty for Natives (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 2003).

*Figure 4. American Indian and White Unemployment Rates, 2007-2010*

(Austin, 2010)

*Health & Death Rates*

From the 1940s until 2006, the health status of Natives has improved but they still maintained a higher risk of death than the total U.S. population (Anderson, Belcourt, & Langwell, 2005; Belcourt-Dittloff, 2006; Young, 1997). According to Belcourt-Dittloff (2006), death rates were considerably higher for American Indians when comparing them
to other ethnic groups. From 1996-1998, suicide rates for American Indians were 91% greater. American Indian males between ages 14 and 17 had suicide rates four times the national average. Homicide rates were 81% greater and death rates associated with alcohol were 638% greater than other ethnic groups (Belcourt-Dittloff, 2006; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Indian Health Services, 2004).

The most vulnerable amongst Natives are the elders, women, and children. Rates of death due to heart disease, diabetes, pneumonia, influenza, firearms, and accidental injuries besides other diseases were all higher for American Indians than for any other ethnic group (Belcourt-Dittloff, 2006; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Indian Health Services, 2004) and there is no evidence that these rates have changed. Infant mortality rates remained 24% greater for Natives than for other groups in 2006 (Belcourt-Dittloff, 2006).

**Historic Trauma**

American Indian history is permeated with themes of “contact, conflict, oppression, attempted genocide, cultural erosion, and the resultant aftermath” (Belcourt-Dittloff, 2006, p. 5). The experiences of American Indians through historic trauma, sustained intergenerational loss and ever-present bereavement equate to what holocaust victims have endured (Belcourt-Dittloff, 2006; LaCapra, 1994, 2001) and are worthy of study. In fact, historical factors continue to influence the development of American Indian individuals and communities in contemporary times. Historic trauma of genocidal practices including “massacres, forced relocations, forced removal of American Indian
children to boarding schools” (Belcourt-Dittloff, 2006, p. 4), forced sterilization of American Indian women, and overt and covert institutional racism are factors that relate to risk and resiliency (Brave Heart & DeBruyn, 1998). The outcomes of these factors continue to impact American Indian individuals and communities today (Garland, 2010; Komlos, 2011; Starks, 2010). However, the fact that Native people still exist and continue to endure historic and contemporary forms of oppression is testament enough to study the strengths exhibited by them (Allen, 2002).

Early Educational Experience

This study also takes into consideration Native American youth and their early experiences with education and how they impact their current view at the community college level. The preschool through 12th grade experience of Native children is fraught with low teacher expectations, imposed racist stereotypes from educators and peers, and pro-assimilation views by teachers and administrators culminating in low student performance and atrociously low success rates (Banks et al., 2005; Moran et al., 2008; Swisher & Tippeconnic, 1999; Young, 2010). In 2010, the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reported that fourth-grade Native students scored below basic levels in math, reading, and history (Young, 2010). In 2008, Moran et al. reported Native children scored lower than their White and Asian counterparts but statistically were similar in their low scores to Black and Hispanic peers. It was made clear by a study by Banks et al. in 2005 that test scores alone indicated schools were not meeting
the needs of American Indian students and that students who were not successful in their educational endeavors joined a growing underclass (Banks et al., 2005).

Despite efforts made to improve education for American Indian students, they “continue to be negatively affected by poverty and low educational attainment” (Beaulieu, 2000, p. 6). In addition, Native students continue to have fewer educational opportunities than other students (Beaulieu, 2000; Young, 2010). Although Beaulieu (2000) found the dropout rates for Native students in 2000 and earlier were high, Natives were often unprepared when they began school, they achieved success at lower rates, and few Indian students entered and finished college 10 years later. Young (2010) found similar results in that Native students were unprepared, achieved success at lower rates and few students entered or finished college. Because Native students are performing below basic skill levels, they are not eligible for college preparation courses and do not benefit from the skills taught in these courses to be successful in higher education, if they succeed in graduating from high school.

Previous research is limited and problematic in that educational data is scarce for American Indians due to small study sample size, generalizability issues, and reliability concerns (Gloria & Robinson Kurpius, 2001; Kidwell, 1994; Pavel, Skinner, Cahalan, Tippeconnic, & Stein, 1998). The little research that exists documents high attrition rates of American Indian college students and ambiguity about the factors or barriers impacting students’ decisions to attend college and persist with their educational goals (Beaulieu, 2000; Young, 2010). This uncertainty originates from the absence of research
on the experiences of Native students within higher education (Falk and Aitken, 1984; Tijerina & Biemer, 1988; Wright, 1985); insufficient representation of American Indians in national research databases (Benjamin et al., 1993; Pavel & Padilla, 1993); and a dearth of studies that take into consideration tribal and cultural experiences and traditions as possible resources related to persistence (Belgarde, 1992; Benjamin et al., 1993; Murguia, Padilla, & Pavel, 1991; Pavel & Padilla, 1993).

Nature of the Study

This study will provide policymakers with data to revise and/or create policy enhancing Native student success. Data collected during this study will contribute to the existing body of research and will be formulated into an equation that can be readily used by administrators, student services, counselors, and faculty at the community college level to assist American Indian students in achieving success. The equation may also be utilized by Native students to enhance their own success rates.

Research Questions

This study explored the experiences of American Indian community college students enrolled at Sacramento City College and focused on student success through obtaining information via survey and focus groups. Using three core theories: Tribal
Critical Race Theory, Community Cultural Wealth, and Resiliency Theory as frameworks impacting the Indigenous experience in and perception of higher education. Students’ experiences were cataloged as responsive to the following research questions:

- What are the academic and personal needs of American Indian community college students?
- What are the perceived barriers American Indian students face at the community college level?
- What are the resiliency and other characteristics employed by American Indian community college students that contribute to student success?

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to determine the self-perceived needs, barriers, and resiliency characteristics impacting the academic success of American Indian community college students at Sacramento City College. This study provides further insight into the American Indian community college student experience.

This study identifies needs and resilient forces in student lives, and gathers student views about barriers experienced in their attempts to obtain academic success. Resiliency strategies and barriers experienced by students serve as factors representing the extreme ends of a host of factors impacting student success. By using resiliency and

---

2 Reziliency and Resiliency are interchangeably defined as positive ways in which students have adapted to their learning or educational environment and factors, skills, and processes used to cope with oppressive conditions.
barriers and including other factors like needs, this study assists in determining factors inhibiting as well as contributing to the success of Native community college students. Needs may include family involvement and support, community involvement and support, pre-college academic preparation or high school experience, financial support, faculty support, coursework and institutional commitment and support.

Previous studies of American Indian students who attended mainstream universities and colleges suggest factors such as precollege academic preparation, family support, supportive and involved faculty, institutional commitment, and maintaining an active presence in home communities and cultural ceremonies are essential to persistence (Astin, 1982; Barnhardt, 1994; Brown, 1995; Falk & Aitken, 1984; Huffman, Sill, & Brokenleg, 1986; Lin, 1990; Reyhner & Dodd, 1995; Starks, 2010). In an early study by Aiken and Falk (1984), it was found that retention related to “parental and community involvement, financial support, academic preparation in high school, campus support for Indian students and lastly, value[s]” (p. 1). While Cole and Denzine (2002) and Huffman (2001) implied cultural conflicts were of the primary issues creating barriers to Native student success. Belcourt-Dittloff (2006) indicated protective factors against risk included community, family, creativity, humor, and spiritual beliefs.

Theoretical Framework

Multiple theories were used to create a framework in which to collect and analyze the data. Tribal Critical Race Theory and Community Cultural Wealth and Resiliency...
Theory, with an explanation as to how these frameworks impact the Indigenous experience in and perception of higher education is discussed. Within this section is a brief overview of each theory. Chapter 2 provides the reader with more theoretical details in addition to a review of the literature.

_Tribal Critical Race Theory_

Tribal Critical Race Theory (TribalCRT) (Brayboy, 2006) addresses the continued impact of colonization on American Indians (Brayboy, 2006). Brayboy (2006) explained how colonization equates to European American thought, knowledge, and power structures present in modern day U.S. society, government, politics, law, and education. He further added that he created Tribal Critical Race Theory as a way to convince scholars of the validity of an Indigenous world-view through stories, which incorporate individual experience and responsibility for community survival (Brayboy, 2006).

Brayboy (2006) focuses on the importance of different types of knowledge within TribalCRT Theory. He defined knowledge as “the ability to recognize change, adapt, and move forward” (Brayboy, 2006, p. 434). He further identified three types of coexisting knowledge: cultural knowledge, the knowledge of survival, and academic knowledge (Brayboy, 2006). All three are important to survival.

Cultural knowledge is everything a person knows as a member of a particular cultural group, specifically what individuals know as members of tribal nations (Brayboy, 2006). Community knowledge is important in understanding cultural knowledge. Cultural traditions and “ways of being and knowing that make an individual a member of
a community” (Brayboy, 2006, p. 434) fall into this category. Cultural knowledge is applied later in a comprehensive theoretical framework.

Knowledge of survival incorporates adaptation strategies that have been learned as well as the personal choice made with the community to change and adapt in order to survive. Knowledge of survival promotes resiliency and is applied later in a comprehensive theoretical framework.

Academic knowledge comes from institutes of education. Also known as “book learning,” academic knowledge is seen by academics as being more valid than Indigenous ways of knowing, but Brayboy (2006) and others (Barnhardt & Kawagley, 2005; Battiste, 2002; Harrison & Papa, 2005; Kawagley, 1995; Medicine, 2001) explained this does not have to be the case. Educators can and should recognize the validity of cultural knowledge and how it contributes to building academic knowledge. According to Brayboy (2006), cultural and academic knowledge blend and balance each other. In fact, the key to survival can be found by combining academic and cultural knowledge (Brayboy, 2006; Barnhardt & Kawagley, 2004, 2005; Deloria, 1970; Medicine, 2001). Brayboy (2006) used an example of Indigenous people combining academic knowledge with cultural knowledge to work toward social justice in tribal communities.

By strategically combining multiple forms of knowledge, power can be created and used for change. Brayboy (2006) explained, “power is rooted in a group’s ability to define themselves, their place in the world, and their traditions” (p. 435). Power is
essentially redefined as sovereignty. Tribal sovereignty is inherent and based in the community (Brayboy, 2006); therefore, power is shared as an expression of rights to self-identify, self-govern, and self-educate to meet the needs of the people. Vizenor (1998) and Vizenor and Lee (1999) add another component, perseverance. Because Indigenous people have persevered in extremely antagonistic conditions including forced assimilation strategies and outright acts of genocide, survivance (a term coined by Deloria [1969], which combines survival and resistance) is used to explain the adaptive processes of the Indigenous community.

According to Brayboy (2006), “culture is the base for knowledge that ultimately leads to power” (p. 436). Brayboy (2006) also explained the reciprocal nature between knowledge and power. Culture acts as a stabilizing force that provides individuals who are part of the larger community with identity. The dynamic nature of culture is its ability to change. Knowledge is essential for culture to survive because through knowledge, information about the culture, cultural boundaries, and ways in which the culture has and can adapt or change are passed down to successive generations. How cultural groups define and identify themselves is a source of power because this too can change due to it being socially constructed (Brayboy, 2006). This base model representing Brayboy’s (2006) TribalCRT is used within the larger theoretical framework.
Tribal Critical Race Theory (Brayboy, 2006) has its roots in Critical Race Theory (CRT), which focuses on education and addresses the fact that racism is widespread, enduring, and embedded in institutions (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Russell, 1992; Solórzano, 1997, 1998; Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001; Solórzano & Yosso, 2000, 2001, 2005). Critical Race Theorists claim educational institutions are not objective, racially neutral, based on merit, and do not provide equal opportunity (Crenshaw, 1989, 1993; Delgado Bernal, 2002; Delgado & Stefancic, 2000; Ramirez, 2011; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001, 2002; Villalpando, 2003). Even though systems of education claim to be fair and unbiased, underrepresented students continue to be marginalized and oppressed as evidenced by the achievement gap (Nevarez & Wood, 2011) and as revealed in
inconsistent policy and practice (Yosso, 2005). CRT scholars expose traditional claims of equity and objectivity in education as fabricated to maintain power and privilege for the dominant group (Calmore, 1992; Solórzano, 1997; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). Contemporary education policies and practices limit opportunities for minority students. TribalCRT and CRT provide a social justice lens that addresses this issue and reinforces liberation ideology (Friere, 1970, 1973; hooks, 1994). CRT promotes an applied approach of theory to practice or praxis in order to work toward eliminating racism, sexism, and classism in education through a social justice research agenda to empower underrepresented students (Brayboy, 2006; Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Friere, 1970, 1973; Parker, 1998; Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001, 2002; Williams, 1997).

TribalCRT will be used to explore the internal and external barriers and support networks as well as evaluate and challenge institutional assumptions, practices and policies that may hinder American Indian community college student success at Sacramento City College. By applying TribalCRT to higher education, assessments can be done on educational procedures, programs, and policies to address barriers to American Indian student educational success.

TribalCRT challenges the Cultural Deficit model and takes into account the power and privilege held by White founded systems of education and the structural inequities that persist to assimilate Native students. This framework is applied to analyze and interpret experiences of American Indian students enrolled at Sacramento City
College to determine the barriers preventing Native students from achieving academic success. A review of institutional policy and practices will take place to determine how they reinforce success or contribute to barriers that discourage achievement.

*Community Cultural Wealth*

Yosso’s (2005) Community Cultural Wealth (CCW) focuses on the importance of unrecognized assets (Ramirez, 2011) within communities of color. Cultural Wealth is accumulated through identifying and utilizing several types of capital, including cultural, social, familial, navigational, linguistic, and resistant capital (Auerbach, 2001; Delgado Bernal, 1997, 2001; Faulstich Orellana, 2003; Ramirez, 2011; Solórzano & Delgado Bernal; 2001; Stanton-Salazar, 2001; Yosso, 2005). These resources are then utilized or transacted within the community in which the individual is a part.

In direct opposition to Community Cultural Wealth is the Cultural Deficit Model, associated with Cultural Capital Theory and the Funds of Knowledge Theory. Bourdieu’s (1977b) theory of Cultural Capital refers to the skills, knowledge, and resources students bring with them to college in order to understand the institutional system of which they become a part. These resources are considered cultural capital. If a student does not have these resources, they are perceived to be at a disadvantage from the larger institution (Bourdieu, 1977a; Bourdieu, 1977b; Throsby, 1999; Tinto, 1975). The education system requires students to acquire certain skills to operate within this environment and become successful. According to Bourdieu (1977b), Throsby (1999), and Tinto (1975), some students enrolled in college are at a disadvantage because they do
not possess the skills or the college cultural capital to operate within the institution. The end result is a labeling of the student as “deficient,” which carries with it negative connotations that could lead one to believe and reinforce stereotypes specifically about minority students being deficient or not capable of obtaining a higher education at all, thereby allowing college faculty, staff, and administrators to be lax in their efforts to teach, reach, retain, and graduate or transfer said students.

Educational institutions subscribe to the Cultural Deficit Model by adopting what Freire (2009) terms the banking method, which in turn is used to infuse students who are empty receptacles, having no valid cultural resources from their communities or skills of their own, with academic and cultural knowledge judged to be essential by mainstream society (Yosso, 2006). Note it is presumed by educators that students do not come into the education system with previous valuable cultural knowledge. Instead, they must learn what is valuable through their teachers and pre-writ curriculum. Educators presume they work in educational institutions that are fair, equitable, and effective systems and what needs to change are the students, parents, families, and communities (Yosso, 2005). This is an inaccurate perception clouded by stereotypes, power, and privilege.

One of the core barriers to academic success (DeJong, 1993) has been assimilation strategies or perceived assimilation strategies reinforced through policy and curriculum in education. The focus in education has been on changing the student, not the system of education (Starks, 2010). This is problematic because the systemic inequities experienced by American Indian and other minority students are external
factors not internal faults of the student. By making the assumption that the student is faulty, researchers, practitioners, and educators are utilizing the deficit model. Yosso (2005) rejects the deficit model and states that students come to educational institutions with cultural resources, and these should be seen as assets.

The Funds of Knowledge Theory by Moll, Amanti, Neff, and Gonzalez (1992) is also based on a deficit perspective placing the educational institution as the knowledge center whereby students must abandon what they previously knew or their Community Wealth to learn the “correct” information. The Funds of Knowledge Theory by Moll et al. (1992) explains that the activities and information provided to a student can add to the student’s fund of college knowledge. However, a lack of this information can provide a gap from which the knowledge must be attained elsewhere, most likely through the educational institution (Andrews & Yee, 2006; Ares & Buendia, 2007; Rubenstein-Arila, 2006; Velez-Ibanez & Greenberg, 1992) in order for the student to succeed. Included in these funds are cultural capital and social capital, which can have a significant impact on students’ educational experiences and achievement. This can also be applied to the cultural beliefs and values passed down through a family. As the culture of higher education may differ from students’ home cultures, students must find some way to adapt. Students’ home lives have a significant impact on their educational experiences, goals, and achievements, but according to the Funds of Knowledge Theory (Moll et al., 1992), this may be viewed as a deficit. This theory is important because the gaps in information may be seen as barriers but, according to Yosso (2005), a student’s home
life, which is associated with cultural and familial capital, could never be considered a
deficit, and the fact that it may be seen as a deficit by educators is actually the root
problem.

A flaw in Bourdieu’s (1977b) Capital Theory and in Mollet al.’s (1992) Funds of
Knowledge Theory is that skills can be learned in an environment that reinforces the
validity of the capital the student brings with them to college. It may actually be easier to
use the student’s strengths and community resources to facilitate learning new skills.
Resources within the college environment, including financial aid, are highly regulated
and serve as a stopgap mechanism or barrier for minority students. This is due to a
collection of factors, stemming heavily from a lack of trust between the college
administration and minority students. Students are often perceived as taking advantage
of the educational system for purposes other than to obtain an education. This is
compounded both by the perception that academic institutions house the ‘correct’
knowledge and by the administration’s paternal idealism, which results in the treatment
of students as if they were incapable of making important decisions for themselves.
There is current discussion in higher education to weed out the undesirable students
negatively impacting college success statistics.

Critical Race Theory when applied to social and cultural capital theory holds that
power and privilege should be considered in terms of the type of cultural and social
capital obtained. Some students have access to power directly and are privileged in that
they have been given the cultural and social capital they need to succeed on a college
campus. For those students who do not have access to power or privilege, barriers can result. The student is then faced with the three choices: they can completely abandon their ethnic identity and assimilate entirely, drop out of college and retain their ethnic identity in its entirety, or try to maintain some ethnic identity while still assimilating to the college experience. The students who choose this last route take a huge risk, trading some loss of identity and social/cultural capital in hopes they will gain new capital within a system with which they are unfamiliar. Students come to college with cultural and social capital originating from their family and community. They bring this to bear at the community college level where they attempt to apply it. Because the community college is based on dominant cultural and social values, the capital the student has obtained from family and community does not always apply in the institutional system. It has often been reinforced by professionals that students must learn how to deal with the dominant culture and through this process begin to build college skills and capital to assist in their success. It is difficult and at times impossible for students to begin to navigate in unchartered waters to find the resources they need to succeed, especially when cultural and social capital are needed immediately in order to navigate a foreign system based on dominant cultural values.

Reziliency Theory

According to Waller, Okamoto, and Hankerson (2002), American Indian communities have social and cultural capital, which promote educational resilience and persistence (Starks, 2010). American Indian individuals and communities have overcome harsh
conditions through what Belcourt-Dittloff (2006) calls “reziliency.” Reziliency means resiliency factors, skills, and processes used to cope with oppressive conditions (Belcourt-Dittloff, 2006). Reziliency is a clever term that makes one think about reservations or, in short “the rez.” However, Belcourt-Dittloff (2006) did not mean for the term to pertain specifically to American Indians living on reservations partially because a majority of Natives live in urban areas and partially because she wanted to coin a term that would encompass the psychological ways in which both reservation and urban Natives adapt in positive ways to adversity or trauma. For the purposes of this study, reziliency will be used interchangeably with the term resiliency and will pertain to positive ways in which students have adapted to oppressive conditions within their learning or educational environments. The theoretical framework provides a basis for the Native Student Success Equation, discussed in detail later. Figure 5 is the theoretical framework incorporating TribalCRT, Community Cultural Wealth, and Reziliency Theory.

**Student Success Equation**

(Needs Being Met – Barriers) + Resiliency Characteristics = Student Success

Based on TribalCRT Institutional Barriers Include:

- Deficit Model Thinking
- Assimilation Strategies
- Lack of Cultural Competence/Understanding
- Institutionalized Racism Stemming from Colonialism
Operational Definitions

The following definitions will be used throughout this study:

American Indian/Native American/Indigenous/Native/Indian

These terms are used interchangeably and refer to a person’s identity or a population. A person having origins in any of the original homeland locations now located within the United States proper. A person who maintains cultural identification through tribal affiliation, enrollment or community recognition (Stoney Brook, 2011).

California Community Colleges (CCC)

Composed of 72 different districts and 112 campuses. The largest postsecondary education system in the U.S.

Community Cultural Wealth

Yosso’s (2005, 2006) concept that brings together various forms of capital (listed below) and validates cultural capital obtained from the community. Yosso challenges the Cultural Deficit Model.

- **Aspirational Capital:** from Yosso’s (2005, 2006) model of community cultural wealth. A form of capital that provides hope in the face of oppression and hardship. This type of capital inspires students to aspire to their greatest potential or goal.

- **Cultural Capital:** refers to an inherent ability to access resources and opportunities associated with birthright, family, culture, and community;
knowledge of college-going processes and skills for navigating institutions of education obtained through family or community knowledge.

- **Familial Capital:** Yosso’s (2005, 2006) model of community cultural wealth. This capital is possessed by students whose cultural competency is a result of their familial connections and the knowledge base that develops from a shared sense of identity and community. What Delgado Bernal (1998, 2002) calls “cultural intuition”.

- **Navigational Capital:** from Yosso’s (2005, 2006) model of community cultural wealth. Capital or maneuvering skills possessed by students who need it to navigate through the educational system. Originally not meant for students of color.

- **Resistant Capital:** from Yosso’s (2005, 2006) model of community cultural wealth. Capital possessed by students who have obtained knowledge and skills created through challenging inequality or social injustice. Rooted in historic and modern day resistance strategies to oppression.

- **Social Capital:** Yosso’s (2005, 2006) model of community cultural wealth or capital possessed by students made up of networks and community resources shared locally. Peer and other social stakeholders are influential in that they possess insider information and can provide emotional support.
Cultural Deficit Model or Deficit Thinking

A framework promoting the belief that minority students and their families are at fault for poor academic performance because these students enter school without knowledge or information about how to navigate the system. It is inaccurate and based on the pervasive assumption or stereotype that minority parents or communities do not support their children’s education.

Drop Out

Occurs when a student enrolled in school leaves it completely, never to come back.

Federally Recognized Tribe/Nation

A tribe of people who can trace their ancestry back before the establishment of the United States, who through treaty have maintained sovereign rights as a domestic dependent nation within a nation (the United States) by giving up land in exchange for resources until the end of time.

Historical Trauma

Forms of oppression equating to genocide experienced by Native American ancestors. Each generation is infused with remembering historical trauma in order to have coping skills to deal with the outcomes of the experiences of oppression and acts of genocide that still occur today.
Los Rios Community College District (LRCCD)

Consisting of four colleges (i.e., American River, Cosumnes River, Folsom Lake, and Sacramento City Colleges) serving the Sacramento and surrounding areas.

Reservation

Land set aside by the federal government through treaty, acts of congress, or presidential decree for American Indian tribes.

Reservation Indian

An American Indian who lives on or who is from the reservation.

Reziliency

A term used interchangeably with the term resiliency pertaining to positive ways in which students have adapted to their oppressive learning or educational environments; factors, skills, and processes used to cope with oppressive conditions.

Sacramento City College (SCC)

SCC is a two-year community college located near Land Park in Sacramento, California. There are approximately 25,000 students enrolled. SCC provides higher educational opportunities consisting of career/vocational/technical certificates or degrees, transfer programs, and courses for personal development.

Stop Out

Occurs when a student enrolled in school leaves for a period of time and then returns to continue their education.
Student Success

For this study, student success is defined as meeting the needs, eliminating the barriers, and reinforcing the resiliency characteristics of students working toward the completion of a desired academic goal.

Survivance

A term coined by Deloria (1969, 1971) combining survival and resistance.

Tribal Critical Race Theory (TribalCRT) & Critical Race Theory (CRT).

A theoretical framework that reveals the systematic exclusion of People of Color from access and opportunity. Applied to education, this theory allows for analysis of American Indian students specifically with TribalCRT incorporating elements of sovereignty and the historic boarding school experience.

Tribally Enrolled

To be enrolled in a federally recognized tribe or to be tribally enrolled has significance in that enrollees are entitled to benefits or resources as outlined through original treaties (where land was given up in exchange for resources) ratified through acts of congress.

Units

A college unit of work is equivalent in lecture courses to one hour in the classroom and two hours of study preparation time per week. Every course has an assigned amount of units associated. Students earn a certain number of units in order to obtain a certificate, degree or to transfer to a four-year institution. The
number of units necessary to earn a degree and the courses taken differentiates between disciplines but certain GE or general education units must be taken in order to earn a certificate or degree. The number of units of credit is listed with each course description.

Urban Indian

An American Indian who is from, and who lives in an urban area or off the reservation.

Assumptions and Limitations

The number of American Indian students who participated in this study may not represent all the Native students at the college; however, this study provides rich information not found in previous studies concerning American Indian community college students. Limitations of this study include (1) the limited sample size living primarily in the Sacramento and surrounding area, representing some but not all of the 500+ federally recognized tribes and 150 tribes not federally recognized, this being the case, not all American Indians throughout California or the United States will be represented; (2) the researcher conducting the study is an American Indian adjunct faculty member at Sacramento City College who teaches the only Native American Studies courses offered in the Los Rios District and as such many of the Native participants in the study may know the researcher; (3) the sample size is small; therefore,
the study is limited in the ability to accurately represent all the experiences of all Natives at Sacramento City College.

Significance of the Study

This study adds to the body of research on American Indian community college students and provides both qualitative and quantitative data on what is needed to facilitate student success. Because there are larger numbers of American Indians attending community college and minimal research about American Indian community college students has been done, this study contributes to the literature. This study looked at how needs as well as barriers that exist can be addressed to promote American Indian community college student success.

Conclusion

The effects of intergenerational oppression and discrimination Native Americans have experienced, including being silenced or made invisible in institutes of education has had the negative consequence of unmet needs, substandard educational conditions (Young, 2010), and an educational deficit that has a spanned generations resulting in institutionalized barriers, disadvantages, and the minimal success of American Indian students (Young, 2010). By addressing the educational barriers and needs, and identifying resiliency strategies, one of the most underserved groups in education, American Indian community college students can achieve success at greater rates.
Bringing together TribalCRT, Community Cultural Wealth and Reziliency Theory is important for this study in order to create a theoretical lens through which to view American Indian community college student resiliency and success. Barriers can be identified and bridges can be built to meet the needs of American Indian community college students and ultimately support their success.

Chapter 2 provides an in-depth review of the literature analyzing the following themes related to needs, barriers and resiliency: internal support (family, cultural capital, community, finances, educational support/opportunities); internal barriers (family, cultural capital, community, finances, student’s previous educational experiences, educational challenges faced by low-income and educationally marginalized students); external support (academic support services provided by the college, educational benefits of social and cultural capital through student involvement, current student positive experiences with peers, faculty, service providers); external barriers (campus climate, student’s negative experiences with peers, faculty, service providers); and resiliency or persistence factors.

Chapter 3 describes the research methodology used in this mixed-methods study, including quantitative surveys and qualitative follow-up focus groups. Chapter 4 provides an in-depth analysis of the data collected. Research questions are used to interpret the findings. Chapter 5 discusses common themes in the data and concludes with recommendations for program creation or program improvement as well as a recommended model to following implications for future research.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Native philosophy tells us, ‘We are, therefore I am.’
(Burkhart, 2004, p. 25)

This chapter provides an overview of historical factors, theory, and current educational research relevant to the study of American Indian community college student success. Topics covered include: (1) the educational experience of the American Indian; (2) the connection between Tribal Critical Race Theory (TribalCRT), Community Cultural Wealth, and Resiliency Theory within a framework to assist in explaining the current Indigenous student’s experience in higher education by utilizing a newly introduced equation for student success focusing on needs, barriers and resiliency characteristics; (3) contemporary research on Native American community college students, and finally, (4) American Indian student data from Sacramento City College.

This chapter provides historical background and outlines the findings and contributions of education scholars and practitioners whose work is significant to the American Indian struggle for an equitable education.

History

Taking into consideration the educational experience of the American Indian student, Battiste (2002) emphasized that Eurocentric ideology rejects Indigenous thought because it does not focus on productivity. This has resulted in Indigenous knowledge...
being dismissed as inferior to Eurocentric thinking (Brayboy, 2006). The problem lies in the fact that education in the United States is fundamentally based on Eurocentric thinking. Hence, the institutionalized education of the American Indian has promoted and reinforced assimilation, “[which] assumes that what is required is the complete and utter transformation of Native nations and individuals” (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2002, p. 282). The ultimate goal has always been assimilation through colonization (Brayboy, 2006). This is most evident through examining the early experiences of Natives with higher education and later with boarding schools.

**Indian Education**

When discussing Native Nations and education, research has focused on post-contact experience. Even though there is no evidence of a formal education system before the arrival of the colonists, Indian education has existed for thousands of years (Raymond, 2004). Indigenous children were taught the skills to survive, unique languages to transfer information about culture, the significance of their community, and how to adapt to their ever changing environment (Kolhoff, 1979; Raymond, 2004; U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs [DOIBIA], 1988).

**Tribal Colleges**

According to Raymond (2004) and White (2007), tribal colleges existed long before boarding schools were established. One of the first colleges established by Jesuits in Cuba in 1568 was established for Florida Natives (Woodcock & Alawiye, 2001). The
purpose of this college was to “civilize the savage,” a theme that has remained persistent and pervasive at all levels of education for Indigenous students for close to 500 years.

There is a long history of American Indian college students matriculating at non-tribal colleges as well. In the early 1600s, scholars at Harvard saw an opportunity to fulfill one focal point of Harvard’s mission, to produce Christian clergy to minister to Natives (Raymond, 2004). Who better to minister to Natives than other Natives who were Christian, especially those trained as clergy? This ultimately influenced Harvard’s charter to include the education of Native American youth. In 1656, an Indian College building was established at the Harvard campus that would house 20 Native students. No more than six Native students were housed in the Indian College Building at one time over four decades (Raymond, 2004; Wright & Tierney, 1991). After King Phillips War, the Indian College Building at Harvard was torn down (Beck, 1995; Raymond, 2004; Salisbury, 1974; Wright & Tierney, 1991). In the end, very few Indians had lived at Harvard’s Indian College Building and after graduating, all of them died because of disease, murder, or accident (Raymond, 2004; Salisbury, 1974; Wright & Tierney, 1991). This was a definite sign of things to come for Native children who were kidnapped and forced into the boarding school system.

In 1693, William and Mary College was created to provide higher education to Native Americans to be clergy who would preach Protestant religious beliefs to other Natives (Raymond, 2004). Ultimately, none of the students who attended William and Mary College ever followed through with this goal (Beck, 1995). No more than 25
Native American students ever attended William and Mary College and funding stopped with the outbreak of the War for Independence (Wright & Tierney, 1991). After the war, no further efforts were made at William and Mary College to recruit or educate Native students (Beck, 1995; Wright & Tierney, 1991). On a side note, during the same time frame, Princeton enrolled three Delaware Native students, but after the war no Natives were enrolled (Beck, 1995).

Dartmouth College, chartered in 1769, was to provide higher education in theology and agriculture to Natives and colonists (Beck, 1995; Wright & Tierney, 1991). Dartmouth was yet another college to focus on assimilation strategies. Between 1770 and 1893, 58 Native American students had been admitted with 11 graduating and two earning additional degrees in medicine (Beck, 1995; Wright & Tierney, 1991).

In the early 1800s, U.S. government policy impacting Native people changed once again. The Indian Removal Act of 1830 and the reservation era took hold promoting an ideology of a separate Indian territory, where Native people were forcibly moved from their homelands. This meant access to mainstream colleges and universities became nonexistent because large populations of Natives were moved to rural reservations where no colleges existed. According to Raymond (2004), “the near-total isolation from Whites did nothing to prepare Native American students for success in higher education at White-dominated colleges” (p. 24). But there were ways in which Natives adapted. One example was the Cherokee Nation, who in 1846 chartered their own seminary after they were forcibly moved to Oklahoma. This seminary today is
known as Northeastern State University. Other tribal colleges began to be established on or near reservations during the late 1800s and early 1900s.

The Indian Reorganization Act was passed in 1934, which set aside loan monies to assist with higher education costs for Native students. By 1935, approximately 515 Native American students were enrolled in college (Wright & Tierney, 1991), a number up 20% from three years earlier (Beck, 1995). In the late 1940s, the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) began to offer scholarships to replace loan monies established through the Indian Reorganization Act (Wright & Tierney, 1991).

The Civil Rights Movement fueled Indian activism and the desire for self-determination and self-government. Having the power over their own education is one of the ultimate expressions of sovereignty (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2002; Pavel, Inglebret, & Banks, 2001; Stein, 1992b). During the 1960s, the Native American college student dropout rate was 97% (Beck, 1995). Factors preventing American Indian college student success were found to be lack of preparation to do college level work, institutional racism (McDonald, 1978), loneliness (Tierney, 1991), economic, emotional, geographic distances, and cultural differences (Houser, 1991).

It became apparent to tribes in the mid-1900s that for American Indian students indoctrinated into White society through boarding schools to be successful, they would need to re-learn their culture, heritage, and traditions and re-establish a secure Indian identity while at the same time learn new skills (Noel, 2002). American Indian students would need to counter the cultural shame they learned by attending boarding schools in
order to achieve academic success in higher education. But the damage was done. In 1961, only 61 Native Americans graduated from four-year colleges (Boyer, 1997). By 1979, fewer than 15 American Indians had earned a doctorate in social sciences and less than five a doctorate in mathematics (Clever, 1983). McDonald (1978) determined that only 3% of American Indian college students actually graduated. A 1995 study showed the graduation rates for American Indian students at more than 300 colleges and universities as only 37%, the lowest among any minority groups (Carter and Wilson, 1997).

In 1996, President Clinton signed Executive Order 13021, which established an advisory committee on Tribal Colleges and Universities, promoted the retention of Indian languages and culture, and increased federal funding for tribal colleges changing policy to allow for equal access to the same monies allotted for other colleges and universities (Executive Order No. 13021, 1996). Also in the late 1990s, approximately 85% of tribal college students lived below the poverty level (Boyer, 1997). Native students enrolled at tribal colleges at the time needed transportation, counseling for drug abuse or alcohol abuse, help with domestic violence issues, child care, and general counseling (Boyer, 1997). Between the late 1990s and early 2000s, approximately half of all Native students entering tribal colleges had a third- or fourth-grade reading level, required tutoring for a minimum of one calendar year before they began matriculation, and were deficient in math skills (Boyer, 1997; Raymond, 2004). These low levels in reading and math are reflective of an education system that has failed Native students.
In 1997, 55% of Native Americans who lived on reservations with a tribal college were unemployed (Wright, 2000). In 1998, the median salary for graduates with a certificate was $12,500, with an associates degree $15,115, and a baccalaureate earned $20,000. A national survey published in 2000 indicated that 91% of students who graduated from a tribal college in 1998 had decided to pursue another degree or had found employment (Raymond, 2004). Jobs students obtained were normally with tribal governments and were in the areas of business or accounting, nursing or health care, office technology, psychology, social work, and human services (Boyer 1997; Wright, 2000). Of tribal college graduates in 2000, 74% were the first women in their family to earn a degree, the average age of female graduates was 34, 55% were married, and 72% had children (Wright, 2000). Overall, this data is very positive, but again the percentage may be misleading in that so few Natives actually attended tribal colleges. The actual number may be equitable to or less than the number of Native students who graduated from a community college and had decided to pursue another degree or who had found employment. The issue is that this type of data from community colleges is not available. Few studies have been done on Natives at the community college level. Comparable data would reveal tremendous information about the success rates of Native students.

Historically, most tribal college instructors were non-Indian (Stein, 1999). Finding qualified Native American faculty was and still is problematic (Boyer, 1997). Low faculty salaries contribute to high faculty turnover (Lane, 2001; Stein, 1999). During the 1997-98 academic year, salaries for full-time tribal faculty averaged $30,000.
while full-time faculty at public community college averaged $46,000 (Lane, 2001). Tribal college faculty teach 6-10 different courses per academic year (Tippeconnic & McKinney, 2003). It was once thought that the reason for high dropout rates was a lack of Native American educators at tribal college institutions, but with reservation schools experiencing an increase in Indian educators, the dropout rate has continued to increase.

Full Time Equivalent (FTE) comparisons between tribal and public community colleges in the year 2000 were such that Congress authorized tribal college FTE reimbursement of $6000 per student but only provided $3849 per FTE student (Lane, 2001). In 2001, federal aid to tribal colleges was down to $3,370 per FTE student while public community colleges received $7,000 per FTE student (Yates, 2001). Federal FTE for tribal colleges is for enrolled Native students only. Typically, 15-20% of the student population at tribal colleges are non-Native (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2002) and generate no financial reimbursement (Oppelt, 1990).

In 2004, between 25% and 33% of all tribal college students, completed college with a certificate or degree (Raymond, 2004). These numbers were consistent with non-reservation community college students (Raymond, 2004), but the numbers are misleading. Because so few Native students attend tribal colleges, success rates for this demographic seem higher than the norm, when in all actuality, tribal colleges average the same or worse than other colleges including community colleges. It would also seem tribal colleges are facing the same challenges as community colleges and four-year institutions in regard to Native students. This study looks at the experiences of Native
students at an urban community college in order to determine the barriers that exist and
the resiliency mechanisms utilized by students, which contribute to their success.

Today there are close to 40 accredited Tribal colleges in the United States
(American Indian Higher Education Consortium, n.d.). Most Tribal College students
come from reservations, but most Natives live in urban areas and attend community
colleges. Tribal colleges on reservations have improved the quality of life for Natives
economically and socially (Pavel et al., 2001; Selden, 2002). Tribal colleges support and
sponsor community events and nearly all colleges have established cultural centers that
double as museums and archives. Studies on reservations have contributed to research on
language revitalization, tribal histories, sacred sites, and tribal perception of land, among
other topic areas (Mortensen, Nelson, & Strauss, 2001). Although few fluent speakers of
Native languages exist, Tribal colleges emphasize learning tribal languages and offer
language courses to students (Raymond, 2004).

As of 2004, 20% of all Native American college students attended tribal colleges.
Given the physical and cultural isolation from mainstream society, the success of
reservation-based colleges in achieving accreditation is no small miracle especially since
tribal colleges are being evaluated based on “standards and expectations foreign to our
tribal environments and needs” (Crazy Bull, 1994, p. 25).

With a new focus on self-determination, new energy sources being found on
reservations, and the contemporary development of businesses and casinos, the demand
for college-educated Indians has been increasing (Oppelt, 1990). To address this need,
Tribal leaders established two-year community colleges on certain reservations (Raymond, 2004). But because of historic trauma associated with education via the boarding school experience, American Indian student success has suffered (Raymond, 2004). Educators have developed new strategies to prepare Native Americans for success. These strategies have impacted the missions of tribal colleges in that they have incorporated Native American history and culture alongside a traditional western college model where courses in specific disciplines transfer to four-year colleges and universities (Raymond, 2004).

Tribal colleges are distinct institutions because they forge Native American culture and values with Western curriculum, meeting the same rigorous academic and administrative standards as mainstream colleges and universities. Tribal colleges have provided opportunities for individuals to pursue their academic goals, support their communities, and have assisted tribes in reconnecting to their history, culture, and languages (Raymond, 2004). But tribal colleges have not been as successful as they claim in the area of degree obtainment for Native American students (White, 2007). In White’s (2007) fairly recent study comparing national data sets of Tribal college persistence and graduation rates with rates of Native students who attend mainstream institutions of higher education, he found the data did not support the claims of success tribal colleges have insinuated.

Table 1 is a comparison of data specifically collected on American Indian college student fall enrollment between community college and tribal colleges in 1990 and 1996.
California had the highest number of Native students enrolled in non-tribal colleges in 1996 with 22,852 in number in any institute of higher education. The total number of American Indian/Alaska Natives community college students enrolled in California in the fall of 1996 was approximately 25,683 according to the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office.

Table 1

Comparison of Indian Fall Enrollment, 1990 and 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Indian students at non-tribal colleges, 1990</th>
<th>Indian students at non-tribal colleges, 1996</th>
<th>% increase</th>
<th>Indian students at tribal colleges, 1990</th>
<th>Indian students at tribal colleges, 1996</th>
<th>% increase</th>
<th>Tribal college students as % of total, 1990</th>
<th>Tribal college students as % of total, 1996</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>7,418</td>
<td>10,140</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td>1,604</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>21,353</td>
<td>22,852</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td>1,865</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>3,563</td>
<td>4,229</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>2,983</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>1,426</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>1,426</td>
<td>2,320</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>1,382</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>4,440</td>
<td>6,979</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>422%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1,134</td>
<td>1,553</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>3,888</td>
<td>6,140</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>2,051</td>
<td>2,333</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96,656</td>
<td>131,002</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>6,315</td>
<td>10,234</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Data on Tribal College students for fall 1996 include 28 colleges, while figures for fall 1990 include 20 colleges. Data in 1990 were not available for some of the colleges because they did not report to IPEDS in that year, did not provide fall enrollment figures, or had not been established (NCES, 1990-1997).
The percent column is misleading; if you review the raw numbers, you will obtain a more accurate representation of the actual number of students attending different colleges and far more Native students attended non-tribal colleges in number. According to the chart, approximately 131,902 students attended non-tribal colleges versus 10,234 students who attended tribal colleges in 1996. These numbers accurately reflect the low numbers of Native students who attend tribal colleges.

**Boarding Schools**

Prior to the establishment of boarding schools, individual American Indian tribes signed treaties ratified by Congress. Within these treaties were standard provisions for food, land set aside as reservations, resources, health care, and guaranteed education for descendents through time in exchange for hundreds of thousands of acres of land. Because land lasts forever, it was implied through treaty that the resources the federal government would provide in exchange for land would last forever. In the early 1800s the federal government decided to partially fulfill the terms of treaty by establishing reservations and outsourcing the education it guaranteed for American Indians to missionary-run boarding schools. Funding was set aside for mission schools on reservations through the first Trade and Intercourse Act (Raymond, 2004; Report on BIA education, 1988). Through boarding schools, the federal government could not only fulfill treaty obligations but advance its colonial assimilation agenda by regulating the contact between American Indian children and their families/tribes in order to isolate and indoctrinate them.
In the early 1800s, the U.S. federal government established a “civilization fund,” also known as the “assimilation fund,” to support mission schools within Indian territory to promote a campaign which was meant to assimilate or “civilize the savage” (Adams, 1995; Berry, 1968; Noel, 2002; Prucha, 1979). Mission boarding schools were created before the public education system had been developed in the United States, so basic reading, writing, and arithmetic as well as labor skills were taught alongside an onslaught of White cultural norms and expectations in order to “kill the Indian and save the man” (Pratt, 1892). Labor was used as a means of civilizing the Indian child, “making him a willing worker” (Reel, 1902). Girls were assigned to domestic labor such as cleaning, washing, sewing, ironing, cooking, baking, and general housework, while boys worked on the farm caring for the cattle, horses, pigs, and crops as well as machinery. Essentially, the boarding schools served as manual labor factories. It seems ironic that Native students would purposefully not be prepared for a higher education (Whiteman, 1985) when higher education was created early on for Native people.

Federal agents were paid to kidnap Indian children and forcibly bring them to boarding schools. Because many children attempted to run away from the schools due to inhumane treatment and terrible conditions, it was not uncommon for the missionaries to lie and tell the children their parents had died because of warfare, starvation, or disease to stop them from trying to escape the confines of the boarding school (Noel, 2002). Regardless, thousands of children died in their efforts to find their way home, while others just did not survive the beatings, rape, and molestation that occurred. It was also
common practice that if the parents or family members of the children who had been kidnapped by federal agents arrived at the school to take their children home, they were often lied to and told their child had died of illness or in transport or that the child was at another school (Noel, 2002). Another factor at work was that the missionaries would rename the children as they were baptized within the religion, so the children would no longer be called their name given by their family, but instead a name that was from the bible, their baptized name (Noel, 2002). So when the parents would come to find their children and ask for them by their given family name, the missionaries could skirt any confrontation or responsibility to return the child to the parent by saying there were no children by that name at that school.

Renaming had another purpose as well, to strip away Indian identity, language and culture (Noel, 2002). Because Indigenous names were associated with cultural, linguistic, familial, and spiritual tradition, they were seen as a threat to the primary goal of assimilation. Renaming was random. Sometimes the children were asked which name they liked best and that became their first name. Other times, names were randomly assigned.

By 1884, there were 73 Christian (including Presbyterian, Episcopalian, Methodist, and Catholic as well as other denominations) boarding schools in existence on reservations imprisoning approximately 239,000 Indian children (Noel, 2002). By 1902, 113 boarding schools were both on and off the reservation, “with an average attendance of something over 16,000 pupils, ranging from 5 to 21 years old.
These pupils are gathered...partly by cajolery and partly by threats; partly by bribery and partly by fraud; partly by persuasion and partly by force, they are induced to leave their homes and their kindred to enter these schools and take upon themselves the outward semblance of civilized life. (Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1902)

Although in 1894 Congress passed an act that made it illegal to send Indian children to boarding schools outside their state or territory without parental consent, the practice continued. Thousands of Indian children were sent to the most infamous school, Carlisle Indian boarding school, established in Pennsylvania in 1879 by Captain Richard Henry Pratt. Pratt created the school based on a mission when he escorted Apache men via train to a fort on the east coast. During this mission, Pratt came to a unique understanding that if the culture were to be completely eradicated from Indians at a younger age when they were developing their identity, then these children could be raised White, be saved from their savagery, and become contributing members of society. He was not alone in his ideology. In fact, Price, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and Lamar, the Secretary of the Interior, both subscribed to the same notion that Indians must be assimilated or die (Adams, 1975). Culture and family life for American Indians was being forcibly altered by indoctrinating the youth into Christian religions and assimilating them through Eurocentric teachings promoted by boarding schools and the federal government. This alone has led to an inherent mistrust of not only the federal government, but of Christian religions and, importantly, educational institutions.

In 1901, W.A. Jones, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs at the time, decided the off-reservation boarding schools needed to be shut down because they were too costly
and did not encourage tribal sovereignty or self-determination. Federal funding consisted of 11-18 cents per day appropriated to feed one boarding school student (Merriam et al., 1928; Whiteman, 1985). Jones continued to support on-reservation boarding schools.

The next Commissioner of Indian Affairs instituted day schools in the Indian territories and on reservations in addition to the boarding schools that already existed.

During the early 1900s as tribes began to exercise their inherent sovereignty, deals were made with the federal government to continue to operate on-reservation boarding schools (Noel, 2002). In addition, many states also entered into contracts with tribes to maintain local control of Indian schools as well as the federal government. Deals were made with four states: California, Nebraska, South Dakota, and Utah to provide funding for Indian schools (Noel, 2002). These contracts were the beginning of the inclusion of American Indian children in public schools. By 1912, the population of Indian children in public schools was larger than in government-sponsored day or boarding schools, moving further toward the assimilation of Indian children into mainstream society (Noel, 2002).

In 1934, Congress passed the Johnson-O’Malley Act, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to develop contracts with states to provide Native American students with a public education (Whiteman, 1985). Sixteen boarding schools were closed and replaced by 84 day schools (Whiteman, 1985). During this time, BIA-operated reservation schools began to include expanded Indian heritage lessons in the curriculum (Reyhner, 1989) and experiments with bilingual education (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2002).
In public schools, American Indian children were subject to intelligence testing to determine if they could meet the same expectations as mainstream White American children (Noel, 2002). American Indian children were expected to already have the knowledge needed to do well on the intelligence tests because several generations had been indoctrinated and assimilated through the boarding school experience (Noel, 2002). The actual experiences of American Indian students was documented in research revealing that institutions encouraged cultural shame be utilized by teachers in Indian schools to reinforce certain behaviors (Noel, 2002). This idea of cultural shame was persistent and pervasive throughout the early to late 1900s and still exists in the psyche of older generations. It has now become part of the historic trauma currently being passed to successive generations and has become a form of internalized oppression reinforcing a self-fulfilling prophecy of educational failure.

Investigations by Congress took place in the 1920s to determine the effects of the Dawes Allotment Act and the boarding school system, which removed tens of thousands of children from their homes to be assimilated through Christian doctrine into U.S. society (Noel, 2002; Young, 2010). The outcome was the Merriam report of 1928, which criticized Native American education and documented the atrocities that occurred within the system. But bringing light to the injustice of subjecting Native children to extreme assimilation policies and procedures through forced relocation and education did not improve education for Native children (Young, 2010). In some ways education became worse. In the 1940s and 1950s, the federal government terminated approximately 100
federally recognized tribes out of the 500 that existed (Spring, 1997). This policy was meant to apply yet another assimilation strategy to tribes to break them up and relocate Indigenous people to urban areas and integrate them socially and culturally (Young, 2010). This action caused Natives to move deeper into poverty because they no longer had access to their land base or treaty agreed, government guaranteed resources (Garrett, 1996).

Although a majority of Native people moved to urban areas, relocation failed (Young 2010). In 1969, the U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare issued the Kennedy Report. The official title was Indian Education: A National Tragedy – A National Challenge. This report revealed the actual intent of the federal government to take Native land and assimilate Indigenous people. A very important part of the Kennedy report was that the federal government had recognized the absolute failure of the American public education system to address Native students’ needs and documented the assimilation policy as the reason for this failure (Young, 2010). A vital recommendation in this report was to obtain Native participation and relinquish control of Indian education to Native people (Spring, 1997; Young, 2010). After the release of this report, efforts were underway to create programs and revisit education policy to ensure the efficacy and solvency of education reform for Native students (Young, 2010). In 1972, the Indian Education Act was passed to provide financial assistance for Native students to meet their needs (Spring, 1977; Young, 2010). In 1975, the Indian Self-Determination and
Education Assistance Act passed. This act gave power to tribes to run their own health and education programs (Spring, 1997; Young, 2010) on and off the reservation.

K-12 American Indian Students Today

The educational experience of Native students has improved, but they “continue to be disproportionately affected by poverty, low educational attainment, and [have] access to fewer educational opportunities than other students” (Beaulieu, 2000, p. 6). Sheets (2003) maintains social injustice is ever-present within contemporary education systems and Native children continue to have their rights to a quality education denied. Tippeconnic and Faircloth (2006) reinforced that many Native students were still not successful in school in 2006. Beaulieu (2000) documented the high dropout rates for Native students, while Young’s (2010) research revealed they are often unprepared to learn when they begin school; they achieve success at lower rates and few enter and finish college.

Reyhner’s (1992) research revealed several factors negatively impacting Native students, including uncaring and untrained teachers, large schools, tracked classes, inappropriate curriculum, lack of parental involvement, inappropriate testing/assessment and student retention. These factors impact student success across the board, but because a majority of Native students attend public schools, these factors have become specific to this group as well (Young, 2010).
American Indians have traditionally scored low on standardized tests. On the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) Native students have scored up to 74 points lower on the combined verbal and math tests and 2.0 to 2.2 points lower on the ACT (Pavel, 1999). Fox (1999) claimed standardized tests are actually a measure of acculturation into mainstream society. Fox (1999) argues, “successful test performance correlates with socioeconomic status” (p. 165), which indicates Native students are at a distinct disadvantage (Young, 2010). In addition, Starnes (2006) found Native students experience gaps in knowledge, which demonstrates they are being taught in a system culturally incompatible and irrelevant. They are also being tested in a hostile environment designed specifically to place them at a disadvantage to preserve power for the ruling class (Starnes, 2006; Young, 2010). Now that high-stakes testing has become the norm in schools in order to meet state and federal standards and obtain monies from these sources, this type of one shot deal has become very damaging to Native student retention and success rates (Nichols & Berliner, 2007). The type of curriculum design utilized in high-stakes testing is not culturally relevant to many students meaning Native students are even further disengaged and pushed out or they are allowed to drop out for the sake of an increase in the overall district test score (Nichols & Berliner, 2005). This places an emphasis on the vested interest in the failure of some students, Native students falling directly in this category.

Schools on and off the reservation, “emphasize a history and culture that does not include American Indians” (Starnes, 2006, p. 185). Identity development of Native youth
has been full of cultural conflict due to differences between tribal traditions and mainstream American social and educational system expectations (Garrett, 1996). Cultural conflict can lower self-esteem and foster internal doubts about what can be achieved (Whitbeck et. al., 2001). In the 1987 study, Sanders found that as early as fifth and sixth grades, many Native students began to withdraw from the education system. The result was discouraged youth confused about their identities and capabilities, who felt ashamed because of their inability to meet educational expectations; they dropped out of the system (Sanders, 1987).

As a majority of Native American youth attend public schools, there is a concern schools are not reaching out to parents or the community to help Native youth succeed in their educational endeavors (Tippeconnic, 2000). Success in elementary school influences success in high school and into college (Young, 2010). Young (2010) found that only 31% of Native students across the nation completed their core curriculum for high school graduation.

Swisher and Tippeconnic (1999) stated that teachers and administrators maintain stereotypes of Native people, and their attitudes and behaviors reflect these biases to the extent that prejudicial concepts remain in academic curriculum. Teacher attitude about students, their knowledge and understanding of the students’ culture, as well as their understanding of the curriculum impact student behavior and academic performance (Yagi, 1985). Mutually respectful and caring relationships are essential to educational success (Swisher & Tippeconnic, 1999; Wilson, 1991; Young, 2010). Ogbu and
Simmons (1998) championed the culturally responsive instruction concept whereby appropriate instruction acknowledges and accommodates culture in the classroom in an attempt to bridge the gap of educational success between White students and students of color. Culturally responsive teaching uses a child’s culture to build a bridge to academic success (Pewewardy, Hammer, & Cahape, 2003).

Cultural assimilation strategies by established educational organizations have meant drastic change, cultural loss, hardship, and a future of mistrust of any education system for American Indians. In facing genocidal practices of attempts to eliminate identity, cultural memory, spiritual beliefs, language, and community connection, American Indians have been resilient. Whether carried out by church or state, assimilation strategies have not succeeded (Salisbury, 1974). What has persisted is poverty, which is a direct result of a limited elementary vocational education (Woodcock & Alawiye, 2001) made compulsory by a genocidal boarding school system. Today, tribally-controlled reservation colleges have given Native nations control over their own education and, moreover, hope for the first time in history for a future of highly educated Natives secure in their cultural identity and propelling their Native communities into the future (Oppelt, 1990). Yet little research has been done on factors contributing to American Indian community college student success.

American Indians are not only victims of an undervalued education system, but they are failing to persist in overwhelming numbers at all levels of education (Young, 2010). According to Bowman (2003), Native student success, persistence, and
graduation rates at all levels of education are in great need of research. More importantly, Deyhle and Swisher (1997) claimed research done on cultural integrity and strengths incorporated into the education environment has been promising for some communities. It is important researchers continue to study Native students in education in order to apply changes in policy, which will have a direct impact on practical application within the classrooms. Bowman (2003) holds that future research should build on culturally relevant pedagogy to impact kindergarten- through graduate school-level policy, which will, in turn, make change within the entire system of education.

Guiding Theoretical Framework

The guiding theoretical framework was a combination of Tribal Critical Race Theory, Community Cultural Wealth, and Resiliency Theory. TribalCRT was used to explore barriers and support networks as well as evaluate and challenge institutional assumptions, practices, and policies that may hinder American Indian community college student success at Sacramento City College.

Tribal Critical Race Theory

Tribal Critical Race Theory has its roots in Critical Race Theory. Critical Race Theory (CRT) has its origin in Critical Legal Studies (CLS), developed during the civil rights movement to expose how laws were contradictory and contributed to maintaining a biased social hierarchy in the United States (Brayboy, 2006; Gordon, 1990; Ramirez, 2011). In the mid 1970s, Critical Race Theory (CRT) focused originally on race used
historically in scientific research and through contemporary assessments in order to perpetuate racial hegemony (Banks, 1993). Later, class and gender were added to holistically address oppression and discrimination and create social and individual transformation (Fay, 1987; Solórzano, 1998; Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001; Tierney, 1993). Critical Race Theory provides a background for Tribal Critical Race Theory in that it recognizes historic and contemporary social injustice and how oppression and discrimination permeate institutions of education.

Critical Race Theory (CRT), as it pertains to education, addresses the fact that racism is widespread, enduring and embedded in institutions (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Russell, 1992; Solórzano, 1997, 1998; Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001; Solórzano & Yosso, 2000, 2001, 2005). Educational institutions are not objective, racially neutral, based on merit, and do not provide equal opportunity (Crenshaw, 1989, 1993; Delgado Bernal, 2002; Delgado & Stefancic, 2000; Ramirez, 2011; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001, 2002; Villalpando, 2003). Even though systems of education claim to be fair and unbiased, students of color continue to be marginalized and oppressed as evidenced by the achievement gap (Nevarez & Wood, 2011) and as revealed in inconsistent policy and practice (Yosso, 2005). The CRT framework assists in explaining pre-existing barriers that impact American Indian students both outside and inside the educational system.
Because Critical Race Theory is the core of Tribal Critical Race Theory, it is necessary to review the five themes that emerge in Critical Race Theory (CRT) as it pertains to education:

1. Race and racism are widespread, enduring and are “a central rather than a marginal factor in defining and explaining individual experiences” (Russell, 1992, pp. 762-763). This means oppression must be recognized as playing a role in Native students’ experiences in higher education.

2. Educational institutions are not objective, racially neutral, based on merit, and do not provide equal opportunity (Crenshaw, 1989, 1993; Delgado Bernal, 2002; Delgado & Stefancic, 2000; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001, 2002; Villalpando, 2003). Education policies and practices are called into question for limiting opportunities for minority students (Yosso, 2005) and maintaining power and privilege for the dominant group (Calmore, 1992; Solórzano, 1997; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). In this way, CRT provides a social justice lens reinforcing liberation ideology (Friere, 1970, 1973; hooks, 1994).

3. CRT promotes a social justice research agenda to eradicate racism, classism, and sexism and empower underrepresented students (Friere, 1970, 1973; Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001, 2002).

4. CRT recognizes that the experiences of students of color are valid and that data from these students is significant to finding solutions to the issues they experience

5. Critical Race theorists support the notion that the effects of racism on people of color should be viewed in historic and contemporary timeframes (Delgado, 1984, 1992; Garcia, 1995; Harris, 1994; Olivas, 1990; Solorzano & Yosso, 2001, 2002) as well as through multiple disciplinary lenses (Solorzano & Yosso, 2001, 2002). Most importantly, CRT scholars work toward eliminating racism, sexism, and classism in education (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Parker, 1998; Solorzano & Yosso, 2001) by reinforcing that change can and should take place in policy and procedure.

CRT has its limitations. Although it is holistic in nature, incorporating many forms of discrimination, it is limited in that it does not focus on nor address the specific needs of each ethnic population. As a result, Latino Critical Race Theory (LatCrit) (Delgado Bernal, 2002; Espinoza, 1990; Hernandez-Truyol, 1997; Montoya, 1994; Villalpando, 2003), Asian Critical Race Theory (AsianCrit) (Chang, 1993, 1998) and Tribal Critical Race Theory (TribalCrit) (Brayboy, 2006) have been developed.

Tribal Critical Race Theory (TribalCRT) is a valid framework that allows for the analysis of programs and problems experienced by American Indian students within institutes of education (Brayboy, 2006). As discussed in Chapter 1, TribalCRT addresses the legal, social and political aspects of the relationship between the United States federal government and American Indians (Brayboy, 2006), which is very complex because
Tribes have sovereignty, a domestic dependent nation status and treaty rights that guarantee education to enrolled descendents. According to Brayboy (2006), there are nine tenets of Tribal Critical Race Theory:

1. colonization is endemic; 2. U.S. policies pertaining to Indigenous peoples are rooted in imperialism, White supremacy, and a desire for material gain; 3. Indigenous peoples occupy a liminal space that accounts for both the political and racialized natures of their identities; 4. Indigenous peoples have a desire to obtain and forge tribal sovereignty, tribal autonomy, self-determination, and self-identification; 5. the concepts of culture, knowledge, and power take on new meaning when examined through an Indigenous lens; 6. governmental and educational policies toward Indigenous peoples are intimately linked around the problematic goal of assimilation; 7. Tribal philosophies, beliefs, customs, traditions, and visions for the future are central to understanding the lived realities of Indigenous peoples, but they also illustrate the differences and adaptability among individuals and groups; 8. stories are not separate from theory; they make up theory and are therefore real and legitimate sources of data and ways of being; 9. theory and practice are connected in deep and explicit ways such that scholars must work towards social change. (pp. 429-430).

TribalCRT provides a lens through which to observe American Indian students and their struggle to overcome barriers in colleges and universities.

TribalCRT is used to analyze the experiences of currently enrolled Sacramento City College (SCC) American Indian community college students within the social justice framework. Native students must have taken or must be currently enrolled in at least one community, junior, or tribal college course. By applying TribalCRT to higher education, assessments can be done on educational procedures, programs, and policies to address barriers to American Indian student educational success.

As stated in Chapter 1, Brayboy (2006) identified three types of knowledge that coexist: cultural knowledge, the knowledge of survival, and academic knowledge.
(Brayboy, 2006). To review, cultural knowledge (also known as cultural capital for the purpose of this study) encompasses everything a person knows as a member of a particular cultural group, specifically what individuals know as members of tribal nations (Brayboy, 2006). Knowledge of survival or resistance capital/survivance incorporates adaptation strategies that have been learned as well as the personal choice made with the community to change and adapt in order to survive. Knowledge of survival promotes resiliency, another significant factor added to the theoretical framework. Academic knowledge is seen as more valid than Indigenous ways of knowing and comes from institutes of education (Barnhardt & Kawagley, 2005; Battiste, 2002; Harrison & Papa, 2005; Kawagley, 1995; Medicine, 2001). Academic knowledge and cultural knowledge blend and balance each other (Brayboy, 2006) and serve as another key element to survival (Brayboy, 2006; Barnhardt & Kawagley, 2004, 2005; Deloria, 1970; Medicine, 2001). It is important to combine multiple forms of knowledge in order to manifest the power for change. Brayboy (2006) explained, “power is rooted in a group’s ability to define themselves, their place in the world, and their traditions” (p. 435). Power is essential and equates to inherent sovereignty. Because power is based in the community, it is shared (Brayboy, 2006). What follows is the ability to meet the needs of the people through the rights to self-identify, self-govern, and self-educate. One element added to this equation is adaptation. Brayboy (2006) accounted for change while Vizenor (1998) and Vizenor and Lee (1999) added perserverance. Together these equate to survivance (Deloria, 1970).
According to Brayboy (2006), “culture is the base for knowledge that ultimately leads to power” (p. 436). Brayboy (2006) incorporated a reciprocal nature between knowledge and power. While culture acts as a stabilizing force providing individuals with identity, the dynamic nature of culture is its ability to change. Knowledge is essential for culture to survive because through knowledge, information about the culture, cultural boundaries, and ways in which the culture has and can adapt or change is passed down to successive generations. Cultural groups define and identify themselves, a source of power (Brayboy, 2006). This base model representing Brayboy’s (2006) TribalCRT is used within the larger theoretical framework.

*Figure 6. Brayboy’s (2006) Tribal Critical Race Theory*
Another fundamental aspect of TribalCRT is recognizing that governmental and educational policies toward Indigenous people have promoted and reinforced assimilation (Brayboy, 2006). Early treaties guaranteed federal provisions for education to Natives (Klug & Whitfield, 2003), but the interpretation and implementation of an appropriate education was left to the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). The BIA’s perspective an education was one that promoted assimilation and the abandonment of tribal culture and language (Brayboy, 2006; Klug & Whitfield, 2003). Attempts at complete assimilation through education have failed (Brayboy, 2006). TribalCRT (Brayboy, 2006) outright
rejects historic assimilation strategies of educational institutions to replace cultural knowledge with academic knowledge.

Deyhle (1995) documented that successful Indigenous students are those who maintain a strong identity and do not allow their educational experience to negatively affect their self-identity or self-worth (Fordham, 1996; Ogbu, 1987, 1993). Brayboy (2006) acknowledged educational institutions today are not blatantly working toward assimilation but also recognized assimilation has become part of the structure or very system of western education. Brayboy (2006) mentioned education could provide so much more in teaching students how to combine cultural knowledge and power with academic knowledge to promote individual survivance (survival + resistance) and tribal sovereignty.

There has been much debate over the value of competition over cooperation in relation to the ideology of capitalistic individualism reinforced in education. It is assumed the primary reason students are obtaining an education is not to assist their community, but to climb the corporate ladder. This is not always the case, especially for Native Americans. Recent education research has reinforced a connection between students who succeed and obtain good paying jobs and what they give back to their community, especially in volunteer time and taxes. Taxes help pay for education, so those who have received an education participate within a system to perpetuate education for future generations, thereby cooperating within a system for the greater good of the community. But in discussing cooperation versus competition in reference to Indigenous

Brayboy (2006), Burkhart (2004), and Deloria (1969, 1988) revealed the perception of cooperation through the educational institution lens is seen as a deficit rather than as a strength for Native students. According to Lomawaima (1994, 1995), boarding schools were built to reinforce individualism and competition. Stereotypes of the unmotivated or lazy Indian who cannot be independent or self-sufficient because he/she is not competitive still exist today and are a throwback from the Dawes Allotment Act era (Brayboy, 2004a, 2005).

Researchers should consider that success for Indigenous students may be tied to survivance (survival + resistance) and the connection between power and community (Brayboy, 1999, 2004a, 2005, 2006). Scholars must look at why Native students attend colleges and universities in the first place, which is to primarily to assist their communities so “education becomes a tool for empowerment and liberation for the community” (Brayboy, 2006, p. 438). This may be another issue with which Native students deal within the system of higher education in that education tends to focus on the individual and personal accomplishments versus the individual as part of a larger community.
TribalCRT supports action or activism, the application of theory to practice, or praxis (Brayboy, 2006; Williams, 1997). Scholars who adopt TribalCRT as a working philosophy work for social justice confronting inequity and assimilation practices. Researchers strive to create systems or make change in organizations that will address the needs of Indigenous people and their communities (Burkhart, 2004).

Tribal Critical Race Theory (TribalCRT) at its core challenges the notion that educational institutions, “serve as bastions of objectivity, meritocracy, color blindness, race neutrality, and equal opportunity” (Ramirez, 2011, p. 46). These frameworks expose color blindness and race neutrality for what they really are, a strategy to avoid addressing oppression, discrimination, and inequity within the system to maintain power and privilege for the dominant groups in American society (Calmore, 1992; Delgado, 1989; Villalpando, 2004). Higher education promotes the ideology that all students have equal opportunity to be successful, while TribalCRT challenges this notion through analyzing the inequitable success rates of minority students.

TribalCRT challenges the Cultural Deficit Model, which has been used to explain discrimination in a way that blames the victim or student for lacking certain traits or qualities (Ramirez, 2011). For example, in studying high dropout rates of minority students, researchers have stated that the culture of the academic environment is too different from what minority students are used to and because of this difference, it becomes difficult and stressful implying minority students do not have the ability to adapt or overcome the “dissonance created by conflicting cultures, [which] results in [their]
academic non-persistence” or high dropout rates (Erickson as cited in Gloria & Robinson Kurpius, 2001, p. 88).

This type of ideology, therefore, blames the minority student for being too different and for not having the motivation or innate ability to adapt. Just because minority students can adapt, does it mean they should? Is this implying that some minorities can and should adapt? The Cultural Deficit Theory ethnocentrically judges Indigenous culture to be deficient in nature, promoting racial stereotypes. A few stereotypes that fit in with this framework include always being late or lazy and transferring a culture of poverty from parent to child (Banfield, 1970; Heller, 1966). These traits are to be overcome once assimilated into the dominant society. Yosso (2006) cited little evidence to support the deficit model. Researchers like Benjamin, Chambers, and Reiterman (1993) abandoned deficit theory and leaned more toward CRT and cultural retention at the same time managing education systems, supporting the notion that instead of cultural knowledge being defective, cultural strengths exist.

Educational institutions subscribe to the deficit model through adopting what Freire (1970, 1973, 2009) termed the banking method, used to infuse students who are empty receptacles (with no cultural resources or skills of their own) with academic and cultural knowledge judged to be essential by mainstream society (Yosso, 2006). Note that it is presumed by educators that students do not come into the education system with previous valuable cultural knowledge. Instead they must learn what is valuable through their teachers and pre-writ curriculum. Educators presume they work in educational
institutions that are fair, equitable, and effective systems and what needs to change are the students, parents, families, and communities (Yosso, 2005). This is an inaccurate perception clouded by stereotypes, power, and privilege. Unfortunately this theory is still utilized by educational professionals including faculty, counselors, and administrators (Yosso, 2006).

The Cultural Deficit Theory/Model has its roots in Capital Theory, which is also associated with the Funds of Knowledge Theory. Capital Theory was developed over a span of 250 years by economists Smith (1723-1790) and Marx (1818-1883) amongst others. Capital Theory analyzes links between production, growth, value, and distribution to explain why capital produces a return that keeps itself intact while at the same time producing interest or a permanent profit (Lawson, 2011; Ramirez, 2011). The greater the capital, the more resources a person has to interact within their social and economic environment. Traditional economists interpret capital to mean raw materials and wages while Marxist economists view capital as social or cultural resources (Bliss, 1975; Harcourt, 1972). Tinto (1975) considered cultural and educational resources as capital to be used in institutes of higher education.

Bourdieu (1973, 1977a, 1986) built on Capital Theory by relating social class status and how it impacts educational attainment via parental education and family expectations (Lawson, 2011; Ramirez, 2011). Parents pass on to their children cultural capital in the form of expectations, attitudes, experiences, and knowledge to succeed in systems of education (Ramirez, 2011). This type of knowledge, specific skills, and
resources work as advantages, considered cultural and social capital and brought to the educational environment to assist students in their educational aspirations, which ultimately impact class mobility (Ramirez, 2011).

In a capitalist classist society, knowledge possessed by the upper and middle classes serves as valuable capital (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Ramirez, 2011; Yosso, 2005). The class system in the United States is so restrictive, very few ever leave the class into which they are born, and the majority of the population is impoverished. If a student does not possess cultural or social resources that apply to the educational environment, they are automatically at a disadvantage (Bourdieu, 1977a; Bourdieu, 1977b; Throsby, 1999). Because cultural capital derives from cultural knowledge and skills, attitudes, and economic opportunities (Borjas, 1992; Lawson, 2011; Ramirez, 2011; Wassmer, Moore, & Shulock, 2004), students possess differing levels of skills and knowledge they can use within their environments, which ultimately impacts opportunity, access, and achievement.

In addition, Coleman (1988) and Portes (1988) discussed the importance of peers and group involvement as a source of capital. American Indian students generally do not come from families who have benefitted from higher education or knowledge of available resources (Ramirez, 2011). These individuals have little access to families with valuable knowledge that allow for access and opportunity to be socially mobile. Bourdieu (1986) and Freire (1970, 1973, 2009) argued education is the great equalizer in that students can become socially mobile through obtaining a formal education. But it is blatantly clear
American Indian students would not have the same access to resources to become successful in their educational endeavors as their Caucasian counterparts (intersecting race with class), who have an unfair advantage.

Bourdieu (1986) implied the class system is set in that it reinforces its very survival through systemic biases apparent in education through the academic achievement gap for minority students. What is even more disturbing is the application of the deficit model to people of color suggesting innate deficits prevent the accumulation of cultural and social capital, therefore restricting academic achievement and social mobility (Yosso, 2005). Educational institutions often focus on new ways to assist disadvantaged or at-risk ethnic minority/lower class students who do not have the needed skills, knowledge, or cultural capital to succeed (Ramirez, 2011; Valenzuela, 1999; Yosso, 2005). But this is not 100% effective. One of the primary issues with cultural capital is that it is based on capitalism and some traits like independence and competition are worth more than others. This type of thinking is ethnocentric and promotes inequality because not all cultures believe these traits are valuable. Because profit can be made from inequality, capitalism promotes inequity and discrimination (Freire, 1970, 1973, 2009).

The educational system requires certain skills be acquired by students for them to operate within the environment and become successful. Resources within this environment (including financial aid) are highly regulated and serve as a stopgap mechanism for students judged to be not serious about their education or those who only
see education as a means to obtain free money. One must be careful when stereotyping students, specifically those at a disadvantage who would benefit the greatest from the system, as automatically deviant and wanting to take advantage of the benefits of the system. This notion works to blame the victim of the inequities in the system and is clearly an outcome of those in privilege and power working to keep the resources and information to a limited few or perpetuate inequity in the educational and social class realm.

The Funds of Knowledge Theory by Moll, Amanti, Neff, and Gonzalez (1992) explains that the activities and information provided to a student can either add to the student’s fund of college knowledge or it can provide a gap from which the knowledge must be obtained elsewhere (Andrews & Yee, 2006; Ares & Buendia, 2007; Rubenstein-Arila, 2006; Velez-Ibanez & Greenberg, 1992) in order for the student to succeed. Included in these funds are cultural capital and social capital, all of which can have a significant impact on students’ educational experiences and success. Capital funds can also be applied to the cultural beliefs and values passed down through a family. As the culture of higher education may differ from students’ home cultures, they must incorporate both belief and value systems into their own. Students’ home lives have a significant impact on their educational experiences, goals, and achievement, which according to the Funds of Knowledge Theory (Moll et al., 1992) may be viewed as a deficit. This theory is important because the gaps in information may be seen as barriers but according to Yosso (2005), a student’s home life, associated with cultural and
familial capital, could never be considered a deficit and the fact that it may be seen as a
deficit by educators is actually the root problem.

Community Cultural Wealth

Yosso’s (2005) Community Cultural Wealth (CCW) focuses on the importance of
unrecognized assets (Ramirez, 2011) within communities of color. Cultural Wealth is
accumulated through identifying and utilizing several types of capital including cultural,
social, familial, navigational, linguistic, and resistant capital (Auerbach, 2001; Delgado
Bernal, 1997, 2001; Faulstich Orellana, 2003; Ramirez, 2011; Solórzano & Delgado
Bernal; 2001; Stanton-Salazar, 2001; Yosso, 2005). These resources are then utilized or
transacted within the community in which the individual is a part. Yosso (2005)
challenges the Cultural Deficit Model and Cultural Capital Theory through Community
Cultural Wealth (CCW), which focuses on the importance of these unrecognized assets
(Ramirez, 2011) within communities of color.
Figure 8. A model of community cultural wealth (Yosso, 2005)

Cultural capital refers to an inherent ability to access resources and opportunities associated with birthright, family, culture, and community, knowledge of the college-going processes and skills for navigating institutions of education obtained through family or community knowledge (Yosso, 2005). Familial Capital (Yosso, 2005) is possessed by students who are culturally competent because of their connections built by family. As a form of cultural wealth, familial capital within the Indigenous community usually originates with the extended family including immediate living kin, grandparents, aunts, uncles, cousins, close friends who are considered family, and dead ancestors. Familial capital carries with it a sense of identity, community, history, and memory. A
commitment to the greater good and survival of the community serves as another extension of kin.

Social capital (Yosso, 2005) is made up of networks and community resources shared locally (Ramirez, 2011). Peer and other social stakeholders are influential in that they possess insider information, and they can provide emotional support. American Indian students may feel more at home or welcome in the environment where they spend time with peers of similar ethnic backgrounds and educational aspirations. Students who receive academic and emotional support from counselors and faculty know they are not alone and can receive the assistance they need to succeed.

Navigational Capital refers to the maneuvering skill set possessed by students who successfully navigate through the educational system (Yosso, 2005, 2006). This type of capital was originally not accessible by students of color because institutions were created with racial, gender, and class bias. Historically, American Indian education was limited to boarding schools who provided up to an eighth-grade class level instruction partially because of stereotypes that American Indians were intellectually inferior but also because by limiting their education, they would be limited to certain skill sets placing them as servants, maids, and in other vocations that paid minimal wage. This also prevented Native students from obtaining navigational capital in higher education.

Resistance Capital (Freire, 1970, 1973, 2009; Giroux, 1983; McLaren, 1994; Solorzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001; Yosso, 2005) is acquired by students who have obtained knowledge and skills by challenging inequity and social injustice. As a form of
cultural wealth, resistance capital carries with it strength and momentum from historic and continued contemporary forms of resistance to oppression (Deloria, 1969). Resistant capital is transferred from generation to generation through children being raised, “witnessing and participating in civil demonstrations, acts of political criticism and civil rights assertion” (Ramirez, 2011, p. 43). Deloria (1969) discussed survival and resistance and coined the concept of survivance, definitely related to resistant capital. This type of capital is rooted in historic and contemporary resistance strategies.

With the exception of linguistic capital, all the aforementioned types of capital or wealth are placed in the theoretical framework and researched in this study. The primary reason linguistic capital is being omitted is because it pertains to students who speak English as a second language. Since the community college being studied is located in an urban area, a distance from any established reservation that may have students who speak their Indigenous Tribal language, it is expected a majority of the Native students who participate in this study have English as their first and primary language. Forms of capital contributing to cultural wealth are reviewed and related to met needs, resiliency, and contributing factors to success. In addition, how American Indian students rank these as factors as perceived barriers will also provide insight into answering one of the research questions in this study.

Reziliency Theory

According to Belcourt-Dittloff (2006), the term reziliency is a play on words combining reservation or the ‘rez’ with resiliency to specifically apply to American
Indian individuals and their ability to adapt and overcome adversity or trauma. Although the term utilizes ‘rez’ to imply reservation, all Natives can experience reziliency or resiliency because it means more than survival. Reziliency is growth, self-actualization, and development of the self. Through this identity development, there is recognition of how power and prejudice can produce discrimination or oppression. If a person can obtain capital through adaptation, they will have more power to increase their opportunity. Because traditionally people in power have not been Native, a non-Native world-view permeates social institutions and is what the norm has been based on. The Indigenous world-view is not the same so Native Americans have limited to no opportunity within a system based on the norm. Reziliency is the connection between the past, present, and future through adaptation and survival often in conjunction with some type of resistance or resistant capital. It is implied that if a culture survives, it is resilient. This means the culture has adapted and resisted in order to survive. For a culture to survive, there must be some type of knowledge integrated so individuals and communities can become successful in adapting without total assimilation. Statistically significant reziliency factors found among American Indians include hope, social support, coping, cultural and spiritual practices, ethnic pride or enculturation, and communal identity (Belcourt-Dittloff, 2006). Reziliency is also included in the theoretical framework.
The theoretical framework combines TribalCRT, Reziliency Theory, and Cultural Wealth Theory by incorporating access to diverse types of capital. The TribalCRT component recognizes Native students experience social injustice and carry with them historic trauma from which they have adapted and survived with important knowledge to apply to future experiences. Community Cultural Wealth recognizes various forms of capital students bring with them to the education system are valid and functional even though they go unrecognized by the institution because of the deficit model. These forms of capital are included within the theoretical framework and are placed in the Native student’s backpack. Reziliency or resiliency contributes to this theoretical framework by providing ways in which students cope and adapt to their oppressive conditions. These resiliency characteristics are included in the Native student’s backpack.
According to Tribal Critical Race Theory, there is the recognition of historic trauma, continued oppression, and social injustice within the connecting realms of knowledge, culture, and power. The base realm is culture. Culture can be both a stabilizing force and a mechanism for dynamic change. Native students bring their cultural knowledge with them to college. The realm of knowledge is divided into three areas: academic knowledge, cultural knowledge, and knowledge of survival. Power, the third realm, pulls from both the realms of knowledge and culture. Concepts such as self-identity, tradition, the ability to adapt and persevere, as well as the ability to share power are included not only in the framework but within the Native student’s backpack.

When employed, Community Cultural Wealth can contribute to the success of Native students. Success is achieved by meeting students’ needs through utilizing capital when barriers are apparent. Native students have access to various forms of capital within their repertoire. When certain types of capital are not recognized by the institution because it utilizes the deficit model, Community Cultural Wealth does not serve as a resource but is turned into a barrier by the institution. Therefore, students’ needs go unmet and barriers are manifested, preventing success. This is unfortunate for Native students and leads to one of the driving research questions: What are the academic and personal needs of American Indian community college students?

Needs vary depending on the task at hand and the availability of resources. But there is more to it because the relationship of resources to the environment must also be considered in that what the student considers a resource may not be usable or recognized
as having value within an educational environment. This does not mean the student cannot learn how to tap into the existing social capital or shared community resources that can provide support, although this may also be limited depending on where the student is from and how comfortable he/she is in attempting to access this resource. The urban environment in which the college is located can impact available resources as well as the campus climate or environment. Thus, students need navigational capital or maneuvering skills to navigate through the barriers in the educational system. They also need to draw on their reziliency/resiliency skills to cope with the oppressive conditions and overcome any barriers they experience. This leads to the last two research questions: what are the perceived barriers American Indian students face at the community college level and what are the resiliency and persistence characteristics employed by American Indian community college students contributing to student success? With the literature in mind this, researcher developed the Student Success Equation.

**Student Success Equation**

\[
\text{(Needs Being Met – Barriers) + Resiliency Characteristics} = \text{Student Success}
\]

The Student Success Equation was created with the three primary research questions in mind: 1) what are students’ needs, 2) what barriers do they experience, and 3) what resiliency characteristics do they employ and how do all three fit together to equate to student success? Core barriers identified by using the theoretical framework include: deficit model thinking, assimilation strategies employed by higher education,
lack of cultural competence or understanding, and ingrained institutionalized racism stemming from colonialism.

*Tinto’s Theory of Student Departure and Model of Student Retention*

The reader may be wondering at this juncture why Tinto has not been utilized in this study. Tinto is well known for his theory about student success and the interdependence between student and institutional responsibility (Tinto, 1975). In building on Spady’s (1970) model, which utilized Durkheim’s 1897 Theory of Suicide, Tinto (1975) worked with Cullen (1973) to form the Theory of Student Departure to explain why student attrition exists. In addition, he created a Model of Student Retention, which can be utilized in determining student persistence. Tinto (1993) insisted that for students to persist in their educational endeavors, they must integrate socially and academically. This concept of integration has been highly criticized as promoting assimilation (Tierney, 1992, 1993a, 1993b), especially as applied to ethnic minority students.

Tinto is also working from a deficit model perspective, finding fault primarily in the student and their culture, versus the education institution. Because the fundamental core of Tinto’s (1975) model is the social and academic integration of the student for retention to take place, students who do not assimilate are found to be at fault. This deficit model blames the victim or the ethnically diverse student for not being able to adapt to the education system. Even though Tinto (1975) has modified his theory to be more inclusive and less assimilative (Tinto, 1987, 1993; Rendon, Jalomo, & Nora, 2000),
this researcher will not be able to use Tinto’s (1992) theory because it does not recognize the social injustice permeating educational institutions. Tierney (1992), Attinasi (1989, 1994), and Kraemer (1997) have questioned the validity of Tinto’s (1993) model to accurately represent the experiences of ethnic minority students because of the focus on assimilation. Tinto is not used in this study.

Educational Research on College Student Success

The variables or components that make up student success are the primary focus of this study. In reviewing student needs and barriers as well as reziliency techniques, important information can be obtained to enact change, revise policy, and promote Native student success. Previous research that has taken place on American Indian students in higher education incorporating academic success follows.

*The Institution and the Individual*

One of the most notable scholars on American Indian college students and the creator of Tribal Critical Race Theory is Brayboy. In Brayboy’s (1999) two-year ethnographic study, seven American Indian undergraduate students at two Ivy League Universities were called on to contribute to the research through their personal experiences. Through the voices of the participants, Brayboy (1999) examined everyday student experiences and found that each student developed their own strategies, academic and social or adaptive responses, to daily situations (Brayboy, 1999, p. 257), clearly an act of reziliency/resiliency. In addition, none of these students had assimilated. Instead
they used resistance strategies or resistance capital to, “subvert the structure and rules or found professors and administrators who were willing to assist them maintaining their cultural integrity while simultaneously being good students” (Brayboy, 1999, p. 258). Resistant capital and reziliency are significant variables incorporated within the theoretical framework of this researchers study. In addition, Brayboy (1999) disputed the notion that all students will benefit from a “cookie-cutter” approach to retention. He challenged institutional programs that have the same response to all students, to take into account the differing needs of students, specifically Native students.

Brayboy’s (2005a) continued research went even further to focus on how Indigenous students “obtain credentials from educational institutions and then use them to benefit and help their tribes” (Lindley, 2009, p. 31). Not only were benefits taken into account, but the costs or tradeoffs involved in pursuing social justice were considered. Most importantly, Brayboy (2005a) cited resistance theories that focused on individuals using their means to oppose assimilation. Resistance in this instance is a way in which marginalized individuals can challenge the status quo and remain intact. In relationship to Brayboy’s (2005a) research, resistance can take various forms including dropping out of school, persevering until graduation, cooperating and appearing to conform or working within the system to make change, and accommodating without assimilating. Brayboy (2005a) recognized Yosso’s (2000) “resilient resistance,” capital or wealth which is a process of “surviving and/or succeeding through the educational pipeline as a strategic response to visual microaggressions” (p. 180).
Brayboy (2005a) defined power as the ability to survive based on the “capacity to adapt and adjust to changing landscapes, times, ideas, circumstances, and situations” (p. 196). Individuals and communities can change educational, cultural, economic, and political situations. Brayboy (2005a) relates this process to Deloria’s (1969, 1970) and later Vizenor’s (1999) concept of “survivance,” which combines survival and resistance. According to Brayboy (2005a), “the resistance aspects of survivance inherently call for strategic accommodation as well as the development of processes that lead to community developments” (p. 197). Power “lies in taking an active stance toward creating something new” (Brayboy, 2005a, p. 197). Solorzano and Delgado Bernal (2001) defined “transformational resistance” as “behavior that illustrates both a critique of oppression and a desire for social justice” (p. 309). Brayboy (2005a) applied this definition to American Indian communities by stating “the acquisition of credentials and skills for the empowerment and liberation of American Indian communities” (p. 196) work as an extension of transformational resistance. Brayboy (2005a) indicated the students in his study and their families made many sacrifices in order to empower their tribes, “personal and community liberation takes a heavy human toll” (Brayboy, 2005a, p. 207).

According to Villalpando (2004), it is the education system, not the race or ethnicity of the student that has placed students at a disadvantage. Native students attempt to negotiate a system that has already condemned them by assuming they have an innate cultural deficiency. So then the primary reason Native students could never
achieve success is because they are Native. This harkens back to the Deficit Model. Native students then must rely on their identity to empower them and fuel their desire to achieve academic success in higher education (Ramirez, 2011; Villalpando, 2004). It is critical to understand the institution impacts Native student success and that Critical Race Theory, specifically TribalCRT provides the framework from which to view this phenomena.

Castagno (2005) conducted ethnographic interviews of 12 American Indian female students and held two focus groups at “Midwestern University” (p. 448). In addition, she interviewed American Indian faculty and staff who worked with Indigenous students, engaged in participant observation at events with Native students and conducted document analysis of previous diversity issues at the university. American Indians enrolled amounted to 0.5% of the total population of 40,000 students with Indigenous women comprising 62% of the total Indians enrolled. Participants in Castagno’s (2005) study faced persistent and pervasive racist attitudes and were often confronted with stereotypes.

Castagno (2005) discussed how understanding racism as an individual act or microaggression is very different from recognizing racist acts as part of a larger system. When it is an individual act, education is the key and the few individuals who are racist can unlearn their bigoted ways. But when racist acts are an accepted part of a larger system, the systemic nature of racism becomes invisible and more difficult to separate from policies and procedure. The impact is also greater especially when it comes to
campus climate and whether or not Native students feel welcome. This has a significant impact on student success. A few years later Castagno teamed up with Lee in their (2007) publication and looked at the contributing role of Native student identity in relation to academic success. Persistence and identity are significant factors when studying American Indian student success.

Viri’s (1989) case study of seven American Indian students at an urban community college found that students viewed college as an opportunity to disassociate themselves from stereotypes marginalizing American Indians. Although the students felt they had this opportunity, they soon came to realize the community college culture actually reinforced stereotypes and, even worse, discounted the students’ self-confidence (White, 2007).

Akers (1990) used national data from the 1976 and 1978 Higher Education General Information Survey to determine if there was a significant difference in success rates for American Indian students based on type of institution. She found no statistically significant differences but concluded that public colleges and universities had higher success rates for American Indian students.

In Garrod and Larimore’s (1997) *First Person, First Peoples*, the personal experiences of 13 American Indian students who graduated from Dartmouth University are portrayed. Barriers that stood out were cultural confrontations and stereotypes by the dominant culture, yet these students remained resilient. Clearly Resistance Capital (Yosso, 2005) was at work. Discussed was the dissonance between home life and the
university as well as attacks on identity and self-esteem. Experiences with racism and conflicts with the institution and even with American Indian peers were revealed within this research (Garrod & Larimore, 1997). In the end, students who remained connected with their tribes, home, and community and secure in their values and traditions were successful (Garrod & Larimore, 1997). The effectiveness of retention programs were discussed. Students in the study represented tribes east of the Mississippi (Garrod & Larimore, 1997).

_Persistence_

Lindley (2009), who utilized CRT as a framework through which to view persistence of Native students in higher education claimed recent research in American Indian education used a deficit theoretical approach and has been limited in focus upon elementary and secondary education (Deyhle & Swisher, 1997; McCarty, 2002). American Indian students, especially in urban areas generally fit the profile for attendance at community college. They are usually ineligible for admissions to a four-year college or university out of high school because of low grades and the need to master basic skills. In addition they may want to take their lower division courses at a two-year community college to save money because the cost of enrollment is more affordable and the geographic location may be closer to home, family, and community.

Krause (1987) determined a variety of factors assisted in persistence and were significant in predicting graduation rates. In studying American Indians students enrolled in the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) at the University of Washington, Krause
(1987) concluded that high school grade point average, first-quarter grades, and membership in the EOP program were significant predictors of student success (White, 2007).

Whitehorse (1992) used mixed methods to study the relationship between institutional character and student cultural identification to determine if they were significant in predicting American Indian student persistence at Northern Arizona University. He found that congruence between these two variables was indicative of student persistence. Most important to this study was the degree to which the institution was perceived to be supportive and committed to American Indian student biculturalism (White, 2007; Whitehorse, 1992).

In White’s (2007) study of persistence and graduation rates of Native American students in postsecondary education, he found, in using data obtained through the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), significant differences in enrollment, persistence, and graduation rates based on institutional characteristics. White (2007) also used student-level data obtained from the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study 1995-96 and the Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study 1996-2001 confirming findings from the IPEDS analysis. Additional findings in White’s (2007) study include attendance and enrollment varies based on geographic region; American Indian students enrolled in tribal colleges had significantly lower transfer out rates than peers enrolled at mainstream institutions of higher education (with approximately half the rate of non-tribal colleges); tribal colleges awarded more total
degrees to American Indian students except for research universities; and tribal colleges awarded more degrees at the less than associate’s degree and associate’s degree level than any other institution (predictable given that tribal colleges’ highest degree level is associates). Institutional characteristics found to affect persistence to graduation include

Geographic region, degree of urbanization, Carnegie Classification, institutional level, institutional control, institutional affiliation, Historically Black College or University (HBCU) status, Tribal college status, cost, size, average standardized test score (ACT or SAT), student library services, financial aid program participation, and the general ethnic and racial composition of the student body. (White, 2007, p. 146)

American Indian students did not experience high rates of persistence at larger, less urban, low-cost, two-year publically controlled institutions (White, 2007). A major finding of White’s (2007) study was that tribal college success was not supported within the data examined.

Retention

Within the literature written about Native Americans by non-Natives and Native scholars alike, several factors seem to stand out as predictors of college student success or barriers. Gilbert (2000), Powless (2008), and Lindley (2009) identified eight causal factors faced by Native American students in higher education, which contributed to low retention rates: low socioeconomic status and lack of funding, preparation for postsecondary education, student and parent motivation, lack of well trained teachers and administrators, differences in learning styles for American Indian students, low self-esteem, and, most importantly, the cultural differences between home culture and the school (Brayboy, 1999; 2005a, 2005b; Castagno, 2005; Castagno & Lee, 2007; Garrod &
Larrimore, 1997; Guillory, 2002, 2008; Huffman, 1999, 2001, 2008; McAfee, 1997, 2000; Napier, 1995; Tierney, 1992; Waterman, 2004, 2007). As Native students face these eight causal factors, they often feel overwhelmed and marginalized, which can lead to attrition (Cole & Denzine, 2004; La Boone, 2006).

Degree statistics in McAfee’s (2000) study are criticized as being unreliable because a majority of Indigenous college students step out at least one time in their college careers. McAfee (1997) argued that stepping out, like stopping out versus dropping out, more precisely explains the Indigenous college student experience in that students who ultimately graduate are able to find the necessary stepping stones to navigate the system even though they leave the institution for a period of time. This does not mean they have given up on higher education, nor have these students left for good. Stepping out implied continuation at a later date (McAfee, 2000). McAfee (1997, 2000) was clearly discussing Navigational Capital (Yosso, 2005). In McAfee’s (2000) study, out of 76 students affiliated with 29 tribes interviewed, 27 were step-outs identified as American Indian students who were science, engineering, math, or business majors no longer enrolled; 16 students had earned a bachelors degree in science, engineering, math, or business. Significant factors or the most important stepping stones, according to McAfee (1997, 2000), were cultural identity, family support, and continued community connection, motivation, and financial resources (Lindley, 2009).

Traditional retention theory (student involvement, change, departure, and institutional adaptation) was utilized by Guillory (2002; 2008) as the focus of his study
on persistence factors and barriers for American Indian students. Guillory (2002) conducted focus groups with 30 American Indian students and interviewed administrators at Washington State University, University of Idaho, and Montana State University. He asked Native American students, presidents, and faculty at each of the institutions, as well as state board of higher education representatives to name and discuss in detail the three or four most important factors leading to the persistence of American Indian students and the three or four barriers that needed to be overcome by American Indian students trying to obtain academic success.

In comparing the responses of the American Indian students to the representatives of the institution, Guillory (2002) found inconsistency because the students identified family, on-campus support, and giving back to tribal communities on the reservation as persistence factors impacting them. In fact, Guillory and Wolverton (2008) noted family (nuclear or extended) was the most significant persistence factor in that Native students were willing to endure many hardships including an unwelcoming environment, inadequate financial support, and lack of or no academic preparation in order to succeed and bring hope for a better life for their families. Guillory observed Native students would put their family and community before themselves, and this aligned with what Deloria and Wildcat (2001) discussed in their work on American Indian communities, revealing an interconnection and respect between all living things for the whole to survive. This is a very important concept for college and university administrators to understand in that the survival of the individual is interdependent with the family and
community and one must sacrifice for the greater good. The Native concept of family is
different than the White, middle-class nuclear family concept. This coincides with the
cooperation versus competition ideology. When one cooperates, one survives and
thrives. When a person is constantly competing, they lose sight of the greater good,
which essentially includes them.

In Guillory’s (2002) study, administrators in institutes of higher education
identified only two persistence factors including adequate financial support and academic
programs tailored to meet American Indian student needs (Lindley, 2009). Both of these
factors are institutionally focused. One must rely on the system of education to assess
these factors internally and make changes as needed which may be problematic in that
they differ so much from what students themselves identify as factors contributing to
their success or those causing barriers. Guillory (2002) points out that the discrepancy
between what is important for students and the perceptions of the institutional
representatives “is further exacerbated by a disconnect between state and institutional
policy” (Guillory, 2002, p. vi). Guillory and Wolverton (2008) recommended the use of
the Family Education Model (FEM) (HeavyRunner & DeCelies, 2002) to incorporate
family and tribal community as “necessary constituents in the educational process and
success of American Indian students” (Lindley, 2009, p. 35).

In a qualitative study by Waterman (2004, 2007), 12 Haudenosaunee Tribal
college graduates, eight female and four male, were interviewed about their college
experience. A majority of the Native students were stop outs as defined by Tinto (1987),
similar to McAfee’s (1997, 2000) step-out. Average length of time until degree completion was eight years, with six graduating within four years (Lindley, 2009). Only the men in the study experienced mentoring. Although all students noted they had changed significantly, Waterman (2007) found student experience did not support Tinto’s (1987) theory of college student integration. While participants were academically engaged, they were able to preserve cultural integrity (Deyhle, 1995) by maintaining their strong supportive connection to their families and communities. Waterman (2007) portrayed these students as having a “double curriculum: their academic program [on the one hand] and…participating in Haudenosaunee ceremonies and traditions [on the other]” (p. 35).

**Success and Barriers**

Oosahwe’s (2008) phenomenological study at a Midwestern university on Native American students focused on narratives of academic success and strategies to overcome obstacles. Focus groups, one-on-one interviews, and journaling was used with 13 undergraduate Native students. Emergent themes included motivation factors, coping skills, the definition of student success, and strategies used for academic success.

In Baxter’s (2009) mixed methods study on Native American students enrolled at San Juan College located in New Mexico in the fall of 2003 through spring 2006 semesters, key barriers impacting Native American student academic performance were discussed. The barriers that may lead to attrition included “lack of adequate financial support, perceived racial prejudice, differences in customs and values, and teaching
styles” (Baxter, 2009, p. 63). In addition, Baxter (2009) revealed cultural differences that block learning associated with a curriculum that does not value or even mention the Native American experience, conflict between cultural world-views, and formal teaching and communication methods. Other variables that may serve as barriers to success include being a first-generation college student, working, being a single parent, needing affordable daycare, taking classes part-time, and feeling less connected to the college (Baxter, 2009).

Significant Variables

In the above section, I reviewed the empirical literature relative to educating the American Indian student in general and in particular higher education. In sum, the factors that stand out in the research include family involvement and support, community involvement and support, pre-college academic experience in grades K-12, peer/mentor relationships, institutional resources/financial support, counseling, experiences with faculty and coursework, and institutional commitment and support. These factors are included in this study and discussed further.

Family Involvement and Support

Time and again, students claim family support is integral to their decision to attend and remain in college (Baxter, 2009). A number of studies have identified family support as a major success factor for American Indian students (Brown & Robinson Kurpius, 1997; Dodd et al., 1995; Falk & Aitken, 1984; Lin, LaCounte, & Eder, 1988;
Tierney, 1995). Families are the support system reinforcing and encouraging individual members to stay in school. Families often realize that a higher education will not only help the individual but there is a perception that the education of one individual could lift the entire family out of poverty and provide better opportunities, a better life for everyone. Many students depend on their families for financial assistance, housing, transportation, and childcare (Baxter, 2009). Family support can also enhance a students’ productivity (Schmidtke, 2008). “Native students may receive total support from the community, tribal leaders, members, family and friends and are the driving force for achievement” (Belgarde & Lore, 2003, p. 177; Jackson and Smith 2001, p. 2; Rindonel, 1988, p. 5).

One important aspect of family support is the educational background of family members, especially their college experiences (Brown & Robinson Kurpius, 1997; Dodd et al., 1995; Jackson & Smith, 2001). Family members with college degrees help students develop a positive attitude toward college. This can lead to increased career maturity, self-confidence, and motivation (Jackson & Smith, 2001; Wentzlaff & Brewer, 1996). Family members with college experience serve as role models to show Native youth that a college education can be achieved and it is worth it (Brown & Robinson Kurpius, 1997; Jackson & Smith, 2001).

Without these role models, families can still help their children beginning in elementary school and up through high school. Familial expectations of children doing well academically help reinforce the child’s desire to excel. Families can even participate
in choosing a desired school and specific courses to help their child get started on their path to college (Schmidtke, 2008). Family members who have no college experience of their own can become involved and talk about college with the school counselor; they can speak with college counselors and go with their children to visit college campuses (Schmidtke, 2008). In addition, friends and extended family may also serve as a role model who could lend support (Tierney, 1995). Jackson and Smith (2001) claimed a father’s encouragement to attend college can be connected to a positive campus experience. According to Brown and Robinson Kurpius (1997), mothers and grandmothers have a positive influence on retention.

Community Involvement and Support

Successful student programs often link the student to the community (Kirkness & Barnhardt, 1991). Through this effort, both the student and the community benefit. The student receives hands-on experience and is introduced into the community where they can make future career connections. The community also benefits from volunteer labor and has the opportunity to make connections to a future employee. Through this process, businesses and organizations can view the actual product of the education system and voice their concerns or their amazement about the skills the student has learned. Hatch (1992) connected student success and motivation with employment opportunities and community development. By connecting with the external community, business representatives can have a say in the skills future employees will need so students can
find employment after graduation. This is especially true for Native students seeking to become employed with their tribes (Schmidtke, 2008).

Pre-college Student Experience

Pre-college programs assist in preparing students for the college experience (James, 1992; Schmidtke, 2008). These programs get students thinking about college (Schmidtke, 2008). They also help students develop career plans and academic and social skills they will need to be successful in college (Falk & Aitken, 1984; Pavel & Padilla, 1993; Schmidtke, 2008). These programs are available through counseling at the local high school, through summer and fall orientation programs put on by the college and through pre-college workshops designed to orient the student for the first semester (Falk & Aitken, 1984; Kleinfeld, Cooper, & Kyle, 1987; Reyhner & Dodd, 1995; Schmidtke, 2008). Once the student is enrolled, many support services can help with the student feeling welcome within the new academic and social environment (Schmidtke, 2008). Academic support can also come in the form of tutoring, study skills classes, and study groups (Schmidtke, 2008). The ultimate goal is to retain students by re-emphasizing the benefits of college (Brown & Robinson Kurpius, 1997; Falk & Aitken, 1984; Hoover & Jacobs, 1992; Jackson & Smith, 2001; Kleinfeld et al., 1987; Pewewardy & Frey, 2004; Reyhner & Dodd, 1995; Schmidtke, 2008).
Peer/Mentor Relationships

When students create relationships at college, they help them feel more at home (Huffman, 2001), and this comfort translates to retention. It is expected professors will act as mentors to their students in part to recruit majors to the discipline but also to promote student success rates (Brown & Robinson Kurpius, 1997; Pavel & Padilla, 1993). Oftentimes, faculty who develop mentoring relationships with their students serve as an extended family, which also contributes to student retention (HeavyRunner & DeCelles, 2002). When faculty become role models, they reinforce a supportive environment (Jackson & Smith, 2001; James, 1992; Tate & Schwartz, 1993). Anyone including faculty, staff, administrators, and peers can be mentors, according to Tierney (1995). But Reyhner and Dodd (1995) recommended mentors have some type of connection to the student, either they are from the same discipline, they have similar interests, or they share the same or similar cultural backgrounds. In fact, several authors reinforce hiring American Indian faculty and staff to provide the Native student with informed and adequate support (Falk & Aitken, 1984; Kleinfeld et al., 1987; O’Brien, 1990; Pavel & Padilla, 1993; Reyhner & Dodd, 1995).

Peer mentoring is important to student retention and success (Hoover & Jacobs, 1992). Peer support helps Native students deal with conflict, improve feelings of belonging, reinforce and clarify identity, and understand that their values, beliefs, and ways of learning and thinking are a burden but an asset to critical thinking and problem solving (Schmidtke, 2008; Tate & Schwartz, 1993). As stated earlier, peer mentoring can
take place in many ways; tutoring, study groups, (Brown & Robinson Kurpius, 1997), student centers (Cole & Denzine, 2002), and student organizations (Reyhner & Dodd, 1995) can all offer peer support (Schmidtke, 2008). Peer groups create a sense of community, “help students deal with feelings of isolation and alienation, and can offer specific advice on study skills or other academic matters” (Schmidtke, 2008, p. 111).

Mentoring contributes to the retention of minority students (Jacobi, 1991; Pope, 2002). Central to Native student success are American Indian faculty and administrators (Schmidtke, 2008). These mentors reinforce student self-esteem, which contributes to their success (Schmidtke, 2008). Native faculty, staff, and administrators are leaders and stakeholders in student success who assist in connecting the student to the professional community (Schmidtke, 2008). Native educators and administrators are needed to mentor Indigenous students to become leaders in their tribal communities (Gilbert, 2000; Huffman, 2001).

Institutional Resources/Financial Aid

While they can find funding for tuition, room and board, books, etc., there is no source of money for emergencies, socializing, or incidentals. They cannot request a little more from their families, as their families may have nothing to offer. (p. 45)

Native American families generally experience poverty at higher levels than the average person in the United States. Academic achievement is dependent upon many variables and funding or financial aid is one of those variables that has a significant impact. Adequate funding can alleviate stress about paying rent and for much needed school supplies. It is imperative financial aid be on time and accurate.

Counseling

Counseling services are one of the most important contributors to student success, if counselors are trained appropriately (Cole & Denzine, 2002; Kleinfeld et al., 1987). Counselors can serve as mentors, too, if they are willing to learn about the various and unique cultures of the students they serve, specifically Native students. To generalize all Natives as having one culture is problematic and can break any trust that has been built with a student (Hornett, 1989; Huffman, 2001; Pavel & Padilla, 1993). Counselors should be prepared to assist students in choosing a program of study and in suggesting specific courses where they believe the student will thrive and possibly find peer support (Schmidtke, 2008). Counselors can also help students understand the policies and procedures of the institution and be ready to provide referrals to a variety of services that can support students (HeavyRunner & DeCelles, 2002; Hornett, 1989; James, 1992; Kleinfeld et al., 1987; Ortiz & HeavyRunner, 2003; Reyhner & Dodd, 1995).
Generally, American Indian students come from high schools with limited to no college preparatory courses, no pre-college admission programs and no financial aid counseling. Besides inadequate guidance and counseling, American Indian students and their families have limited information about the college admissions process. It is no wonder the community college counselor plays a very critical role in providing accurate information to students and their parents. The matriculation process includes academic, career, and personal counseling, registration assistance, and assessments in writing, reading, and math to adequately place students in the courses they need.

Curriculum

According to Connelly, He, and Phillion (2008), the movement toward culturally relevant instruction began in the 1960s with the development of Ethnic Studies programs and bilingual education. These movements led to a 1970s concept that curriculum should be multicultural in nature, addressing equity and social justice issues to improve the education of children who had been disenfranchised. Some educators believed this change in curriculum meant an introduction of “colorblindness.” According to Nieto (2003), this concept upholds historic amnesia and “fails to recognize the way race has historically, systematically and institutionally been used to oppress certain groups….and masks the persistent and deep entrenchment of racial inequality” (Nieto et al., 2008, p. 181). Questions arose about the nature of curriculum (Apple, 2004). Who wrote it? What knowledge were they using? Why was it organized in one specific way? Could it
be taught another way? A curriculum revolution was underway. There arose a notion that students were not blank slates meant for the “banking method” of instruction (Freire, 2000). Students brought with them information and funds of knowledge (Moll et al., 1992). They were experts about their environments, and they had experienced oppression first hand (Nieto, et. al., 2008).

In reviewing curriculum through a social justice and equity lens, one can anticipate the possible negative impact stereotypical information will have on students. Curriculum must be viewed within a cultural context to see how it pertains to the lives of students. This directly relates to best practices pedagogy and what pertinent information students take with them that reflects and relates to their personal experiences. When curriculum perpetuates a stereotypical perspective, thus reinforcing the deficit model, underrepresented students are not included as pertinent contributing members of academia, thereby reinforcing othering and/or making the group invisible. Furthermore when a humanistic curriculum is employed, it is ever changing and complex. This type of fluidity allows for the influx of multicultural curriculum and reflection or praxis to understand how the environment impacts education. In addition, links to identity, community, and diversity can be made to better understand how multicultural education or cultural competency education has a beneficial impact.

When discussing curriculum, colleges must commit to incorporating culturally relevant pedagogy as part of their mission (Tierney, 1995). Once this has been accomplished, they can address integrating diversity within the curriculum by adding an
Indigenous perspective to all courses and all disciplines. Old and new programs alike should be designed with Indigenous students in mind (Pewewardy & Frey, 2004).

According to Geneva Smitherman-Donaldson and Teun A. van Dijk (1988), language and discourse play critical roles in the reproduction and perpetuation of oppression. They argue the roots of oppression are firmly embedded in opinions and attitudes shaped by society’s elites and mediated through “socialization networks, such as schools, and in information-disseminating institutions, such as the mass media” (as cited in Connelly et al., 2008, p. 188). Whether through television programs, new reports, radio talk shows, magazines, textbooks, or novels, “the expression, enactment, and legitimization of racism in society takes place…at a symbolic level” in “a variety of communicative contexts and in various types of talk and text” (as cited in Connelly et al., 2008, p. 188).

Today equity in education has not been completely realized because even though a multicultural curriculum has been implemented, the content and context have been mitigated to the point where it is no longer relevant and meaningful. Nieto et. al. (2008), argue for a new way of creating curriculum by incorporating community, students, teachers, theory and ideologies. A critical analysis of power is called for when initiating culturally relevant curriculum (Banks, 2004b; Connelly et al., 2008; Gay, 2004; Grant, Elsbree, & Fondrie, 2004; Neito & Bode, 2008).
Professors

Studies have time and again shown that professors impact student success (Cole & Denzine, 2002; Dodd et al., 1995; Reyhner & Dodd, 1995). Professors can motivate students and give advice on how to access resources on campus. Professors have great influence on student perceptions of the campus climate, whether or not it is a racist environment and no matter how they see themselves in relation to this, as victims of discrimination or as empowered to resist the oppression (Brown & Robinson Kurpius, 1997; Hornett, 1989). Professors can be culturally sensitive and apply this to their teaching style to reach more students. But often Professors fall prey to limited time and resources. Through this they begin to reduce curriculum to the simplest concepts and in so doing can create categories that, “keep us from seeing the students before us” (Smith & Wilhelm, 2002, p. 9). This is problematic but, fortunately, there are evaluations put into place, a way for students to be heard. All they need to do is listen and through their academic freedom, they have the ability and right to make changes to their teaching style and curriculum so it may reflect the most recent developments in the discipline.

Conclusion

Eurocentric ideology promoting the individual and productivity has become the basis for educational systems in the United States, leaving no room for Indigenous thought or perspective. Institutes of education promote and reinforce assimilation, requiring a complete transformation of Natives, which serves as a reminder of
colonization and historic trauma. Examining early experiences of Natives with boarding schools and higher education, it is evident American Indians have suffered a great injustice that has yet to be remedied.

Previous research has provided a starting point where new scholarly activity can flourish. Factors impacting American Indian community college student success are within reach. The variables considered in this study include precollege academic preparation, financial support, family support, student motivation, peer mentor relationships, counseling, a supportive and involved faculty, institutional commitment, and support for Indian students and their world views, maintaining an active presence in home communities and cultural ceremonies (Aiken & Falk, 1984; Astin, 1982; Barnhardt, 1994; Belcourt-Dittloff, 2006; Brown, 1995; Cole & Denzine, 2002; Falk & Aitken, 1984; Huffman, 2001; Huffman et al., 1986; Lin, 1990; Reyhner & Dodd, 1995, Starks, 2010). In addition, an equation has been created that may be applied to reveal strategies for Native student success. Chapter 3 outlines the methodology utilized in this study to identify factors serving as barriers, needs and resiliency characteristics.
Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

Humankind has not woven the web of life.
We are but one thread within it.
Whatever we do to the web, we do to ourselves.
All things are bound together.
All things connect.
Chief Seattle, 1854

Chapter 3 describes the research design, including the role of the researcher, and a
detailed description of the context, setting, sample, instrumentation, data collection, and
analysis. The purpose of this study was to determine the needs, as well as the perceived
barriers, and resiliency characteristics that impact the success of American Indian
community college students at Sacramento City College. This study identifies resilient
forces in Native students’ lives and gathers student opinions about barriers experienced,
needs, and strategies utilized in attempts to obtain academic success.

Research Questions

The methodology described in this chapter was used to collect data to answer the
following research questions:

- Research question #1: What are the academic and personal needs of American
  Indian community college students?
- Research question #2: What are the perceived barriers that American Indian
  students face at the community college level?
• Research question #3: What are the resiliency and persistence characteristics employed by American Indian community college students contributing to student success?

Research Design

Creswell and Plano Clark (2007) define four reasons to use mixed-methods, as opposed to a solely qualitative or quantitative design. They explained researchers use the mixed-method design to (1) triangulate; (2) embed the design; (3) explain the design; and (4) explore the design. Mixed methods are used in this study to triangulate the data gathered through the survey results and coded focus group transcriptions. The use of a survey allowed for a breadth of quantitative information while the focus group portion provided the depth of student “experiences and perspectives” (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003) or a balance with qualitative information. A mixed-method approach allowed for in-depth, multilayered analysis while at the same time provided an opportunity for research participants to have a voice and contribute meaning.

The research questions are further explored through both quantitative and qualitative methods. Quantitative data is derived from the survey (full survey is included in Appendix A). The quantitative section of this study provides for a statistical correlation analysis of the factors impacting Native students academic success, as demonstrated in the literature. A Pearson Correlation Coefficient analysis was used to determine the significance of the relationship among the variables. The qualitative
section allowed for the voice of the Native student to be heard through three focus groups. Coding strategies related to the research questions along with the theoretical framework. The equation derived from the research questions as well. The merger between the theoretical concepts allowed for the researcher to delve deeper into students’ perceptions and experiences to provide a broader and more encompassing understanding of the data. Both quantitative and qualitative data were analyzed simultaneously to look for patterns in the data and triangulate results.

This study examined the needs barriers and resiliency characteristics as factors impacting Native students success. Because student success for the purposes of this study has been defined as meeting the needs, eliminating the barriers and reinforcing the resiliency characteristics of students working toward the completion of a desired academic goal several variables were considered that are discussed within the Instrument section.

Role of the Researcher

The researcher is a current American Indian adjunct professor who teaches Anthropology and Native American Studies courses at Sacramento City College. The researcher is aware that this could present a conflict of interest because of the development of mentoring relationships between various students and the professor. The participants may have wanted to respond in a way that would impact their professor and mentor, when their true feelings might have differed. To alleviate this potential conflict of interest, the researcher clearly explained to the participants that their honest responses
not only aided in the research, but were appreciated. In addition, there was no incentive, nor positive outcome of any response, and no response was considered “correct.” This information was provided on the survey consent form (see Appendix B).

**Setting**

The setting for this study was Sacramento City College (SCC), an urban community college located in Sacramento, California. Sacramento City College was founded in 1916, is the seventh oldest public community college in California, and is the oldest institution of higher learning in Sacramento (Sacramento City College, 2007). As one of four sister colleges within the Los Rios Community College District, SCC is recognized by the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office and is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) (Jeffery, 2009).

The mission of Sacramento City College incorporates terms such as open-access and diversity, specifically in the context of commitment and support relating to the needs of students (Sacramento City College Catalog, 2009-2010). The open access concept was based on California’s Master Plan for Higher Education, which divided students between the community college system, the four-year state colleges where students could receive Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees, and the four-year university system where they could work toward their Master’s and Doctorate degrees. The Master Plan was developed in the 1960s (Esch, 2009) to allow students the opportunity to achieve success along with a
good job and a living wage. Times have changed and, according to Dr. Grabriner (Esch, 2009), the plan was designed with an entirely different population in mind and with a state budget that could support a three-tier system.

Today, California’s population is made up of a more diverse group, largely Latino and other minority groups that have been consistently disenfranchised by the education system (Contreras & Gándara, 2009). With a shift in the labor market for highly educated workers, there is a greater need for more students to graduate with a college degree (Esch, 2009). Sacramento’s population estimate is approximately 500,000 people with a Native American Indian population of approximately 1.1%.

Sacramento City College serves a very diverse student population of approximately 25,000 with a Native American Indian (identified as Native American only) student population of approximately 0.7%. SCC is known for being one of the most diverse campuses in Sacramento and has taken an innovative approach in terms of providing equal and open access to education by providing low enrollment fees coupled with evening, weekend, and online classes to accommodate enrollment growth. During times of budgetary crisis, it becomes difficult at best to maintain an open-door policy in terms of enrollment, especially with diminished resources and more and more students need basic skills education. Part of the issue at hand is that community colleges have permeable boundaries (Bess & Dee, 2008). Because of the interdependence between the community college and the community, boundaries need to be permeable for the college
to meet the needs of the students and community. But this can lead to difficulties, especially when there are limited resources.

With two off-campus sites (West Sacramento and Davis), Sacramento City College has grown by at least 2.6% (Yen, 2009) culminating in an increase in enrollment by more than 1,000 students per year between 2005 and 2009 (Sacramento City College Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness Office, 2009). According to Chancellor Harris (2008), the weak economy coupled with increased unemployment and higher tuition at four-year universities has led to a greater demand for classes at the community college level.

It is generally understood that a majority of minority students have been disenfranchised due to racism, classism, and/or sexism, as well as previous educational experiences, and they have specific needs when they arrive at the community college level (Perry, Rosin, Morgan, Woodward, and Bahr, 2010). It is the norm for these students to need basic skills or remedial education (Perry et al., 2010). In response to student needs, Sacramento City College has developed certain programs whose missions are to increase student success.
Table 2

*Programs at Sacramento City College*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extended Opportunity Program and Services or EOPS</td>
<td>The Extended Opportunity Program and Services (EOPS) is an organization that assists first-time, first-generation, economically disadvantaged students who historically would not have attended college (Sacramento City College [SCC], 2012).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Agencies Resources for Education or CARE</td>
<td>Cooperative Agencies Resources for Education or CARE is a supplemental program to EOPS that provides additional support and services to students who are single parents (SCC, 2010b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEACON PAL</td>
<td>BEACON PAL is a Peer Assisted Learning Program designed to provide collaborative learning (SCC, n.d.a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalWORKs</td>
<td>CalWORKs, which stands for California Work Opportunity &amp; Responsibility to Kids, is a state-funded welfare to work program designed to help individuals on public assistance become self-sufficient (SCC, 2010a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESA</td>
<td>MESA assists educationally and financially disadvantaged students majoring in math, engineering, or science transfer to four-year colleges and universities. The program emphasizes collaborative study and support to attain high academic achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puente</td>
<td>Puente, which is a statewide program administered by the University of California Office of the President, is designed specifically to meet the needs of Mexican American/Latino students transferring to four year colleges and universities (SCC, n.d.c).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISE</td>
<td>RISE, which stands for Respect, Integrity, Self Determination and Education, is a program designed to fill the gaps students experience when attending college the first time, through personalized counseling, tutoring services, a book loan program, and a variety of other services designed to meet the needs of students who feel disenfranchised or specifically challenged in the college environment (SCC, n.d.b).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The programs are created and maintained to assist minority students in overcoming the achievement gap but none have been directly created with the needs of American Indian students in mind.

*The Native-only Student Population at Sacramento City College*

Data requested from and provided by the Planning Research and Institutional Effectiveness (PRIE) Office at Sacramento City College includes information on students who identified as Native American only (not mixed race and no identification with any other racial/ethnic groups) for fall 2004-Spring 2011 (End of Semester data). It was recommended by the PRIE Office researchers to use end-of-semester data because they capture late-start classes. End-of-semester data provide information about students who received a transcription notation (A, B, C, D, F, Pass, No Pass, Incomplete, Withdraw) in the course. In addition, it should be noted that because ethnic or racial group definitions changed in 2009 and another category, Multi-Race, was added to the Race/Ethnicity section of the application, data on students of mixed race could not be provided consistently across years. Thus, Native American students who claimed more than one racial/ethnic group were not included in this data.

The Native-only student population demographics at Sacramento City College reveal a very small population of students who claim to be Native American only and not part of any other ethnic group. It is fairly consistent that fall semester enrollment
numbers for students who claim to be Native American only are higher than spring semester numbers except between fall 2010 and Spring 2011.

Table 3

*Native American-only Student Population End-of-Semester Enrollment (PRIE Office at SCC)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Native American only</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>21609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2005</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>20494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>21767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2006</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>20491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>22768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>21863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>24602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>22936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>25788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>24957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009*</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>27028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>25206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>24781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>24279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*First semester with added Multi-Race as a category*

The chart reveals a somewhat steady percentage rate of Native students over three to four semesters, even though the total population of all students fluctuates. But there appears to be a noticeable decline occurring since fall 2009. The actual numbers of these same Native students claiming Native American-only as their race/ethnic identity fluctuates across the board, with the highest numbers being 261 and the lowest being 168. Note the numbers only sharply decrease when the Multi-Race category is added to the application in fall 2009, then again in spring 2010, and once more in fall 2010 with a
small rise of three students in spring 2011. It is unknown to this researcher if the Multi-
Race category affected these numbers or if there was an actual decline in Native students
who identified as Native American-only during the fall 2009-fall 2010 semesters. The
PRIE Office at SCC suggested the initial decline in those checking “Native American”
only was the result of the addition of the changes in how the data were collected
beginning in 2009.

The degree in declared major chart reveals a steady increase in the number of
Native American-only students who obtained a degree in their declared major within the
specified academic year when comparing successive years. Although the frequency or
number of students who obtain their declared major within the academic year increases
year by year, the percentage dips in 2007-2008 due to the overall total number of students
increasing to 38 with only 18 obtaining their degree in their declared major for that year.
Not provided is the number of semesters lapsed prior to degree attainment.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree in Declared Major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Even though a student’s educational goal may change throughout their tenure at the college, documenting educational goals within the year is significant. The educational goal of Native students who selected Native American only as their racial/ethnic group, utilizing EOS data, revealed a trend that seemed to indicate the primary educational goal for Native students was to transfer to a four-year college or university after obtaining their AA/AS degree. The next category, transfer to a four-year college or university without an AA/AS degree is consistently lower than transferring after earning an AA/AS degree but generally higher than earning an AA/AS degree with no transfer, with the exception of fall 2006, spring 2009, fall 2009, fall 2010, and spring 2011. In fall 2008, the numbers were the same. The undecided category begins in fall 2004 with the highest number of 41 students. Although this number drops significantly within the next semester to 15, it elevates the following semester to 22 students. There is no perceivable pattern except from spring 2007 the numbers continuously reduce each semester dropping to the lowest in spring 2010 and spring 2011 to seven students being undecided.

The unit load a student carries is significant because it relates to a number of variables, including but not limited to: affordability, scheduling (students may have to juggle work with childcare), type of classes being taken (some classes require more study time than others), and student ability to work on a certain number of classes at the same time (may also be based on their study habits, needs, and motivation). Regardless of the reason, patterns in unit load can tell us a lot about a student population.
The trend developing from fall 2004 to spring 2006 (four semesters) is that a majority of Native-only students were taking between 6 and 11.99 units. In fall 2006, the majority of Native-only students were taking fewer than six units but this was due to a slight margin increase of three students taking 5.99 or fewer units. In spring 2007, the units jumped again to between 6 and 11.99, but fell once more and remained at fewer than six units for two semesters, fall 2007 and spring 2008. From fall 2008 to fall 2009 (three semesters), the unit load increased again to between 6 and 11.99, reducing to fewer than six units in spring 2010. Fall 2010 to spring 2011 unit load increased again to between 6 and 11.99. In addition, a majority of Native-only students attend college part-time.

More information can be obtained from reviewing persistence patterns. Persistence patterns documenting the groups of the same students attending from one semester or one year to the next are available. This is the case for Native American-only students (see Table 5).

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall to Spring Terms</th>
<th>Percent Returned</th>
<th>Fall to Fall Terms</th>
<th>Percent Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With the exception of a drop in fall to spring term 2007-2008, an approximate five-point drop between fall to fall 2005-2006 and 2006-2007, and consistent drops through fall to fall terms 2008-2009, there is a trend that the percentage of Native-only students returning from fall to spring semesters was increasing. Fall to fall term persistence is varied with the highest rate of 44.8% occurring in 2005-2006. A rate of 39.1 occurs in fall to fall persistence numbers in 2004-2005 and again in 2006-2007. A lower rate of 38.5 is also significant in the years 2007-2008 and again in 2009-2010. The lowest rate of return occurred in 2008-2009 with a 37.5%. The overall patterns that emerge from this data are that the return rates are higher between fall and spring semesters compared to fall to fall persistence patterns.

Sample

The sample population for the survey was 45 self-identified American Indian (identified as Native-only or in conjunction with other ethnic groups), community college students, aged 18 or older who stated they were taking or at least had completed a minimum of three units at a community college, tribal college, or junior college. Forty-three out of 45 students indicated they were enrolled at Sacramento City College at the time they completed the survey. Two students did not answer this demographic question but these two students indicated they were enrolled in units at the time they completed the survey.
Descriptive statistics reveal a snapshot of the students who participated in the survey. Twenty-five or 55.6% were female and 20, or 44.4%, were male. Out of the 45 American Indian students who participated in the survey, 22 participants stated they were American Indian-only while 23 stated they were American Indian and some other ethnic group(s). The race or ethnic identity of the student is important to this study because students were disqualified if they did not state they were Native-only or Native in conjunction with other racial or ethnic groups. The following information reveals more about the sample.

Table 6

Race or Ethnicity of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race or Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian Only</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian &amp; African American/Black</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian &amp; Mexican American</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian &amp; Caucasian White</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian &amp; Latino &amp; Mexican American</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian &amp; Caucasian/White &amp; Mexican American</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian &amp; Caucasian/White &amp; Other: Norwegian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian &amp; Caucasian/White &amp; Italian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian &amp; Cuban</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian &amp; Caucasian/White &amp; Other: Tarahumara &amp; Azteca</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian &amp; Caucasian/White &amp; Latino</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty were tribally enrolled while 25 were not. Almost half the participants (22) were California Natives with more students representing the following tribes: Miwok (3), Wintu (3), Yurok (2), Pomo Big Valley Rancheria Lake County (2). The Cherokee Nation had the largest number of participants with six students total.
Table 7

*Tribal Affiliation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not listed</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Yurok*</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Cherokee &amp; Chuctaw</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cherokee</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lumi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Piscataway/Conoy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purehecha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Apache</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yaqui*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miwok*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chippewa &amp; Cree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cherokee/Pomo*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comanche</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wintu*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pit River/Paiute*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfeet (Blood)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Maidu Konkow*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Apache/Mescalero</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickasaw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pomo Big Valley*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yaqui &amp; Apache</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherokee &amp; Creek</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Konkow Maidu, *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Te-Moak Band</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wintun, Hupa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Western Shoshone Elko Colony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paiute * &amp; First Nations Cree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Blackfood &amp; Cherokee &amp; Apache</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mono*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wailacki*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mestizo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yuki, Pomo,*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Konkow Round Valley, Assiniboine, Montana, Miwok El Dorado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conkow Maidu*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Konkow Maidu —*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Modac/Klammath*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mooretown Rancheria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| * California Tribe/Nation

A combined 11 students, or 25% of the students who took the survey, were 18 and 19 years old. Fourteen, or 31.8%, students’ ages ranged between 20 and 29 years. Nineteen students, or 43.4%, fell between the ages of 30 and 56 years. Participants’ educational goals ranged from certificate to doctorate with a majority of degrees falling in the Masters range (see Table 8).
Table 8

*Participants’ Educational Goals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Goal</th>
<th># Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA/AS</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/MA</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey revealed a majority, or 31.1%, of participating Native students would be seeking their Masters degrees. A significant number would be seeking their Bachelors (26.7%) and Associates (24.4%) degrees, as well. In addition, 13.3% would seek their doctorate degrees. A majority of the students who participated in the study did indicate they would be transferring to a four-year institution, supporting the data about Native-only students provided by the PRIE Office. Majors included but were not limited to: Law, Business, Japanese, Sign Language, Ethnic Studies/Native American Studies, Psychology, Art, History, Engineering, Nursing, and Anthropology. Several students were undecided. Over half the students who participated in the study were single and had no children. The following charts reveal more pertinent data related to marital status and the number of children in the family.
A majority, or 63.6%, of American Indian students who took the survey were single.

And a majority of Native American students (57.8%) did not have any children.

A bulk of the students recruited for the study were in attendance at the Sacramento City College (SCC) Indigenous Student’s Welcome/Welcome Back scheduled in the fall semester 2011. Out of the initial 45 students who took the survey at the event, only 37 met eligibility requirements. Eight additional surveys were obtained by the researcher at informal Native gatherings in the late fall of 2011 and early spring 2012 semesters to total 45 complete surveys.
Focus Groups

Within the demographic section of the survey, a question asked the student if they were interested in participating in a focus group. Those who were interested provided their contact information and were given a focus group consent form. Twenty-six students indicated they were interested. This researcher created a separate list of the 26 students and their contact information. A Research Assistant was instructed to call students on the list to make initial contact to determine if the student was still interested and determine whether or not they were available to meet on the date focus groups were scheduled. The Research Assistant was able to confirm 16 interested students whom she initially scheduled within each respective focus group time frame. This researcher contacted the 16 students to confirm and remind them of the focus group two days before the sessions took place. Even though efforts were made to confirm and remind students of the focus groups three students did not show on the date and time they were scheduled to attend. Two of the three who did not attend had last-minute family emergencies and they let the researcher know the day of the focus groups sessions.

Ten of the students were female and three were male. All 13 students were enrolled at Sacramento City College. Nine out of the 13 were enrolled in their tribe. Four were affiliated with a tribe.

Survey and focus group response rates. The original target sample size for the survey was 250 students, but this number was reduced to 50 because of the difficulty in obtaining participants. In the end, only 45 completed surveys with consent forms. Out of
the 45 survey participants, 26 students indicated they were interested in participating in a focus group. Ten students either changed their minds about participating, were not available to meet on the day scheduled, or their contact information was not valid. Sixteen students confirmed their participation, but on the day of the focus groups, three students did not show, leaving 13 participants in total. Focus group one had six students participate, focus group two had four students participate, and focus group three had three students participate.

Instrumentation and Materials

Survey

Quantitative data was gathered via a nine-page survey instrument developed by the researcher with inspiration from Baxter’s (2009) survey, which incorporated demographic questions specific to American Indians (see Appendix A). Additional surveys that influenced this research were the National Study for Student Engagement (2007), The Community College Student Report (2005), The Student Success Survey (Rios Kravitz, 2011), The Student Academic Success Survey (Buechner, 2004) and Ranking Resiliency Factors (Holt, Mahowald, & DeVore, 2002). Each of the mentioned surveys had been used in previous studies and were found to be statistically valid for the research done. The National Study for Student Engagement and the Community College Student Report are traditionally utilized by community colleges and universities to collect data on their student bodies. The Student Success Survey is being used in a current study
at Sacramento City College, the Student Academic Success Survey has been used in a pilot study, and Ranking Resiliency Factors has been used in a published study (Holt et al., 2002).

The researcher was not able to find one existing survey that contained all the variables stipulated by the literature to be significant to Native American community college student success. Hence, the survey instrument was derived from factors identified within the research that either supported or served as a barrier to student success. The survey was divided into several sections. The demographic section alone was three pages. The remaining six sections of the survey were designed to examine the extent to which student success, the independent variable, was impacted by several other dependent variables. Section one asked questions pertaining to capital or resources and barriers with family, social or college community, tribe or cultural community, student characteristics, and what would cause students to withdraw from college. Section two focused on precollege academic preparation. Section three asked questions pertaining to financial support. Section four involved faculty and coursework. Section five concentrated on institutional commitment and support, and section six brought in resiliency characteristics.

Demographic questions ranged from the general to specific pertaining to the age, gender/sex, marital status, socio-economic status, discipline major, grade point average, intention to graduate, units enrolled, units completed, complete a certificate or transfer, how far students intended to take their education, tribal affiliation, if their tribe was
federally recognized, if they were an enrolled tribal member, if they received financial or other support from their tribe, if they took college preparatory courses in high school, parents educational levels, if the student was the first generation in their family to attend college, etc. Primary variables in the demographic section indicating student success as defined by this researcher included grade point average (GPA), units taken, and units enrolled. These three variables alone relate to persistence, retention, and active engagement.

In section one, questions regarding capital, resources, and barriers focusing on family and community involvement and support were asked. The first four questions asked the student to rate on a Likert-type scale ranging from N/A or not applicable, not at all, not very, somewhat, quite a bit, to extremely important, how supportive their immediate/extended family, friends attending college, community, and tribe were to them. Students were also asked to rate on a scale of never, not at all, rarely, sometimes, and often, how often they participated in tribal or Native community activities. Additional questions in this section focused on students rating on three different scales the quality of their relationships with fellow students, instructors, and administration. Categories to choose from associated with student relationships with fellow students included sense of alienation, unsupportive, unfriendly, sense of belonging, supportive, and friendly. For instructors, students could choose not sympathetic, unhelpful, unavailable, sympathetic, helpful, and available. Rigid, inconsiderate, unhelpful, flexible, considerate, and helpful were choices in the administration category.
The next question in section one dealt with student experiences at Sacramento City College and how they contributed to their knowledge, skills, and resource base. Students were asked to rate, on a Likert-type scale of not at all, very little, some, quite a bit and very much, several factors including acquiring work-related knowledge/skills, computer skills, working with others from diverse ethnic groups, understanding self, contributing to the welfare of their tribe or community, developing clear career goals, and gaining information about career opportunities.

Student characteristics were the focus of the next question in section one. Students were asked to rate the degree to which student characteristics served as barriers to academic success. Not applicable (N/A) or does not apply, no barrier/no effect on success, moderate barrier or major barrier were the choices given. Factors ranging from motivation, to inadequate preparation for college-level work, inadequate study skills, first generation to attend college, commuting, socio-economic disadvantage, indecision about major and career goals, inadequate financial resources, physical and mental health problems, lack of support from significant others, family demands, job demands, social integration, academic integration, distance from home, and inadequate coping skills were covered.

How likely specific issues would cause a student to withdraw from class or from the college was the content of the next question in this section. Not likely, somewhat likely, likely, and very likely was the scale students could choose from. Factors included working full-time, caring for dependents, whether or not the student was academically
unprepared, lack of finances, personal motivation, computer access, restrictive admissions practices, bureaucratic financial aid services, bureaucratic academic advising, judgmental attitude of faculty or staff for students, limited academic support service, no available housing, limited number and variety of courses, racially biased professor, transportation issues, and transfer to a four-year college or university were also included.

In section two, questions regarding precollege academic preparation or high school experiences were asked. Students were asked to rate their school as above average, average, below average, or not sure. Question two in this section focused on factors that were helpful or those that served as barriers. Students were given the option of choosing does not apply, major barrier, barrier, neither helpful nor barrier, helpful, and very helpful. Factors included taking college preparatory courses, taking college or university courses, teachers, counselors, classmates, friends at school, parents, family, career center, tutoring, academic preparation (learned skills), participation in pre-college programs (Upward Bound, Alpha Academy, AVID), visiting four-year institutions, visiting a community college, summer bridge program, and other were given.

Section three concentrated on financial support. The first question in this section asked whether or not the student believed they had enough financial support to achieve their academic goal. They could choose yes or no. Question two in this section asked students to indicate whether or not their own income/savings, parents’ income/savings, spouse’s/significant other’s income/savings, employer contributions, grants and
scholarships, student loans, tribal monies, or public assistance were a major source, minor source, or not a source of support used to pay tuition at Sacramento City College.

In the fourth section, questions were asked pertaining to faculty and coursework. The extent to which professors contributed to academic development was the first question. Students were given a range to choose from in their answer including N/A, not at all, not very, somewhat, and very. In question two of this section, students were given the same scale but were asked to rate their professor’s involvement in their academic success. Question three asked about the importance of several variables to the student’s academic success. Clear and interesting lectures or labs, class participation, encouragement and respect from professors, good use of classroom technology, fair exams and other evaluations, clear feedback, good textbooks, useful homework, clear course materials, working in groups in class, clear expectations about requirements, tutor availability, chance to choose between many sections, class size, class time, access to computers and other resources, feeling welcome in class, participating in learning communities, doing remedial/developmental coursework, and participating in service learning programs were the factors to be rated on a scale of very, somewhat, not very, not at all, and N/A.

Section five centered on institutional commitment and support. The first three questions delved into the use of, satisfaction with, and importance of specific services including academic advising, career counseling, job placement assistance, peer or other tutoring, skill labs, child care, financial aid advising, computer labs, student
organizations, transfer credit assistance, services to students with disabilities, EOPS and RISE. Assessment was an additional category added to questions two and three in this section. In question one, students could choose between N/A, don’t know, never, rarely, sometimes, and often. In questions two and three, students had the option of choosing N/A, not at all, somewhat, and very.

Question four in section five dealt with how students felt Sacramento City College emphasized the following: encouraging time spent on studying; providing support needed to ensure success; encouraging interaction amongst students from diverse backgrounds; helping students cope with non-academic responsibilities (family, work, childcare, etc.); providing support to thrive socially; providing financial support; contributing to the welfare of the community; solving complex real world problems; understanding self; rules and regulations/policy; voting in local, state, tribal, or national elections; and attendance at campus events and activities. Students were asked to rate each factor based on how they felt the institution emphasized them. The rating included very little, some, quite a bit and very much.

Question five in section five focused on how students evaluated their entire educational experience at Sacramento City College. They were given the following categories: poor, fair, good, and excellent. Question six asked if the student would recommend this college (SCC) to a friend or family member with a yes or no response requested. And finally, question seven in this section asked if they could start all over
again, would they choose the same institution they were now attending with options to answer definitely yes, probably yes, probably no, and definitely no.

Section six asked students to rank factors in the resiliency rank chart. Students were asked if the following factors were or have been the most important resiliency factors in regard to their academic success: scholarship/financial support, mentors, salary, role models, family support, time spent with family, friend/peer support, social/community support, high school preparatory support, or spiritual support. Other factors were open for students to include additional factors. Students were supposed to rank only the top five with one being the most likely factor and five being the least.

Each section listed above concentrated on variables that connected to diverse kinds of capital or resources as well as barriers. For instance, family involvement and support connects with family capital, cultural capital, and/or navigational capital depending on how the family assists the student. If relatives know about how to navigate the educational system and they teach this to the student, then it is considered navigational capital. Community involvement and support is linked to social capital, navigational capital (depending on the example), and/or cultural capital depending on whether or not the community is identified as the Native community. Pre-college academic experience in grades K-12 is associated with navigational capital. Peer/mentor relationships are associated with social capital unless distinctly connected to the Native community and then becomes identified as cultural capital and/or navigational capital. Institutional resources/financial support as well as counseling, experiences with
faculty/coursework and institutional commitment and support are all considered social capital and/or navigational capital. Helpful and non-helpful services are identified and related to internal institutional resources. External resources of the institution include tribal resources, public assistance, or community resources. Barriers were also identified within each of the capital areas.

Focus Groups

Three focus groups of five students each were planned to gather qualitative data. Six students participated in focus group one; four students in focus group two, and three students in focus group three actually participated. Participants in the focus groups were asked the same series of questions in the same order related to factors leading to and barriers preventing American Indian community college students from achieving success. Students participated in a guided discussion approach based on a scripted series of questions that covered the same or similar categories as the survey, pertinent to the literature (Baxter, 2009). Participants in the focus groups were asked about factors that assisted in their success and barriers they have experienced. They were also asked to assess the most important factors affecting their success. These questions directly related to the three primary research questions of the study.

Questions relating to the primary research questions of the study were grouped into four categories: opening, introductory, transition, and key. Questions were designed to elicit information about how students felt and thought about their own personal and peer Native student success at the community college level. Questions followed a semi-
structured questioning format with the desired goal of consistency for validity and reliability purposes.

The first three opening questions were demographic in nature and were meant to initiate dialogue, build rapport, and promote comfort between participants and the researcher (Baxter, 2009; Creswell, 2003; Krueger & Casey, 2000). Tribal membership or affiliation, location in which the student was raised, where they currently lived, and how many community college units taken provided a base of knowledge.

The next four introductory questions were open-ended and introduced the topic of discussion. These questions encouraged participants to share what they thought and how they felt, their attitudes and perceptions (Baxter, 2009; Creswell, 2003; Krueger & Casey, 2000) about Native student success. Questions focused on how students felt about their experience as a community college student, educational services that had been helpful, and what made them helpful, as well as services that have been frustrating and what made them frustrating. Included in this section was also a question about specific barriers to academic success.

The following two questions were transition questions. In order to look deeper into the points of view of participants and shift the discussion to the key questions of the study (Baxter, 2009; Creswell, 2003; Krueger & Casey, 2000), one question about how family, community, and tribe felt about student attendance at college and one question about the student’s primary goal at college and the impetus for their motivation were asked. Finally, key questions that promoted self-disclosure were asked (Baxter, 2009;
Creswell, 2003; Krueger & Casey, 2000). Topics of the questions included greatest resources that positively impact academic success, cultural values that had assisted in achieving success, greatest barriers preventing success, Native community college student needs, what could be done to better serve Native students, and the last question which was omitted due to time constraints was educational goal in relation to ability to obtain a job (see Appendix B for questions).

Specific codes were created and used to identify barriers, needs, resiliency strategies, and different forms of capital within the focus group transcripts. These codes were taken from the research and the capital categories established by Yosso (2005) on community cultural wealth. Because this research is also reviewing barriers, needs, services, and resiliency characteristics, these codes were also added.

Table 10

*Codes for Analyzing Focus Groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAR=Barrier</td>
<td>Barriers work to prevent student success. In this way, they work against any type of resource or capital. To address student success, this study must identify academic barriers, needs, and resources or services, as well as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNED=Personal Need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANED=Academic Need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVC=Helpful Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHSVC=Not Helpful Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REZ=Resiliency Characteristic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMC=Familial Capital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCC=Social Capital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASPC=Aspirational Capital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULC=Cultural Capital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVC=Navigational Capital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESC=Resistant Capital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
resiliency characteristics that help overcome barriers. An example of a barrier includes limited or no financial resources to attend college, which would equate to a personal and academic need. A helpful service (HSVC) like financial aid could assist in creating a bridge to overcome this barrier or the student may rely on other forms of capital like family (FAMC) or tribal funds (CULC) to assist in the financial need, which may end up being a reziliency (REZ) characteristic. Barriers can be internal to the institution or external, existing outside the institution but still having a negative impact on the student. Internal barriers are within the institutions purview to change. External barriers are largely left up to the student to reconcile. Lacking capital in some areas can act as a barrier unless other capital is used to fulfill the student’s need.

PNED is the code used to determine whether or not something is a personal need. Examples of personal needs would be food or housing and transportation. Personal needs are primarily ones that exist outside of academia but have an indirect and/or direct impact on academic student success and must be considered. For instance, the need for transportation was mentioned earlier. Students need to go to the store to buy food to survive, but they also need to be able to get to college to be academically successful. This type of personal indirect need can also be considered a direct academic need (ANED). When personal needs and academic needs align, it makes that need so much more integral to academic success.

Academic needs span a broad range including the need to have a supportive campus environment in order to be successful and supportive professors and counselors;
even textbooks can be included in this category. Academic needs have a direct impact on student success and as mentioned earlier when joined with personal needs, the impact is much greater. The institution has direct control or some type of regulatory power over many of the resources that fulfill academic needs. If a barrier exists within the academic needs sphere, student success is then dependent not only on the student finding some type of resources or services to meet this need but it relies also on the institution to provide resources or services for the student to become academically successful.

Educational institutions often provide services or programs for students who have academic needs. HSVC is the code for helpful service. When students identify helpful services it means the services have helped the student in some way to be successful. For example, if a student takes advantage of free tutoring provided by the institution and finds that tutoring has been a service that has helped them achieve academic success in that they received a passing grade or better in the class for which they were being tutored, then the student may see tutoring as a helpful service. Conversely, NHSVC is a not helpful service. Students who identify non-helpful services are identifying possible barriers to their success. Services discussed are either college or institutionally provided (internal) services or community (external) services. Because college campuses have tried to account for the many needs of students, oftentimes resources can be found on campus that provide external services like CalWORKs offices or state funded welfare to work programs. If a student finds this type of service is not helpful, there is little to nothing that can be done by the institution to effect change within this type of program.
because it is operated by the state of California. It is important to differentiate between external and internal services in order to identify institutional barriers that need to change to have a greater impact on student success.

Yosso’s (2005, 2006) Community Cultural Wealth concept validates diverse types of capital obtained from the community. Types of capital identified by Yosso (2005) include: aspirational, cultural, familial, navigational, resistant, social, and linguistic capital. For this study, linguistic capital was omitted because very few Native tribes continue to speak their indigenous languages and because the population of Native students in an urban area generally reflects an urban Indian population that usually speaks English as their first language. These different types of capital were used to code responses to questions within the focus groups. Note that more than one type of capital can apply to any given situation, and through the process of resiliency students operate an intricate capital exchange system they have built and maintained, which exists uniquely for them. Yosso’s (2006) diverse types of capital exist for every student. How much capital they possess and of which type depends on their interaction with their environment, which makes each student’s system of exchange unique.

Aspirational capital, coded ASPC is a form of capital possessed by students that provides hope in the face of oppression and hardship. This type of capital also incorporates motivation and inspiration and can be seen as a resiliency characteristic. Maintaining aspirations in the face of obstacles, oppression, and limited resources and services directly relates to resiliency. Different resources can be turned into aspirational
capital. For example, if the student’s family believes the student can be successful, this support from the family or family capital (FAMC) can be turned into aspirational capital. Anything motivating the students to succeed can be considered aspirational capital, but it may also have roots in other resources or other forms of capital like family, culture, or community. Familial capital, coded as FAMC is possessed by students who are culturally competent because of their connection to a knowledge base built by family, which carries with it a sense of identity, community, history, and memory.

Cultural capital, or CULC, is the inherent ability to access resources and opportunities associated with birthright, family, culture, and community. One example of cultural capital is when students rely on cultural values or morals like sharing to obtain student success. If sharing is defined as a cultural imperative, then it may be expected that Native students share their class notes with other students. Sharing notes could lead to student success. Cultural capital is often associated with Navigational capital (NAVC), the knowledge of college-going processes and skills for navigating or maneuvering through institutes of education because this is associated through family or community knowledge. If another Native student knows how to navigate the educational system then by sharing this information, he/she is not only providing navigational capital but he/she is also working with cultural capital. Diverse types of capital do not need to be exclusionary of each other. In fact, they oftentimes work together to increase student success.
Social capital, coded as SOCC is different from Cultural capital in that it refers to the larger society or community, which for the purposes of this study could mean the college campus community representing an internal resource or a broader external community extending into the city of Sacramento, which expands beyond the Native, tribal, or cultural community. Social capital refers to the capital possessed by students made up of networks and community resources shared locally. Peer and other social stakeholders are influential in that they possess insider information and can provide emotional support.

Resistant capital, coded as RESC, is possessed by students who have obtained knowledge and skills to challenge inequality and social injustice. Resistant capital is rooted in historic and modern day resistance strategies to oppression. Resistant capital is utilized when Native students need a voice, specifically in situations when the educational institution is seen as oppressive and racist. This type of capital is pursuant to change within the internal education system and is often seen as an external force trying to impose its will on the larger system. In reality, resistant capital may play a role in student success especially if through resistance capital students are able to make changes within the system that afford them with services or resources they need to be academically successful.

REZ stands for reziliency characteristics. A REZ characteristic is one that allows for coping and the use of learned skills to adapt with the environment, situation, or circumstance. Reziliency characteristics assist students in overcoming barriers especially
in oppressive conditions. One example of a reziliency characteristic is the ability to convert or use different types of capital to bridge barriers and fulfill personal and/or academic needs. If students need financial aid to attend college and they do not receive any grants or loans because of some glitch in their paperwork, they may be able to rely on family or “cash in” on family capital by borrowing money from their parents to help them with their personal and academic need to pay their fees or pay for their textbooks. One other reziliency characteristic example would be if a Native student experienced racism in the classroom from the professor. Because the professor is in an authority position, the Native student is at a disadvantage. The student may feel he/she cannot address the problem with the professor because his/her grade would be in jeopardy so a reziliant characteristic might be the ability to drop that class and take it with another professor, which would indicate the use of navigational capital. Or the student may choose to stay in the class and challenge the professor’s stereotypes by using resistance capital, but then the student would have to deal with the barrage of daily racial oppression directly impacting the student’s self esteem and identity and leading to greater personal and emotional needs that must be fulfilled by other types of capital.

Data Collection

Quantitative Data Collection

Quantitative data was gathered from the survey instrument, as described in the previous section. Quantitative data was taken from the survey answers pertaining to
demographic information and responses to a variety of questions that employed Likert-type scales and ranked order about factors previous research supports as barriers to or identifies as success factors leading to academic success of Native American students. This data was used to contribute to the answers of the three research questions. Research question #1: What are the academic and personal needs of American Indian community college students? Research question #2: What are the perceived barriers that American Indian students face at the community college level? Research question #3: What are the resiliency and persistence characteristics employed by American Indian community college students that contribute to student success?

Quantitative Data Analysis

The survey was entered into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Over 200 related variables were initially analyzed in SPSS. A Pearson Correlation Coefficient analyses which “assess[es] the degree that quantitative variables are linearly related in a sample” (Green & Salkind, 2011, p. 256) was administered using SPSS for the quantitative survey responses to determine the extent to which the independent variable, student success as seen through a 2.0 grade point average, units completed and units enrolled was related to the dependent variables or factors students identify as significant.

Qualitative Data Collection

Qualitative data was gathered from the focus group sessions as described in the previous section. Students interested in the focus groups provided their contact
information on the survey and were given a focus group consent form. Twenty-six students indicated they were interested. This researcher created a separate list of the 26 students and their contact information and reserved a conference room at Sacramento City College on Friday February 3, 2012 as the location. Three separate one-hour time frames were set with a 15-minute cushion between each session. A Research Assistant was instructed to call students on the list to make initial contact to determine if the students were still interested and determine whether or not they were available to meet on the date focus groups were scheduled. Each student was given a choice of three different times. Phone numbers were disconnected for three students and two additional students called indicated they were no longer interested in participating in the focus groups. The Research Assistant was able to confirm 16 interested students whom she initially scheduled within each respective focus group time frame. This researcher contacted the 16 students to confirm and remind them of the focus group two days before the sessions took place. Even though efforts were made to confirm and remind students of the focus groups, three students did not show on the date and time they were scheduled to attend. Two of the three who did not attend had last-minute family emergencies, and they let the researcher know the day of the focus groups sessions. A stenographer was hired to transcribe the focus group discussions as they took place. The stenographer did not know the participants in the groups personally.
Qualitative Data Analysis

Within five days, the transcripts were received in both hard copy and in three separate word documents via email from the stenographer. The researcher read through all the data to cross reference and check key points in her notes. The researcher then coded the data by making notes in the margins based on codes described in an earlier section, which related directly to the research questions:

- Research Question #1: What are the academic and personal needs of American Indian community college students?
- Research question #2: What are the perceived barriers that American Indian students face at the community college level?
- Research question #3: What are the resiliency and persistence characteristics employed by American Indian community college students contributing to student success?

The purpose of the study, to determine the academic and personal needs, perceived barriers, and resiliency characteristics and success factors of Native students to aid in their academic success was also directly related to the research questions and codes used on the transcripts. Pertinent information from coded transcripts was typed into a table based on codes and themes to be used in Chapters 4 and 5.
Protecting Participant Rights

The study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of California State University, Sacramento and the Sacramento City College Research Review Committee or informal IRB in fall 2011 and contained minimal risk to the participants. Procedures were followed to provide participants with the least amount of risk and maintain their comfort throughout the completion of the survey and during the focus group sessions. Protective measures included: (1) student contact information was kept confidential; (2) the survey did not ask students to provide their names, just demographic information, so their identity remained anonymous; (3) confidentiality was maintained of all respondents by not making the database available to others and by creating a private pass code to access the data; (4) numbers were used for all participants and confidentiality will be kept for all participants in any document made public, i.e., research papers, publications, or presentation; (5) participants were required to indicate they read and consented to participate in the study prior to taking the survey or prior to participating in the focus group (the consent form specified the purpose of the study and described ways in which their contributions would be used); (6) participants were notified they had the option to withdraw from the study at any time or not answer questions that give them discomfort.

Consent forms, surveys, transcriptions of focus group meetings, and data gleaned from the surveys and transcriptions were kept separate in a locked file cabinet in the researcher’s home office and on the researcher’s personal computer under password lock and encryption to be destroyed within six months upon completion of the research.
The subjects’ rights to privacy and safety was protected by ensuring that few people had access to participant information or data. The researcher, the faculty supervising this research, up to two research assistants, and the stenographer hired to record/transcribe the focus groups were the only people who had access to varied forms of the data. Procedures like assigning numbers to participants at the very beginning when the survey data was first collected were followed to disconnect student identification from the exact data and to protect student privacy. The only person who had access to the linked data was the researcher. Names of participants were not used on the survey directly, instead numbers were assigned. A separate consent form was used for the focus groups. Contact information including phone numbers and or email addresses (that did not have identifying characteristics like the participant’s name or any identification numbers) were associated with the participant’s assigned number for this study to be able to contact participants interested in participating in a focus group. Students who participated in the focus groups were also referred to as their first name in the focus group session. These names were changed to participant numbers in coding the transcripts. Consent forms and contact information was kept in a separate area and will be destroyed six months after the study is complete. During the study, all hard copies of consent forms, surveys, and transcriptions were kept at the home of the researcher in a locked file cabinet. In addition, some of the data was kept on the researcher’s laptop computer under password lock and encryption. There were separate locked and coded folders on the researcher’s computer for consent forms, actual data, and for other
identifying information. Back-up files were kept separately, encrypted, and destroyed upon completion of the study. All data will be destroyed six months after completion of the study.

Conclusion

Data was collected, transcribed, and analyzed during the fall 2011 and spring 2012 semesters. Analysis included inputting quantitative data into SPSS files to run correlation analyses as well as code focus groups. Coding focus group discussions was based on coding as a means of data reduction. Coding is a qualitative method of associating conceptual labels with words or passages iterated in focus groups, then assigning similar passages into like categories (Alder & Clark, 1999). Words were used to categorize common themes aligning with research questions. The process began by identifying themes or forms of capital from the survey like “family support” or “community support.” Subsequent steps included focused coding identifying terms from the theoretical framework, discarding what was not related. Codes for the qualitative analysis included the use of capital, resiliency strategies, etc. Both types of data, quantitative and qualitative, were triangulated for consistency and to link meaning with behaviors. Chapters 4 and 5 provide greater detail of the data and significance of the findings.
This chapter is comprised of quantitative survey data results and qualitative focus group data. Both quantitative and qualitative data address the three research questions. The purpose of this study was to determine the self-perceived needs, barriers, and resiliency characteristics contributing to or diminishing the academic success of American Indian community college students at Sacramento City College. Relevant quantitative and qualitative data are addressed in accordance with each respective research question.

Needs, barriers, and resiliency characteristics are the independent variables upon which student success depends; therefore, student success is the dependent variable. Pearson Correlations were run on the quantitative data between the independent variables to establish which factors emerged as significant. Qualitative data were then reviewed for emergent concepts associated with at least one of the three independent variable categories – needs, barriers, or resiliency characteristics. Triangulation between the data...
then took place to assemble a complete list of specific needs, barriers, and resiliency characteristics of Native community college students who took part in this study.

- Research Question 1: What are the academic and personal needs of American Indian community college students?
- Research Question 2: What are the perceived barriers American Indian students face at the community college level?
- Research Question 3: What are the resiliency and other characteristics employed by American Indian community college students that contribute to student success?

Quantitative Data Analysis

Quantitative data from the survey address the three research questions. A Pearson Correlation analysis was conducted to ascertain significant relationships between the independent variables related to needs, barriers, and resiliency characteristics. Table 4 was constructed to reveal significant independent quantitative variables and serves as an outline for this section of the chapter.
Table 11

*Independent Quantitative Variables Impacting Native Student Success*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Resiliency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Support</td>
<td>Socioeconomic Disadvantage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid Advising</td>
<td>Inadequate Financial Resources/Lack of Finances</td>
<td>Scholarship/Financial Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bureaucratic Financial Aid Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Too Many Family Demands</td>
<td>Spiritual Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising/RISE</td>
<td>Bureaucratic Academic Advising</td>
<td>Social/Community Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOPS</td>
<td>Restrictive Admissions Practices</td>
<td>Friend/Peer Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer &amp; Other tutoring</td>
<td>Limited Academic Support</td>
<td>Role Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Labs</td>
<td>Limited Courses</td>
<td>Mentor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inadequate Coping Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant Correlations**

Significant correlations were found between some independent variables related to needs, barriers, and resiliency characteristics. Categories established in the literature explored in this study to determine needs, barriers, and resiliency characteristics included family involvement, community involvement, pre-college academic preparation or high
school experience, finances, faculty and coursework, institutional commitment, and resiliency characteristics. The following sections will further illustrate significant correlations.

Needs

This section will provide the reader with frequency statistics and correlations pertaining to student needs. Needs are defined as resources or skills needed to be successful. If a need is not met it may become a barrier to student success. Significant correlations occurred within the following categories: finances, academic advising, RISE, EOPS, peer and other tutoring and skill labs.
Table 12

**Significant Correlations Among Variables Related to Student Needs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Public Assistance to pay tuition</th>
<th>Grants &amp; Scholarships to pay tuition</th>
<th>Use EOPS</th>
<th>Use RISE</th>
<th>Important EOPS</th>
<th>Important RISE</th>
<th>Peer &amp; Other Tutoring</th>
<th>Skill Labs Importance</th>
<th>Skill Labs Satisfaction</th>
<th>Tutor Availability</th>
<th>Satisfaction EOPS</th>
<th>Satisfaction Academic Advising</th>
<th>Important Academic Advising</th>
<th>Satisfaction Financial Aid Advising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Assistance to pay tuition</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants &amp; Scholarships to pay tuition</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use EOPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use RISE</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important EOPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important RISE</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer &amp; Other Tutoring</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Labs Importance</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Labs Satisfaction</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor Availability</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction EOPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction Academic Advising</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important Academic Advising</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction Financial Aid Advising</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*+ = positive correlation with p=.01 or less*

**Finances**

This section provides the reader with frequency statistics and correlations pertaining to student finances. Sources of financial support were specific factors addressed in this section.
Frequency data ~ Annual yearly income. In the demographics section of the survey, students were asked to indicate their annual yearly income. The following frequency chart is the breakdown of student income. A majority of the students who answered this question (29, or 72.5%) fell at or below the $20,000 yearly income level. Twenty percent, or 10 students out of the 45 who took this survey and answered this question fell within the $0-2000 range.

Table 13

Annual Yearly Income Frequency Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12001-15000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40001-45000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-5000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15001-18000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45001-50000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001-8000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18001-20000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60001-65000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8001-10000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20001-25000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65001-70000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10001-12000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35001-40000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>95001-100000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximately 60% or 27 students stated they received financial aid in the demographics section of the survey.

Sources of financial support. In section three of the survey, question 2 asked students to indicate from a list of sources used to pay tuition, which ones were major, minor, or not a source of financial support. Significant correlations occurred between public assistance as a major source used to pay tuition and grants and scholarships as a major source of financial support used to pay tuition.
Tribal support and type. Although tribal support was listed as a source of financial support for a few students, when this independent variable was correlated with other variables in the survey, there was no significance. Frequency data indicate a majority of the students (86.7%, or 39 out of 45) who participated in the survey did not receive tribal financial support. For those who did receive tribal financial support, the type of support ranged from education funds set aside by the tribe, to grants, scholarships, the tribe paying for tuition and supplies, as well as use of per capita to pay for college. Per capita distributions are monetary payments to Native citizens of federally recognized tribes through either the Bureau of Indian Affairs or from the tribe. The monies are garnered from leased land in trust or Indian businesses the tribe owns and operates.

Public Assistance as a source of support used to pay tuition. Students who used public assistance as a major source of support to pay tuition were also likely to see grants and scholarships as a major source of support used to pay tuition.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Public Assistance/Grants &amp; Scholarships Sources of Major Support to Pay Tuition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Assistance used to pay tuition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* =.05 or less, **=.01 or less

The researcher is 99% sure findings are not due to chance with this correlation.

The correlation between using public assistance as a major financial resource to pay
tuition and students who use grants and scholarships as another major likely resource to pay tuition was significant, \( r(35) = .50, p<.01 \). The effect size (.499) is high. Students who were likely to use public assistance as a major source to pay their tuition were likely to also use grants and scholarships as a major financial resource to pay tuition.

Academic advising and student services ~ EOPS & RISE. Section five of the survey asked questions about institutional commitment and support. Question one asked how often services were used, question two asked how satisfied students were with those services, and question three asked about the importance of the services. Students were asked to rank how often they used the services with options of often, sometimes, rarely, never, don’t know, and N/A. When asked how important or satisfied with services students were given the option of choosing very, somewhat, not at all or N/A.

EOPS, which stands for Extended Opportunities Programs and Services and RISE, which stands for Respect, Integrity, Self-determination, and Education have many significant correlated factors: a) students who ranked public assistance as a major source to pay tuition were more likely to state they used EOPS & RISE often; b) students who ranked public assistance as a major source to pay tuition were more likely to state EOPS and RISE were very important services; c) students who ranked EOPS and RISE to be very important were likely to often use peer and other tutoring; d) students who ranked RISE to be very important were also likely to find tutor availability very important to their academic success; e) students who ranked EOPS and RISE to be very important were also likely to rate skill labs as very important; f) students who ranked EOPS and
RISE to be very important were likely to be very satisfied with skill labs; g) students likely to be very satisfied with EOPS were also likely to be very satisfied with academic advising; h) students who found RISE to be very important also found academic advising to be very important; i) students who found EOPS to be very important were likely to find financial aid advising to be very satisfying;

Table 15

*Correlation of Students Who Rely on Public Assistance/Students Who Used EOPS and RISE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students who were likely to rely on public assistance as a major source to pay tuition</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likely to often use EOPS</td>
<td>.464**</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.464 M-High</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely to often use RISE</td>
<td>.529**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.529 High</td>
<td>=.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = .05 or less, ** = .01 or less

The researcher is 99% sure correlation findings are not due to chance. The correlation between students likely to rely on public assistance as a major source to pay tuition and also likely to often use EOPS was significant, \( r(31) = .46, p < .01 \). The effect size (.464) is between medium and high. The correlation between students who were likely to rely on public assistance as a major source to pay tuition were also likely to often use RISE was significant, \( r(32) = .53, p = .001 \). The effect size (.529) is high. These correlations indicate students likely to rely on public assistance to pay for their tuition were also likely to often use EOPS and RISE.
Table 16

**Correlation Students Who Rely on Public Assistance/Importance of EOPS & RISE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students who were likely to rely on public assistance as a major source to pay tuition</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likely to see EOPS as very important</td>
<td>.566**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.566 High</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely to see RISE as very important</td>
<td>.496**</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.496 High</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = .05 or less, **=.01 or less

The researcher is 99% sure correlation findings are not due to chance. The correlation between students likely to rely on public assistance as a major source to pay tuition were also likely to see EOPS as very important was significant, $r(32) = .57$, $p<.001$. The effect size (.566) is high. The correlation between students likely to rely on public assistance as a major source to pay tuition were also likely to see RISE as very important was significant, $r(32) = .50$, $p<.01$. The effect size (.496) is high. The correlations mean students likely to rely on public assistance to pay their tuition were likely to see both EOPS and RISE as very important.

Table 17

**Correlation Importance of EOPS and RISE/ Use of Peer and Other Tutoring**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students who were likely to often use peer and other tutoring</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likely to see EOPS as very important</td>
<td>.495**</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.495 High</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely to see RISE as very important</td>
<td>.462**</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.462 M-High</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = .05 or less, **=.01 or less
The researcher is 99% sure correlation findings are not due to chance. The correlation between students likely to often use peer and other tutoring and the likelihood of seeing EOPS as very important was significant, \( r(32) = .50, p<.01 \). The effect size (.495) is high. The correlation between students likely to often use peer and other tutoring and the likelihood of seeing RISE as very important was significant, \( r(32) = .46, p<.01 \). The effect size (.462) is medium to high. The correlations mean students likely to often use peer and other tutoring were also likely to see EOPS and RISE each respectively as very important.

In section four, question three of the survey, students were asked to rank a number of factors they felt were important to their academic success on a scale of very, somewhat, not very, not at all, and N/A. Tutor availability was one such factor students were asked to rank.

Table 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely to see RISE as very important</th>
<th>Likely to see tutor availability as very important to their academic success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.561**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=35</td>
<td>df=33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher is 99% sure correlation findings are not due to chance. The correlation between students seeing tutor availability as very important and the likelihood of them seeing RISE as very important was significant, \( r(33) = .56, p<.001 \). The effect
size (.561) is high. The correlation means students who found RISE to be very important were also likely to find tutor availability to be very important to their academic success.

Table 19

*Correlation Importance of EOPS and RISE/Importance Skill Labs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely to rank Skill Labs as very important</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likely to see EOPS as very important</td>
<td>.587**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.587 High</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely to see RISE as very important</td>
<td>.540**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.540 High</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = .05 or less, ** = .01 or less

The researcher is 99% sure findings are not due to chance with the correlations.

The correlation between likely to rank skill labs as very important and the likelihood of seeing EOPS as very important was significant, \( r(34) = .59, p < .001 \). The effect size (.587) is high. The correlation between likely to rank skills labs as very important and the likelihood of seeing RISE as very important was significant, \( r(34) = .54, p = .001 \). The effect size (.54) is high. These correlations mean students likely to rank skill labs as very important were also likely to see both EOPS and RISE as important to academic success.

Table 20

*Correlation Importance of EOPS and RISE/Satisfaction Skill Labs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely to be very satisfied with Skill Labs</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likely to see EOPS as very important</td>
<td>.483**</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.483 M-High</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely to see RISE as very important</td>
<td>.506**</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.506 High</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = .05 or less, ** = .01 or less
The researcher is 99% sure findings are not due to chance with the correlations.

The correlation between the likelihood of students to be very satisfied with skill labs and the likelihood of seeing EOPS as very important was significant, \( r(33) = .48, p < .01 \). The effect size (.483) is medium to high. The correlation between the likelihood of students to be very satisfied with skill labs and the likelihood of seeing RISE as very important was significant, \( r(33) = .51, p < .01 \). The effect size (.506) is high. These correlations mean students very satisfied with skill labs were also likely to find both EOPS and RISE to be very important.

Table 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Likely to be very satisfied with</th>
<th>Likely to be very satisfied with Academic Advising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.471**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>df=33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=.05 or less, **=.01 or less

The researcher is 99% sure findings are not due to chance with this correlation.

The correlation between the likelihood of students to be very satisfied with EOPS and the likelihood of students to be very satisfied with academic advising was significant, \( r(33) = .47, p < .01 \). The effect size (.471) is between medium and high. The correlation means students who were likely to be very satisfied with EOPS were also likely to be very satisfied with academic advising.
Table 22

Correlation Importance of RISE/Importance of Academic Advising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely to see RISE as very important</th>
<th>Likely to see Academic Advising as very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.444**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=35</td>
<td>df=33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = .05 or less, ** = .01 or less

The researcher is 99% sure findings are not due to chance with this correlation.

The correlation between the likelihood of seeing RISE as very important and the likelihood of seeing Academic Advising as very important was significant, \( r(33) = .44, \ p < .01 \). The effect size (.444) is between medium and high. The correlation means students who were likely to see RISE as very important were also likely to find academic advising to be very important.

Table 23

Correlation Importance of EOPS/Satisfaction with Financial Aid Advising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely to see EOPS as very important</th>
<th>Likely to be very satisfied with financial aid advising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.517**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=35</td>
<td>df=33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = .05 or less, ** = .01 or less

The researcher is 99% sure findings are not due to chance with this correlation.

The correlation between the likelihood of seeing EOPS as very important and the likelihood of being very satisfied with financial aid advising was significant, \( r(33) = .52, \ p = .001 \). The effect size (.517) is high. The correlation means students who were likely to
find EOPS as very important were also likely to be very satisfied with financial aid advising.

**Barriers**

This section provides the reader with frequency statistics and correlations pertaining to barriers. Barriers are defined as something preventing students from achieving success. Barriers are considered to be an independent variable. Unmet needs may become barriers. Barriers may help indicate specific needs.
### Table 24

**Significant Correlations among Variables Related to Barriers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ = positive correlations, − = negative correlations with p<.05 or less

−· = negative correlation with p<.01 or less

---

**Socioeconomic Disadvantage**

The frequency statistics and correlations pertaining to barriers include socioeconomic disadvantage as a barrier, inadequate financial resources as a barrier, withdrawing because of bureaucratic financial aid, and negative correlations with withdrawing due to bureaucratic financial aid and were specific factors addressed in this section. In section one question eight of the survey, socioeconomic disadvantage is one
of the categories students were asked to rate as to whether it was a major barrier, moderate barrier, minor barrier, no barrier/no effect on success or N/A does not apply. Socioeconomic disadvantage seen as a major barrier correlates with several other variables including withdrawing for lack of finances, withdrawing due to restrictive admissions practices, withdrawing because of bureaucratic academic advising, withdrawing because of limited academic support services, seeing too many family demands as a barrier, and finally, units enrolled and units earned. Table 25 reveals factors correlated with socioeconomic disadvantage.

Table 25

*Correlations of Socioeconomic Disadvantage with Other Factors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socioeconomic Disadvantage &amp; Withdraw factors</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Withdraw lack of finances</td>
<td>.469**</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.469 M-High</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdraw restrictive admissions practices</td>
<td>.441**</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.441 M-High</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdraw bureaucratic academic advising</td>
<td>.478**</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.478 M-High</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdraw limited academic support services</td>
<td>.488**</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.478 M-High</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = .05 or less, ** = .01 or less

The researcher is 99% sure findings are not due to chance with the correlations in Table 25. The correlation between socioeconomic disadvantage as a major barrier and the likelihood of withdrawing because of a lack of finances was significant, \( r(38) = .47, p < .01 \). The effect size (.469) is medium to high. This correlation means students who considered socioeconomic disadvantage to be a major barrier were also very likely to withdraw due to lack of finances. The correlation between socioeconomic disadvantage
as a major barrier and the likelihood of withdrawing due to restrictive admissions practices was significant, $r(36) = .44, p<.01$. The effect size (.441) is medium to high. This means students who viewed socioeconomic disadvantage as a major barrier would also be very likely to withdraw due to restrictive admissions practices. The correlation between socioeconomic disadvantage as a major barrier and the likelihood of withdrawing due to bureaucratic academic advising was significant, $r(36) = .48, p<.01$. The effect size (.478) is medium to high. This means students who considered socioeconomic disadvantage as a major barrier would also be very likely to withdraw due to bureaucratic academic advising. The correlation between viewing socioeconomic disadvantage as a major barrier and the likelihood of withdrawing because of limited academic support was significant, $r(36) = .49, p<.01$. The effect size (.488) is medium to high. This means students who saw socioeconomic disadvantage as a major barrier would also be very likely to withdraw because of limited academic support. These correlations are significant in that students who see socioeconomic disadvantage as a major barrier would also be very likely to withdraw because of a lack of finances, restrictive admissions practices, bureaucratic academic advising, and limited academic support.

Too many family demands. An additional correlation took place between socioeconomic disadvantage seen as a major barrier and too many family demands as a major barrier. These two variables were found in the same section in the survey (section one, question eight).
Table 26

*Correlation Socioeconomic Disadvantage/Too Many Family Demands*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socioeconomic Disadvantage</th>
<th>Too many family demands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.506**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=40</td>
<td>df=38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = .05 or less, ** = .01 or less

The researcher is 99% sure correlation findings are not due to chance. The correlation between socioeconomic disadvantage seen as a major barrier and too many family demands as a major barrier was significant, \( r(38) = .51, p = .001 \). The effect size (.506) is high. This correlation means students who perceive socioeconomic disadvantage as a major barrier were also likely to view too many family demands as a major barrier.

Units enrolled/units earned. In the demographic section of the survey, students were asked in how many units they were enrolled and how many units they had earned. These variables correlated with socioeconomic disadvantage.

Table 27

*Correlation Socioeconomic Disadvantage Seen as a Major Barrier*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units Enrolled</td>
<td>-.370*</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.37 Medium</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units Earned</td>
<td>.558**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.558 High</td>
<td>=.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = .05 or less, ** = .01 or less

This researcher is 95% sure findings are not due to chance. The negative correlation between socioeconomic disadvantage as a barrier and units enrolled was
significant, \( r(38) = -0.37, p<0.05 \). The effect size (.37) is closer to medium. This negative correlation between socioeconomic disadvantage as a major barrier and units enrolled reveals that students who saw socioeconomic disadvantage as a major barrier were likely to enroll in fewer units.

The researcher is 99% sure findings are not due to chance. The correlation between socioeconomic disadvantage as a major barrier and units earned was significant, \( r(32) = 0.56, p=0.001 \). The effect size (.558) is high. Students who had earned more units were likely to see socioeconomic disadvantage as a major barrier.

**Inadequate financial resources.** Section one question eight of the survey asked students to rate each characteristic listed in terms of whether or not it was a major barrier, moderate barrier, minor barrier, no barrier/no effect on success, or N/A or does not apply. Inadequate financial resources as a major barrier to success was one characteristic students were to rate, which was found to correlate with a) students who were very likely to withdraw because of a lack of finances, b) students who were very likely to withdraw because of bureaucratic financial aid, and c) students who were very likely to withdraw due to limited courses.

**Withdraw lack of finances.** Section one question nine of the survey asked students if certain factors or issues would cause them to withdraw from class or from the college. Options were not likely, somewhat likely, likely, and very likely. There was a strong correlation between perceiving inadequate financial resources as a barrier and being very likely to withdraw due to the lack of finances.
Table 28

**Correlation Inadequate Financial Resources/Withdraw Lack of Finances**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inadequate Financial Resources</th>
<th>Withdraw Lack of Finances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.528**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>df=39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* =.05 or less, **=.01 or less

The researcher is 99% sure findings are not due to chance with this correlation.

The correlation between students with inadequate financial resources and withdrawing because of a lack of finances was significant, $r(39) = .53$, $p<.001$. The effect size (.528) is high. Students who saw inadequate financial resources as a barrier to academic success were also very likely to withdraw due to lack of finances.

*Withdraw because of bureaucratic financial aid.* Also found in section one question nine of the survey was withdrawing because of bureaucratic financial aid. This variable strongly correlated with students perceiving inadequate financial resources as a barrier.

Table 29

**Correlation Inadequate Financial Resources/Withdraw Bureaucratic Financial Aid**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inadequate Financial Resources</th>
<th>Withdraw Bureaucratic Financial Aid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.631**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>df=39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* =.05 or less, **=.01 or less

The researcher is 99% sure findings are not due to chance with this correlation.

The correlation between perceiving inadequate financial resources as a major barrier and
being very likely to withdraw due to bureaucratic financial aid was significant, $r(39) = .63, p<.001$. The effect size (.63) was high. This means students who saw inadequate financial resources as a major barrier were also very likely to withdraw due to bureaucratic financial aid.

Withdraw because of limited courses. Found in section one question nine of the survey was withdrawing because of limited courses, which correlated with inadequate financial resources as a barrier to student success.

Table 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inadequate Financial Resources</th>
<th>Withdraw Limited Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.449**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=40</td>
<td>df=38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* =.05 or less, **=.01 or less

The researcher is 99% sure findings are not due to chance with this correlation.

The correlation between seeing inadequate financial resources as a major barrier and being very likely to withdraw because of limited courses was significant, $r(38) =.45, p<.01$. The effect size (.449) is between medium and high. Students who saw inadequate financial resources as a major barrier were also very likely to withdraw due to limited courses.

Withdraw due to bureaucratic financial aid. In section one, question nine asked students how likely certain factors or issues would cause them to withdraw from class or from the college. Being very likely to withdraw because of bureaucratic financial aid
services was one of the significant factors that correlated with being very likely to: withdraw due to a lack of finances, withdraw due to restrictive admissions practices, withdraw because of bureaucratic academic advising, withdraw because of limited academic support, and withdraw due to limited courses. Table 31 reveals factors that correlated with being very likely to withdraw due to bureaucratic financial aid services.

Table 31

*Correlations Withdraw due to Bureaucratic Financial Aid Services with Other Factors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Relationship with Withdraw Bureaucratic Financial Aid Services</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Withdraw lack of finances</td>
<td>.574**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.574 High</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdraw restrictive admissions practices</td>
<td>.465**</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.465 M-High</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdraw bureaucratic academic advising</td>
<td>.505**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.505 High</td>
<td>=.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdraw limited academic support</td>
<td>.479**</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.479 M-High</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdraw limited courses</td>
<td>.511**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.511 High</td>
<td>=.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = .05 or less, ** = .01 or less

Withdrawning because of a lack of finances. The researcher is 99% sure findings are not due to chance with the correlations in Table 31. The correlation between being very likely to withdraw due to bureaucratic financial aid services and being very likely to withdraw because of a lack of finances was significant, $r(39) = .57, p < .001$. The effect size (.574) is high. This correlation means students who were very likely to withdraw due to a lack of finances were also very likely to withdraw due to bureaucratic financial aid services.
**Withdrawing due to restrictive admissions practices.** The correlation between being very likely to withdraw due to bureaucratic financial aid services and being very likely to withdraw due to restrictive admissions practices was significant, \( r(37) = .47, p < .01 \). The effect size (.465) is medium to high. Students who were very likely to withdraw due to restrictive admissions practices were also very likely to withdraw due to experiencing bureaucratic financial aid services.

**Withdrawing because of bureaucratic academic advising.** The correlation between being very likely to withdraw due to bureaucratic financial aid services and being very likely to withdraw because of bureaucratic academic advising was significant, \( r(37) = .51, p = .001 \). The effect size (.505) is high. Students who were very likely to withdraw due to bureaucratic financial aid services were also very likely to withdraw because of bureaucratic academic advising.

**Withdrawing due to limited academic support.** The correlation between being very likely to withdraw due to bureaucratic financial aid services and being very likely to withdraw because of limited academic support was significant, \( r(37) = .48, p < .01 \). The effect size (.479) is medium to high. Students who were very likely to withdraw due to bureaucratic financial aid services were also very likely to withdraw because of limited academic support.

**Withdrawing because of limited courses.** The correlation between being very likely to withdraw due to bureaucratic financial aid services and being very likely to withdraw due to limited courses was significant, \( r(38) = .51, p = .001 \). The effect size
(.511) is high. Students who were very likely to withdraw due to bureaucratic financial aid services were also very likely to withdraw due to limited courses.

These correlations imply students who were very likely to withdraw because of a lack of finances, restrictive admissions practices, bureaucratic academic advising, limited academic support and limited courses were also very likely to do so because of bureaucratic financial aid services.

*Socioeconomic disadvantage.* One final correlation with being very likely to withdraw due to bureaucratic financial aid services includes socioeconomic disadvantage seen as a major barrier, which is found in section one question eight of the survey. Students were to rate characteristics as to whether they were major barriers, moderate barriers, minor barriers, no barrier/no effect on success, or N/A does not apply.

Table 32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Withdraw Bureaucratic Financial Aid/Socioeconomic Disadvantage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Withdraw Bureaucratic Financial Aid Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* =.05 or less, **=.01 or less

The researcher is 99% sure findings are not due to chance with this correlation. The correlation between being very likely to withdraw due to bureaucratic financial aid services and viewing socioeconomic disadvantage as a major barrier was significant, \( r(38) = .58, p < .001 \). The effect size (.583) is high. This correlation means students who
saw socioeconomic disadvantage as a major barrier, were very likely to withdraw due to bureaucratic financial aid services.

Negative correlations – Withdrawing due to bureaucratic financial aid. Three significant negative correlations were associated with being very likely to withdraw due to bureaucratic financial aid. These three variables were found in section five, question four of the survey, which asked students how much the college emphasized certain factors. Factors that were significant included providing support needed to ensure student success, help coping with non-academic responsibilities, and providing financial support.

Table 33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative correlations with Withdraw Bureaucratic Financial Aid Services</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College providing support to achieve success</td>
<td>-.440**</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.44 M-High</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College helping cope with non-academic responsibilities</td>
<td>-.437**</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.437 M-High</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College provided financial support</td>
<td>-.495**</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.495 High</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* =.05 or less, **=.01 or less

The researcher is 99% sure findings are not due to chance with all three correlations. The negative correlation between being very likely to withdraw due to bureaucratic financial aid services and the college’s emphasis on support was significant, \( r(34) = -.44, p<.01 \). The effect size (.44) is between medium and high. This negative correlation means students would be less likely to withdraw because of bureaucratic
financial aid services if at the same time the college were to provide support needed to ensure student success.

The negative correlation between being very likely to withdraw due to bureaucratic financial aid services and the college’s emphasis on helping students cope with non-academic responsibilities was significant, \( r(34) = -.44, p < .01 \). The effect size (.437) is medium to high. This negative correlation means students would be less likely to withdraw because of bureaucratic financial aid services if at the same time the college’s emphasis were to help students cope with non-academic responsibilities.

The negative correlation between being very likely to withdraw due to bureaucratic financial aid services and the college’s emphasis on providing students with financial support was significant, \( r(34) = -.50, p < .01 \). The effect size (.495) is high. This negative correlation means students would be less likely to withdraw due to bureaucratic financial support if at the same time the college’s emphasis were on providing students with financial support.

Students who said if the college emphasized support to ensure success and helped coping with non-academic responsibilities and financial support, they said they would also be less likely to withdraw due to bureaucratic financial aid.

*Withdrawing due to restrictive admissions practices.* In section one, question nine of the survey students were asked to rank a number of different factors that would cause them to withdraw from class or from college. Students were asked to rank factors as to very likely, likely, somewhat likely, and not likely. Withdrawing because of
restrictive admissions practices correlated with several other variables including withdrawing because of bureaucratic academic advising, withdrawing due to limited academic support, using public assistance to pay tuition, socioeconomic disadvantage, and students with too many family demands.

Table 34

*Correlations Withdraw due to Restrictive Admissions Practices with Other Factors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Relationship with Withdraw Restrictive Admissions Practices</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Withdraw bureaucratic academic advising</td>
<td>.520**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.52 High</td>
<td>=.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdraw limited academic support</td>
<td>.580**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.58 High</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using public assistance to pay tuition</td>
<td>.477**</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.477 M-High</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic disadvantage</td>
<td>.441**</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.441 M-High</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many family demands</td>
<td>.418**</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.418 M-High</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = .05 or less, ** = .01 or less

Withdraw due to bureaucratic academic advising. The researcher is 99% sure findings are not due to chance with the correlations in Table 34. The correlation between being very likely to withdraw due to restrictive admissions practices and being very likely to withdraw because of bureaucratic academic advising was significant, $r(36) = .52, p=.001$. The effect size (.52) is high. This correlation means students who were very likely to withdraw due to restrictive admissions practices were also very likely to withdraw due to bureaucratic academic advising.

Withdraw because of limited academic support. The correlation between being very likely to withdraw because of restrictive admissions practices and being very likely
to withdraw due to limited academic support was significant, $r(36) = .58, p < .001$. The effect size (.58) is high. Students who were very likely to withdraw due to restrictive admissions practices were also very likely to withdraw due to limited academic support.

*Using public assistance to pay tuition.* The correlation between being very likely to withdraw due to restrictive admissions practices and using public assistance as a major source to pay tuition was significant, $r(33) = .48, p < .01$. The effect size (.477) is medium to high. Students who were very likely to withdraw because of restrictive admissions practices indicated they use public assistance as a major source to pay tuition.

*Socioeconomic disadvantage.* The correlation between being very likely to withdraw because of restrictive admissions practices and students who see socioeconomic disadvantage as a barrier to their success was significant, $r(36) = .44, p < .01$. The effect size (.441) is medium to high. Students who were very likely to withdraw due to restrictive admissions practices also said that socioeconomic disadvantage was a major barrier.

*Too many family demands as barrier.* The correlation between being very likely to withdraw due to restrictive admissions practices and seeing too many family demands as a major barrier was significant, $r(36) = .42, p < .01$. The effect size (.418) is between medium and high. Students who were very likely to withdraw due to restrictive admissions practices were also likely to see too many family demands as a major barrier.

*Inadequate coping skills as a barrier to academic success.* In section one, question eight asked students to rate certain characteristics that would serve as barriers to
academic success. Choices were major barrier, moderate barrier, minor barrier, no barrier/no effect on success, and N/A does not apply. Inadequate coping skills were seen as a major barrier correlating with being very likely to withdraw due to limited courses and being very likely to withdraw due to transportation issues.

*Withdrawing due to limited number of courses.* Section one question nine asked students to rank factors that would cause them to withdraw from class or the college based on a scale of very likely, likely, somewhat likely, and not likely. Being very likely to withdraw due to limited number of courses strongly correlated with inadequate coping skills as a major barrier.

Table 35

**Correlation Inadequate Coping Skills as Barrier/Withdraw due to Limited Courses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inadequate Coping Skills as Barrier</th>
<th>Likely to withdraw due to Limited Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.452**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=40</td>
<td>df=38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = .05 or less, **= .01 or less

The researcher is 99% sure findings are not due to chance with the correlation. The correlation between being very likely to withdraw due to limited courses and inadequate coping skills as a major barrier was significant, \( r(38) = .45, p < .01 \). The effect size (.45) is between medium and high. The correlation means students who saw inadequate coping skills as a major barrier would also be very likely to withdraw due to limited courses.
Withdraw due to transportation issues. Section one question nine asked students to rank factors that would cause them to withdraw from class or the college based on a scale of very likely, likely, somewhat likely, and not likely. Being very likely to withdraw due to transportation issues strongly correlated with inadequate coping skills as a barrier.

Table 36

Correlation Inadequate Coping Skills as Barrier/Withdraw due to Transportation Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inadequate Coping Skills as a barrier</th>
<th>Likely to Withdraw due to Transportation Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.562**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=39</td>
<td>df=37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = .05 or less, ** = .01 or less

The researcher is 99% sure findings are not due to chance with this correlation.

The correlation between inadequate coping skills as a barrier and being very likely to withdraw due to transportation issues was significant, $r(37) = .56$, $p < .001$. The effect size (.56) is high. The correlation means students who saw inadequate coping skills as a major barrier were very likely to withdraw due to transportation issues.

Withdrawning because of transportation issues. In section one, question nine asked students to rank how likely certain factors or issues would cause them withdraw from class or from the college. Options such as very likely, likely, somewhat likely and not likely were listed. Being very likely to withdraw because of transportation issues
correlated with being very likely to withdraw because of limited number of courses and, as stated earlier, inadequate coping skills as a major barrier.

Table 37

*Correlation Withdraw due to Transportation Issues / Withdraw Limited Number of Courses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Withdraw due to limited number of courses</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.447**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=39</td>
<td>df=37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = .05 or less, ** = .01 or less

The researcher is 99% sure findings are not due to chance with the correlation.

The correlation between being very likely to withdraw due to transportation issues and being very likely to withdraw due to limited number of courses was significant, \( r(37) = .45 \ p<.01 \). The effect size (.447) is between medium and high. The correlation means students who would withdraw due to transportation issues were also very likely to withdraw due to limited number of courses.

*Resiliency*

Section six of the survey asked students to rank from a list of factors the most important resiliency factors with regard to their academic success. Significant correlations emerged between resiliency characteristics including spiritual support and scholarship/financial support; spiritual support and mentors; spiritual support and social/community support; social/community support and role model; social/community support and friend/peer support.
Table 38

Significant Correlations among Variables Related to Resiliency Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spiritual Support Resiliency</th>
<th>Scholarship/Financial Support Resiliency</th>
<th>Social/Community Support Resiliency</th>
<th>Role Model Resiliency</th>
<th>Friend/Peer Support Resiliency</th>
<th>Mentors Resiliency</th>
<th>Inadequate Financial Resources as Barrier</th>
<th>Grants/Scholarships source to pay tuition</th>
<th>Public Assistance source to pay tuition</th>
<th>Peer and other Tutoring (used)</th>
<th>Financial Aid Advising (used)</th>
<th>Financial Aid Advising (satisfied)</th>
<th>Financial Aid Advising (importance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Support Resiliency</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship/Financial Support Resiliency</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Community Support Resiliency</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Model Resiliency</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend/Peer Support Resiliency</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors Resiliency</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate Financial Resources as Barrier</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants/Scholarships source to pay tuition</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Assistance source to pay tuition</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer and other Tutoring (used)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid Advising (used)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid Advising (satisfied)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid Advising (importance)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ = positive correlation with p ≤ 0.01 or less
Table 39

Correlations between Resiliency Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Relationships between Resiliency factors</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Support/Scholarship Financial Support</td>
<td>.482**</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.482 M-High</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Support/Mentors</td>
<td>.478**</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.478 M-High</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Support/Social Community Support</td>
<td>.536**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.536 High</td>
<td>=.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Community Support/Role Model</td>
<td>.507**</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.51 High</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Community Support/Friend Peer Support</td>
<td>.595**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.60 High</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = .05 or less, ** = .01 or less

Table 39 indicates that at minimum six resiliency factors had some type of correlation with another resiliency characteristic.

Spiritual support/scholarship financial support. The researcher is 99% sure findings are not due to chance with the correlations in Table 39. The correlation between spiritual support and scholarship/financial support was significant, \( r(32) = .48, p < .01 \). The effect size (.482) is between medium and high. This correlation means students who ranked spiritual support as an important resiliency factor for their academic success were also likely to rank scholarship/financial support as an important resiliency factor.

Spiritual support/mentors. The correlation between spiritual support and mentors was significant, \( r(31) = .48, p < .01 \). The effect size (.478) is medium to high. Students who ranked spiritual support as an important resiliency factor for their academic success were also likely to rank mentors as an important resiliency factor.
**Spiritual support/social community support.** The correlation between spiritual support and social community support was significant, $r(31) = .54$, $p=.001$. The effect size (.536) is high. Students who chose spiritual support as an important resiliency factor for their academic success were also likely to rank social/community support as an important resiliency factor.

**Social community support/role model.** The correlation between social/community support and role model was significant, $r(31) = .51$, $p<.01$. The effect size (.51) is high. Students who chose social/community support as an important resiliency factor for their academic success were also likely to rank role models as an important resiliency factor.

**Social community support/friend peer support.** The correlation between social/community support and friend/peer support was significant, $r(32) = .60$, $p<.001$. The effect size (.60) is high. Students who chose social/community support as an important resiliency factor for their academic success were also likely to rank friend/peer support as an important resiliency factor.

**Spiritual support resiliency factor.** Spiritual support as a resiliency factor correlated with a number of other variables including inadequate financial resources as a barrier, the use of grants and scholarships as a source to pay for tuition and the use of public assistance as a source to pay for tuition.
Table 40

*Correlations Spiritual Support Resiliency with Other Financial Factors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Relationship with Spiritual Support Resiliency</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate Financial Resources Barrier</td>
<td>.437**</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.437 M-High</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants/Scholarships to pay tuition</td>
<td>.520**</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.52 High</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Assistance to pay tuition</td>
<td>.461**</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.461 M-High</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * =.05 or less, ** =.01 or less

*Inadequate financial resources barrier.* The researcher is 99% sure findings are not due to chance with the correlations. The correlation between spiritual support as a resiliency factor and inadequate financial resources as a major barrier was significant, $r(32) = .44 \ p=.01$. The effect size (.437) is between medium and high. This correlation means students who ranked spiritual support as an important resiliency factor were more likely to consider inadequate financial resources as a major barrier.

*Grants/scholarships to pay tuition.* The correlation between spiritual support as a resiliency factor and grants/scholarships used as a major source to pay for tuition was significant, $r(31) = .52 \ p<.01$. The effect size (.52) is high. This correlation means students who said spiritual support was an important resiliency factor were also likely to use grants and scholarships as a major source to pay tuition.

*Public assistance to pay tuition.* The correlation between spiritual support as a resiliency factor and using public assistance to pay tuition was significant, $r(31) = .46 \ p<.01$. The effect size (.461) is between medium and high. This correlation means
students who said spiritual support was an important resiliency factor were likely to use public assistance as a major source to pay tuition.

**Scholarship/financial support as a resiliency factor.** Scholarship/Financial support as a resiliency factor correlated with a number of other variables including grants and scholarships as a source to pay tuition, used peer or other tutoring, used financial aid advising, satisfied with financial aid advising, and importance of financial aid advising.

Table 41

*Correlations Scholarship Financial Support Resiliency with Other Factors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Relationship with Scholarship/Financial Support Resiliency</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants/Scholarships to pay tuition</td>
<td>.482**</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.482 M-High</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used Peer or other Tutoring</td>
<td>.449**</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.449 M-High</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used Financial Aid Advising</td>
<td>.476**</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.476 M-High</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with Financial Aid Advising</td>
<td>.590**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.59 High</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Financial Aid Advising</td>
<td>.581**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.58 High</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = .05 or less, ** = .01 or less

**Grants and scholarships to pay tuition.** The researcher is 99% sure findings are not due to chance with the correlation. The correlation between scholarship/financial support as a resiliency factor and grants/scholarships used to pay for tuition was significant, r(34) = .48 p < .01. The effect size (.482) is between medium and high. This correlation means students who said scholarship/financial support was an important resiliency factor were likely to use grants and scholarships as a major source to pay tuition.
**Used peer or other tutoring.** The researcher is 99% sure findings are not due to chance with the correlation. The correlation between scholarship/financial support as a resiliency factor and used peer or other tutoring was significant, $r(34) = .45$, $p<.01$. The effect size (.449) is between medium and high. This correlation means students who said scholarship/financial support was an important resiliency factor also said they were very likely to use peer or other tutoring.

**Used financial aid advising.** The researcher is 99% sure findings are not due to chance with the correlation. The correlation between scholarship/financial support as a resiliency factor and using financial aid advising was significant, $r(34) = .48$, $p<.01$. The effect size (.476) is between medium and high. This correlation means students who said scholarship/financial support was an important resiliency factor also said they were very likely to use financial aid advising.

**Satisfied with financial aid advising.** The researcher is 99% sure findings are not due to chance with the correlation. The correlation between scholarship/financial support as a resiliency factor and being satisfied with financial aid advising was significant, $r(34) = .59$, $p<.001$. The effect size (.59) is high. This correlation means students who said scholarship/financial support was an important resiliency factor also said they were very satisfied with financial aid advising.

**Importance financial aid advising.** The researcher is 99% sure findings are not due to chance with the correlation. The correlation between scholarship/financial support as a resiliency factor and the importance of financial aid advising was significant, $r(35) =$
58, p < .001. The effect size (.581) is high. This correlation means students who said scholarship/financial support was an important resiliency factor also said they were very likely to see financial aid advising as important.

Quantitative Analysis Summary

*Needs of American Indian Community College Students: Quantitative Analysis*

Research question 1: What are the academic and personal needs of American Indian community college students?

Quantitative analysis reveals the needs of American Indian community college students who participated in this study to be the following:

- financial aid and financial support,
- academic advising through RISE and EOPS, and
- peer and other tutoring and skill labs.

Services found to be important were:

- RISE (by students who received financial aid and those who used public assistance to pay for their education),
- EOPS (by students who used public assistance to pay for their education; in correlation with satisfaction with financial aid advising), the satisfaction and importance of academic advising (RISE),
- skill labs (EOPS & RISE),
- tutor availability (RISE), and
• EOPS & RISE (peer and other tutoring). Students used the following services or resources: grants and scholarships to pay tuition; public assistance to pay tuition; financial aid, EOPS and RISE, peer and other tutoring (in relation to importance of EOPS & RISE).

Students were satisfied with the following services: EOPS (academic advising) skill labs (important EOPS & RISE); and RISE (students who had earned units). Students were satisfied with financial aid advising.

*Perceived Barriers for American Indian Community College Students: Quantitative Analysis*

Research question 2: What are the perceived barriers that American Indian students face at the community college level?

Quantitative analysis reveals the perceived barriers of American Indian community college students who participated in this study to be the following:

• socioeconomic disadvantage,
• inadequate financial resources,
• lack of financial support,
• bureaucratic financial aid services,
• restrictive admissions practices,
• limited academic support,
• limited number and variety of courses offered,
• bureaucratic academic advising,
• too many family demands,
• transportation issues, and
• inadequate coping skills.

A significant finding revealed that if the college emphasized support, financial support, and help coping with non-academic responsibilities, Native students would be less likely to withdraw due to bureaucratic financial aid services.

Students who were more likely to see inadequate financial resources as a barrier to academic success were more likely to withdraw from a class or the college due to lack of finances. Furthermore, students who perceived socioeconomic disadvantage as a barrier would be more likely to withdraw from classes or the college because of a lack of finances, bureaucratic financial aid services, restrictive admissions practices, bureaucratic academic advising, and because of limited academic support. Moreover, students who were more likely to use public assistance as a resource to pay tuition were also more likely to withdraw because of restrictive admissions practices.

A number of factors could conceivably work together to prevent Native student success. For instance, students who were likely to withdraw because of a lack of finances, restrictive admissions practices, bureaucratic academic advising, limited academic support, and limited number and variety of courses were also likely to do so because of bureaucratic financial aid services. Being likely to withdraw due to restrictive admissions practices and due to limited academic support also correlated with too many family demands, which was likely seen as a major barrier.
Resiliency Characteristics that Contribute to Student Success: Quantitative Analysis

Research question 3: What are the resiliency and other characteristics employed by American Indian community college students that contribute to student success?

Resiliency is defined as the skills or processes by which people cope with oppressive conditions. Quantitative analysis revealed students were likely to feel the following characteristics were important: scholarship/financial support, spiritual support, social/community support, friend/peer support, serving as a role model, and obtaining mentoring as a resiliency characteristic.

Scholarship/financial support refers to skills or knowledge necessary to obtain financial support. This resiliency characteristic strongly correlated with the use, importance of, and satisfaction with financial aid advising as well as with using peer and other tutoring. This resiliency characteristic also correlated with students who used grants and scholarships as a resource to pay tuition. This would make sense because students have obtained skills necessary to obtain these resources and incorporate them with the resiliency characteristic scholarship/financial support. Students enrolled in units correlated with financial support as an important resiliency factor. Units earned also correlated with financial support as an important resiliency factor.

Spiritual support as a resiliency characteristic has to do with the ability to cope with factors that may be out of one’s control. Students who ranked scholarship/financial support as an important resiliency factor were also likely to rank spiritual support as a factor. Students indicated that spiritual support as a resiliency characteristic was likely
used when they were also likely to face inadequate financial resources as a barrier. Spiritual support resiliency also correlated with students who were likely to use public assistance and grants and scholarships as a major resource to pay for tuition. Students who were enrolled in more units were less likely to view spiritual support as a resiliency factor.

Social/community support as a resiliency factor is defined as receiving support from the larger community including social groups, religious groups, and cultural groups and or tribes. Spiritual support as a resiliency characteristic correlated with social/community support as a resiliency factor.

Friend or peer support or obtaining emotional support from friends or college peers as a resiliency factor and utilizing role models as a resiliency characteristic both strongly correlated with social/community support as a resiliency factor.

Although mentors or mentoring as a resiliency factor correlated with spiritual support as a resiliency factor, this resiliency characteristic had a negative correlation with students enrolled in units, indicating that enrolled students were not likely to see themselves as mentors as a resiliency characteristic.

Qualitative Data Analysis

The qualitative data includes three focus group transcripts. These transcripts were read and coded by the researcher. Questions asked during the focus group sessions were based on the research questions: 1) What are the academic and personal needs of
American Indian community college students? 2) What are the perceived barriers American Indian students face at the community college level? 3) What are the resiliency and other characteristics employed by American Indian community college students contributing to student success? Specific questions asked during the focus group directly related to the research questions. Focus group question 13, which equated to research question 1 about academic and personal needs asked students, what are the needs of Native students at the community college level? Focus group questions 7 and 12 equated to research question 2 about barriers by asking students, what do you see as the barriers to obtaining academic success and what are the greatest barriers that could prevent you from achieving your goals? Focus group question 10 equates to research question 3 about resiliency by asking students, what are your greatest resources that you believe positively impact your academic success?
Table 42

*Qualitative Needs, Barriers and Resiliency Characteristics Chart*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Resiliency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Support &amp; Recognition</td>
<td>Education System</td>
<td>Resistance/Survivance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of Recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Counseling</td>
<td>Admissions &amp; Records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(paperwork/policy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>Lack of Financial Resources or Inadequate Finances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Student Outreach</td>
<td>Financial Aid Services (paperwork/policy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment &amp; Retention</td>
<td>Limited Courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Caring Culturally Competent Professors</td>
<td>Racial Stereotypes in Course Content reinforced by Professors</td>
<td>Academic Support from Professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from Family Attending College</td>
<td>Lack of Tribal &amp; Family Support</td>
<td>Family &amp; Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Speakers and Mentors from the Community Telling their Stories</td>
<td>Condescending Tutors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug and Alcohol Counseling Services</td>
<td>Cost of Books</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs like RISE and other support services like Labs</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Program Support (RISE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Organizations Peers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Native American Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Needs of American Indian Community College Students: Qualitative Analysis*

Drawing from the patterns of responses, qualitative analysis reveals the academic and personal needs of American Indian community college students who participated in the focus groups of this study to be: support and recognition; academic counseling;
financial aid; Native student outreach; recruitment and retention; more caring, culturally
competent professors; support from family members attending college; Native
speakers/mentors from the community to tell their experiences and success stories; drug
and alcohol counseling on campus; programs (RISE) and other support services like the
writing lab and math lab; student organizations and peers.

*Need - College support & recognition.* There were patterns of responses by
Native students who felt invisible and needed more support and recognition. In addition,
students expressed a need for the campus community to have more Native events
happening and more Native student outreach. The following examples express the need
for Native student recognition and the connection between this and their needs being
pushed aside.

I think Native students probably the hardest part, at least for me from a Native
perspective being at a community college, is that there is just a lack of
recognition. And here it is so much greater here. We have so much more than
other places do because we have a ton of Native students and we have a ton of
Native studies teachers, many of whom themselves are Native American, and we
have a lot of other faculty members who do genuinely care about the concerns of
Native American students, but at the same time there is just a general -- and I
mean it's the same sort of disregard that's just through the rest of the community
that they don't see it as disregard and that's the hardest part is getting them to see
it as how much Native students are being ignored and how much their needs are
being pushed aside enough to then recognize that Native students need more -- we
need some sort of support system that is stuck into the hardwiring of the education
system itself and not just through finding our own community in the school.
(Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 7, pp. 30-31, lines 21-13)

Also, even by campus community acknowledging Native American students in
the community or in the city and promoting those services on campus that would
be great help for the American Indian students. (Focus Group 2, Female Native
Student 9, p. 27, lines 3-6)
Two additional female Native students also felt more recognition, support, and events needed to take place (Focus Group 3, Female Native Students 11 & 12, p. 17, lines 8-10).

**Need - Native student outreach & programming.** Patterned responses from students revealed a need for Native student outreach and programming on campus. This coincides with the need for recognition. In the example, one student expressed a need for more native students, faculty, and administrators.

More Native faces are needed not just students but faculty and administrators. (Focus Group 1, Male Native Student 2, p. 33, lines 19-25)

One of the biggest things that this community college needs is Native outreach. (Focus Group 1, Male Native Student 2, p. 34, lines 1-5)

The school maybe could do something to recognize on a school-wide basis Native American -- California Indian Day or some of the other days we have. (Focus Group 1, Male Native Student 2, p. 42, lines 2-6)

I know in my tribe we consider new years in May. And if we could have like a Native new years celebration...And just a lot of things that we do traditionally to acknowledge passing time and our world, if the school could recognize that, that hey, this is a special day for us. (Focus Group 1, Male Native Student 2, p. 42, lines 16-21)

More Native student outreach was a theme discussed by a few students.

And I think that would bring more students to come out of high school and everywhere else that would come join this community college if there was more advertisement about the Native American studies program. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 8, p. 27, lines 7-10)

Few programs are mentioned like Tribal Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) and California Indian Manpower Consortium (CIMC) to assist Native students.

So the interaction between community and education at the college level, even at the high school level, because...there is no outreach really. There's a few programs and there's a few individuals that come through from TANF or whoever
that can go, "You can go to college," because there's some educated women, Indian women especially, in some of the programs for TANF and CIMC that will help students. And through proxy it ends up getting to them where they get help. (Focus Group 3, Female Native Student 13, p. lines )

I would have to say with the needs of the Native students, there's a lot of Indian kids that are out there that are not in school now and that need to be in school. And if you would just -- if the community -- the Indian community would come out and just reach out to them and say, "You know, school is good. You are going to become something in life. Just go for it and do it. Go day by day and take it slow and you can accomplish something in life. Just don't listen to what your family says or think you have to stay at home and babysit kids or any of that. Go to school! (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 8, p. 32, lines 1-10)

**Need - Native American studies division.** A few students who participated in this study felt some kind of department or division with an administrative leader like a chair or dean would improve recognition and fulfill the needs of Native students. Students had ideas of creating a Native American Studies Division including any disciplinary field like Ethnic Studies, History, Art, etc. which would bring recognition to Native students on campus and would also bring about a greater awareness of contemporary Indian issues not just to students but to professors, administrators, and staff assisting Native students in their success.

So what I think community college can do to better Native Americans is to give us our own department, to have our own dean, more classes, because right now we're in an ethnic department and we're shifted all around. I mean, how are Native Americans going to get an identity when they don't even have a department. How about a Native American history department with a dean and more than one teacher to teach Native American studies. (Focus Group 1, Male Native Student 5, p. 41, lines 4-12)

This ideology to create a department relates to identifying who or what has power to make change. For Native students to call for a department means they are thinking about
ways in which they can get their needs met, address and reduce or eliminate barriers, and reinforce resiliency characteristics.

I think the biggest part for me is if there was just more in classes about Native Americans and Native American people because even in history classes where I have had really respectful teachers, really knowledgeable teachers, there's always the Native Americans. There's not this people over here and this people over here. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 7, p. 34, lines 3-10)

In the previous example, Female Native Student 7 in Focus Group 2 is concerned Natives are being lumped into one category in history classes when tribes and their experiences are so very diverse. There is a need for a program dedicated specifically to teach accurate information about Natives.

*Need - Education/cultural competency.* Several students who participated in this study felt cultural competency training and education is needed for faculty, staff, and administrators. In the first example, the student compares her experience with professors who have accurately portrayed Natives versus professors who have not.

Cultural understanding and knowledge of Native presence today is one of the needs that Native students are facing at community college especially from the professors. Like you mentioned, our history professors, I've had a history professor where he spoke very well about Native presence and I felt like he really understood and he really spoke truth about what happened with Native Americans and how they survived through all that as opposed to a history teacher that I'm taking currently where he mentioned Native Meso-Americans as Mexicans, as just plain Mexicans. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 9, g. 32, lines 11-20)

So that's just a need that as a student I feel that professors should know how to speak culturally and respectively about cultures. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 9, pp. 32-33, lines, 21-3)
In the following example, the student discusses how Native students are 
gen generaliz ed in terms of their culture and identity. She continues to explain how some 
professors side with the textbook over the student’s knowledge and experience. 
Furthermore, this student points out that some professors just do not care about making 
changes even when they are made aware of the inaccuracies. These professors are 
complacent in their ignorance, which creates a stressful situation for the student and 
negatively impacts their success.

There’s no differentiation between Native Americans. We are one lump sum and 
there's no differences between us. We are all the same people. And that is 
frustrating as well as I have had classes where I have all but stormed out pretty 
much. I have left during class and I have had conversations with my teachers 
about I really disagreed with what you said. I really do not appreciate you saying 
this because it's not true. And I've had my teachers basically say, "Well, I'm 
sorry. I don't know where you got your knowledge from, but that is not in the 
textbook. And it's just so -- in situations like that it's so frustrating because not 
only is it that people don't know, it's people don't care. You get that sense that 
people don't care even when you are there screaming in their faces about this is 
wrong. This is not true. This is what actually happened. You could stand in their 
face and scream at them and they just look at you like why are you telling me 
this? I'm not going to change what I'm saying. I don't care. So that is very -- it's 
very difficult to succeed in class then because like I said before you have to pretty 
much just do whatever they want you to do and not actually do what you know. 
(Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 7, pp. 34-35, lines 10-26, 1-5)

Student 7 continues to discuss resolutions to the problem of culturally incompetent 
professors, and she advocates for educating the educator as well as the review or 
evaluation of the curriculum.

And so I think it would just be -- it would just be so much greater if we had 
teachers -- like if there was some way that the teachers could get together maybe 
with a Native studies teacher and go over that first part of the curriculum in their 
history classes and then the teachers could say -- I mean the Native American 
udies teachers could say, "Well, you know it would be better if you worded this
like this in your anthropology class or if you included this in your history class," just things like that. I've had anthropology teachers, too, where we'll be talking about a certain way that two cultures clash and then somebody will always inevitably bring up the example of, oh, like this with the Native Americans with the Sioux or with the Cherokee or whatever and my teacher would be like, "Oh, yeah, but we all know how that ended, ha, ha, ha." And I know laughter is a self-defense mechanism. I know it's a way to push off the blame, but you can't help but sit there in class and just look like, oh, my God, did that just happen? Is this real life? And everybody's laughing because it's all -- it's a joke. It's a Hollywood movie and it's not real. And people don't -- they're comfortable in their knowledge of that. And if that's what we keep teaching them I feel like -- if we give them no other reason -- if the only place that they are getting this knowledge is their Native studies classes and not their history classes, not their poly-sci classes, not their anthropology or archaeology classes, the only place they're getting that is in their Native studies classes, it's not going to make that much of a difference. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 7, pp. 35-36, lines 9-16, 1-12)

In the previous example, the student also expresses frustration with her fellow students and professors alike in their acceptance of media stereotypes and how it may be an exercise in futility to educate because of how immense and entrenched the problem has become, especially when it seems like only a few people are working to dispel stereotypes.

I think the whole student body, the school, the instructors, need to have some cultural education. And I think if you teamed that with the community, there's a million elders that would love to educate other cultures and students and faculty members to help their people. They would love to. I know some right now that would love -- that are in their 70's, 80's, even up into the 90's that would love to come and be part of a group that educated instructors and started a community effort to better their people to make the kids more self-sufficient and educated. (Focus Group 3, Female Native Student 13, p. 23, lines 13-22)

Need - Academic counseling. General support comes in the form of academic counseling, financial aid, RISE, and other support services and caring professors. One
student recommended a specific counselor be available just for Native American students.

I’m trying to transfer, so I have to do the whole long counseling session, not the 15 minute one. So that was pretty frustrating for me to get that. (Focus Group 1, Male Native Student 5, p. 16, lines 5-7)

I think that the community college can better serve American Indian students by establishing a location or a specific counselor that's designated to assist Native American students with questions, guidance, and anything that they may have -- we need a place where we can feel comfortable knowing that this person understands a little more about us, our culture, our people, that will be able to better understand what we're trying to get across and articulate to them because some people just like I said don't -- … some people are very intelligent, but when it comes to wording what you want to say and talking to somebody that you … you don't really say what you want to say to that person when you're there. You're just basically trying to get past that meeting or just uncomfortable with them. (Focus Group 1, Male Native Student 3, pp. 38-39, lines 11-26 & 1-2)

**Need - Financial aid.** The need for financial aid is significant for Native students who participated in this study because of high poverty levels experienced by Native families.

The greatest resource that I believe positively impacted my academic success was I guess I'd say the financial aid and being able to tap all those resources. That allowed me to really let go of anything that I thought in my mind I would need to keep my energy on so I could pay bills, have gas, live life. Acquiring those resources allowed me to let go of a lot of people and a lot of things that I was dealing with in order to focus on making a change in life. It's hard to do that when you're worried about paying those bills, electricity, cable or even having a decent vehicle to drive, all these little small things. (Focus Group 1, Male Native Student 3, pp. 27-28, lines 19-26 & 1-5)

They really help with the cost of living and stuff because as a student you're not working a lot, so you have to mainly rely on financial aid and the BOG fee waiver to get you through. (Focus Group 1, Male Native Student 5, p. 11, lines 1-4)

Several times, Native students expressed they depend on financial support.
I also use -- I'm on Native American TANF (Temporary Assistance to Needy Families) and county food stamps and Medi-Cal and those resources have been very helpful in providing for my books, my school supplies, my childcare and just in general academic counseling and support through both Native American TANF. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 10, p. 6, lines 11-16)

The financial aid helped me because I couldn’t afford it. I got approved for financial aid and [peer student] helps me a lot with it. (Focus Group 3, Female Native Student 12, p. 4, lines 16-18)

One Native student summed up the support needed to achieve academic success:

I think financial support, cultural support, community support all ties in to your educational goal where the community recognizes and validates your efforts and believes in what you're doing is huge and mentoring from other students in an organized way. (Focus Group 3, Female Native Student 13, p. 17, lines 11-15)

Need - Caring professors. For Native students who participated in this study, the need for caring professors is important to Native student success. The following example sums up the general consensus of focus group one.

I think it would be beneficial to have more professors … that legitimately care or show that they care about your success in reaching your goals. (Focus Group 1, Female Native Student 4, p. 36, lines 1-3)

Need - RISE & other support services. Support services were important to Native students who participated in this study. Students used the RISE program, the Native American Studies Program, and the Indigenous People’s Club, a student organization.

RISE and they were very helpful. I didn't do much there, but I utilized them for what I needed, to order my books and stuff. (Focus Group 1, Male Native Student 3, p. 10, lines 4-6)
RISE is significant for students because not only does the program operate a textbook loan program, but students in all three focus groups indicated RISE assisted them with academic counseling.

I started going to RISE this semester and [Blank Advisor’s Name] has been helping me pick my classes and stuff. (Focus Group 3, Female Native Student 11, p. 4, lines 7-8)

Me in my education, like RISE, the math lab, tutoring, the LRC, just my peers that I'm involved with in certain clubs or organizations have really have always supported me and pushed me towards not giving up and I really appreciate all the services that there are available to us on campus. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 9, p. 6, lines 1-5)

Native American studies program, … and the RISE program. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 10, p. 6, line 16)

Sac City Indigenous People's Club a lot for counseling, for rides, for books, for tutoring, counseling, for helping me with my sobriety. (Focus Group 1, Male Native Student 2, p. 8, lines 23-24)

**Need – Peers.** Peers were found to be important to student success for Native students who participated in this study.

Students have helped me find books, find classrooms, professors, proper professors, helped me find out a lot of resources and stuff that are available to me, scholarships and things like that. (Focus Group 1, Male Native Student 2, p. 9, lines 22-24)

In the previous example, the student mentions how students assist other students and professors are also mentioned as a resource important to student success.

Most of us, the only reason we survive in the educational environment is because some other student has come before us or is in there with us that has already gone through and fought the battle themselves so they can help you out. (Focus Group 3, Female Native Student 13, p. 17, lines 16-20)
Emotional support because if I slack off, then I don't want to do my work, so if I post something on Facebook, you're like, "Well, shouldn't you be doing your project? or if I'm on the phone with him, he'll be like, "You need to do your homework and stop procrastinating." And [Blank] she's like, "If I find out you're not doing your work I'm going to text you and call you all the time so you do it. (Focus Group 3, Female Native Student 12, p. 12, lines 17-24)

Students with previous experiences with the educational system were mentioned as resources, and peer pressure to say in school and succeed was also important.

*Need - Speakers/mentors from the community.* Students identified speakers/mentors from the community as vital to supporting Native students and encouraging success. The following example was chosen because it was very specific.

I think having speakers and telling people about their experiences … that just opened so many eyes for so many people who had no idea what was happening and stuff. And people are still talking about it. And it's really nice to know that there's people like that that are still out there that experience it. They're not all dead. They're not all gone. They're not just stories. So I think speakers and just overall I think mentors, right, that people who have walked in your shoes, who have experienced the stuff that you do. (Focus Group 1, Female Native Student 4, p. 44, lines 15-26)

*Need - Drug and alcohol counseling.* Even though only one Native student suggested the need for drug and alcohol counseling on campus, Native students in focus group 1 concurred with this idea.

I think maybe drug and alcohol counseling is one thing this school could use, not just for Natives but just in general. (Focus Group 1, Male Native Student 2, p. 34, lines 17-21)

*Summary.* In summary, qualitative analysis connects and reinforces several quantitative findings related to needs including: academic advising, financial aid, family support, programs like RISE and other support services like the writing and math labs.
and peer support. Additional needs include speakers/mentors from the community and drug and alcohol counseling on campus.

*Perceived Barriers for American Indian Community College Students: Qualitative Analysis*

Qualitative analysis reveals American Indian students who participated in this study perceive barriers to be the system itself, admissions and records, lack of financial resources or inadequate finances, financial aid services, limited courses, lack of tribal and family support, racial stereotypes, condescending tutors, transportation, and the cost of books.

*Barrier - System itself.* Native students who participated in focus groups revealed problems with the system itself. There are several types of barriers embedded within the system. The fact that Native students perceive themselves as insignificant to the college administration because of their low enrollment numbers is a significant barrier.

Also, I'd have to agree that administration -- I think that being a member of the Native American population on campus has sort of put us -- I guess we're in the gutter because we have such low numbers compared to other students, one percent of the population. We're kind of last on the list of the hungry mouths that need to be fed so we don't have a lot of weight I guess you would say on campus. We don't have a lot of political power even when it comes to administration because of our numbers. So that has been extremely frustrating. (Focus Group 2, Student 10, p. 9, lines 4-13)

The lack of recognition serves as a somewhat insurmountable barrier.

I think Native students probably the hardest part, at least for me from a Native perspective being at a community college, is that there is just a lack of recognition. And here it is so much greater here. We have so much more than other places do because we have a ton of Native students and we have a ton of Native studies teachers, many of whom themselves are Native American, and we have a lot of other faculty members who do genuinely care about the concerns of
Native American students, but at the same time there is just a general -- and I mean it's the same sort of disregard that's just through the rest of the community that they don't see it as disregard and that's the hardest part is getting them to see it as how much Native students are being ignored and how much their needs are being pushed aside enough to then recognize that Native students need more -- we need some sort of support system that is stuck into the hardwiring of the education system itself and not just through finding our own community in the school. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 7, pp. 20-31, lines 21-13)

According to one student, the administration has hindered her success by preventing Native students from organizing events.

For me administration has kind of hindered my success here on campus. When you want to organize for something or you just want to try to do something you always have to kind of -- there's always some logistics or some little some school politics that stop you in the way of trying to do whatever you feel like doing. That with, what do you call it, the food services on campus. They have really stopped us from getting funding for our organizations and clubs on campus. So together they have really -- they don't help much. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 9, p. 8, lines 1-10)

According to another student, threats to cut the Native American Studies Program are a significant barrier because it connects to low Native student enrollment numbers and the lack of recognition of Native students.

The educational services that have been frustrating for me have definitely been basically the effect of congress' decisions on our programs. I think the looming threat of my college losing my major, my program, the Native American Studies program, has been something that has really caused me a lot of stress throughout my time here. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 10, p. 8, lines 12-16)

One student mentioned the system is not user-friendly so students must ask for help and this may be a cultural issue.

System itself doesn’t really help you unless you go and seek out and we’re not used to asking for help because it’s a shame to expect it. So if you ask for help, it’s like you’re almost reinforcing that you’re not as good if you have to ask for help. (Focus Group 3, Female Native Student 13, pp. 4-5, lines 25-4)
Barrier - Admissions and records. Native students who participated in this study revealed Admissions and Records procedures created barriers to student success primarily because of clerical error or because of an apparent disconnect between services.

Mine is the records department. For some reason or other they keep changing my major and keep messing up my financial aid. (Focus Group 1, Female Native Student 6, p. 16, lines 8-10)

I don't seem to get anywhere when I go to like admissions and records or even business services or anything like that or financial aid. (Focus Group 1, Female Native Student 4, p. 10, lines 18-21)

Admissions and records, I've had issues with them as far as one teacher dropped me from the class and I was still attending. And then I got slammed by financial aid for a bill. (Focus Group 1, Male Native Student 5, p. 15, lines 22-25)

I picked up a second major, political science, to kind of I guess cover myself as far as that is concerned so that -- because the majors are similar, however, that caused me issues to where when financial aid made the decision -- our college made the decision to implement new policies and guidelines I wasn't qualified to transfer. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 10, p. 8, lines 17-22)

Barrier - Lack of financial resources or inadequate finances. Lack of financial resources, are revealed to be a barrier experienced by Native students.

It's hard for you to be a student and be successful and concentrate on what the professor is telling you when in the back of your mind they're going to cut your power off the next day and you're trying to figure out in the back of your mind, "Who am I going to call to borrow this money? Who can I call? What can I do?"

And I don't really want to call anybody to beg for money because I'm a grown person, but it's hard for me to pay bills because I'm not focused. (Focus Group 1, Male Native Student 3, p. 28, lines 5-13)

I mean, definitely financing is difficult because I live by myself and because of the stuff I kind of already mentioned with financial aid it just makes it more difficult to figure out how to pay for stuff. And there have been several semesters where I've nearly had to sit out. And at the very last moment I figure out how to make it happen, but just because I couldn't -- all last semester I worked 40 hours a week and had two jobs, one of which was full time and the other one was part-
time. It's just hard to make things meet” (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 7, p. 10, lines 7-14).

Example: “Money and housing. That why I dropped out two semesters ago because I started school and then I got a job, so then I dropped out of school and then I got my own apartment and then I lost my job, then I lost my apartment and then I was like bouncing around. Now I'm in school again. So I'm hoping this housing situation -- I get my financial aid so I can get my housing. So it's kind of like that's one of the main things. (Focus Group 3, Female Native Student 11, pg. 15, lines 14-21)

**Barrier - Problems with financial aid services.** Several Native students exposed problems they had with financial aid services. Some of the issues are rooted in a lack of understanding compounded by policies instituted through Financial Aid Services requiring students to determine and deal with their own financial aid issues without much assistance.

Example: “When I first came here I would have to say financial aid was the most frustrating for me” (Focus Group 1, Male Native Student 5, pg.15, lines 15-16).

Example: “and they’re not going to go out of their way to help you, ever” (Focus Group 3, Female Native Student 13, pg. 7, lines 7-8).

One Native student revealed issues with trying to get financial aid and having only a GED.

I would say I'm still having trouble I'd say with financial aid because there's areas I didn't understand and people that were helping me didn't understand. So like last semester I went through the whole semester without any financial aid. I got all my money at the end when school was out and I was struggling through the whole time. And it made it harder for me to even complete last semester because of the financial situation. And financial aid, no one was giving me the correct answers. And I'm yet to get a Cal grant in effect because I came in with a GED because I did leave school and I took my GED -- went back three years later, took my GED test, paid for it, got it, didn't use a GED for anything. Just went on another 10 years of life (Focus Group 1, Male Native Student 3, pp. 13-14; lines 11-26, 1-5). And I still haven't even got funding for half of --the Cal grant money
hasn't come in. And I probably won't get that until next year. And I'm in constant contact right now with them myself. (Focus Group 1, Male Native Student 3, p. 14, lines 10-13)

According to Native students who participated in this study, just learning about how to fill out the paperwork and the type of documentation expected is problematic for students because every student has different circumstances and there are different forms and different policies for every situation. In addition, when paperwork has been lost by financial aid services, it falls to the student to obtain the documents and resubmit them, once again causing undue hardship.

I'd say that financial aid was hard and learning about what you gotta do and knowing your particular circumstances because everybody is different. (Focus Group 1, Male Native Student 3, p. 14, lines 20-22)

Because they keep on giving me the runaround about everything because I don’t have my high school diploma or GED or anything. I had to keep on taking the ability to benefit test and never passed it. Every time I took it I was like one or two points off from passing. And then I finally got my six credits because you can get financial aid if you have six or more college units, so I finally had that, but then when I went to go apply, I didn’t have like the certain percentage you need, like 75% or more because I have like three W’s on my record from like years ago and --yeah, they just keep on giving me the runaround and I don’t like it. (Focus Group 3, Female Native Student 11, p. 5, lines 14-25)

I would say financial aid, as well, just because of everything she said, all of the -- you have to turn it in and then records and then proof and then this and then they're lost or they never received them, that kind of stuff. (Focus Group 1, Female Native Student 4, p. 15, lines 1-5)

The following Native student explains a problem within the federal financial aid policy requiring a set age limit to be independent and expects parents to provide financial resources to supplement student support. This issue plagues Native students and their
families who are at a socioeconomic disadvantage because the parents’ income is counted against the student.

I'm at an age where I'm legally considered an adult, but according to the government I don't qualify to be my own person in the eyes of financial aid. I still go under my parents, but I don't have any connection with my parents. And it's really difficult to figure out how to -- pretty much for the last two years I've been paying for college by myself and that's really hard because I don't get -- I do get the BOG fee waiver, which is the fantastic thing about living in California, being a California resident, but I don't get any federal aid and so everything like that I do have to pay for by myself and that's the hardest. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 7, p.7, lines 1-11)

Another connection is made by a student participant between the funding California provides students and the number of units a student can take. New policies are restricting the number of units a student can take having an impact on Native student success rates.

My barrier would be finance and space. The finance part is the economy is bad. They're raising prices on tuition and units, so the State is forking out more money for people that are on BOG fee waivers so they're shortening the amount of units that you can take. (Focus Group 1, Male Native Student 5, p. 19, lines 10-14)

Finally, one student explained her frustration in following all the policies and trying to deal with financial aid services and admissions and records, which ultimately reveals a disconnection between departments.

Definitely financial aid and it’s because their policies are set in stone in their mind. And a lot of it is I think because when you go, you go to the counter and you’re not allowed to ever speak to a supervisor so you have students….so they can’t make really any decisions for you so they’re just feeding you the information that’s written on the screen in front of them (Focus Group 3, Female Native Student 13, p. 6, lines 4-8 & 9-11). So now I’m on academic probation and then I’m finally---it’s halfway through the semester or pretty well good three weeks into the semester and I still haven’t gotten financial aid or my student loans because they dragged their butt in admissions and records, too, with handling my appeal. Even though the appeal was granted…financial aid still hasn’t cleared it. So it’s frustrating because you do everything—even when you follow all the rules
and dot all the I’s and cross all the T’s there’s always some other paper or some other thing and they do not notify you. (Focus Group 3, Female Native Student 13, p. 6, lines 16-26)

**Barrier - Limited courses.** Another barrier was the limited type and availability of courses in which Native students could enroll.

And the further along I get in my education the less I have to choose from in order to graduate or transfer. I'm sort of working around the college's schedule. Well, I am working around the college's schedule. And there are a lot of conflicts with my schedule, my son's schedule and a daycare schedule. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 10, p. 12, lines 11-17)

And it's challenging to find the time and to find classes that fit with my major because you're only allowed so many units after you max out because you get -- I had to put in an appeal --for example, for lifetime units you're only allowed -- policies and procedures from the federal government has changed to where if you go over 72 credit hours at the junior college level you have to explain that and why you haven't gotten your degree yet. It all comes down to finance really and not enough course work offered via online, for example, or at night. (Focus Group 3, Female Native Student 13, pp. 8 & 9, lines 19-25 & 1-2 & 7-9)

**Barrier – Lack of tribal support and lack of family support.** The lack of tribal and family support serve as barriers to success for Native students.

I think when I first started college I felt like I was alone. I felt like I was alone in everything. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 10, p. 17, lines 23-24). As far as my family is concerned, my family has not always been supportive. I get a lot of, "When are you ever going to graduate?" "Do you really think that you're making a wise decision?" Choosing law at this time in my life seems nearly outrageous to some of my family members, but luckily what my family can't do for me my community can. And what my community can't do for me my family can. And I think what I’ve learned in between there is that I have through my tribe and through learning more about myself and culture is that my people have been through far worse than community college and that my relatives sacrificed their lives. They paid in blood so that I can be here. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 10, pp. 18-19, lines 19-5)

I think one of the greatest barriers for me personally and as much as it hurts me to say this is probably my family. And I have spent several years trying to come to
terms with not only what they want but who they want me to be in terms of who I want myself to be and who I know I am. And I have come to the realization, which is really kind of heartbreaking, the last probably year, about a year ago from now, that the only way I'm going to be successful and the only way I'm going to feel good not just about what I'm doing but also about myself is to basically cut them out of my life. And I have just recently started to feel strong enough to … to start to make my own family, to see that just because you're born with these people, you don't have to be stuck with them. Your family is whoever is around you, who you make that connection with. It is --family is fluid. You can make it for yourself. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 7, pp. 29-30, lines 16-6)

My older family members, they wish I would have a career now or be married and be at home and have kids, all this stuff. Weird. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 9, p. 17, lines 4-7)

Now, with my family there is only one member in my family that does support it and that's my brother, but when it comes to my mom she doesn't. And when it comes to my dad's side they never did. So if it wasn't for him I wouldn't be in college. If it wasn't for him pushing me, I wouldn't be in college (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 8, p. 16, lines 14-19). So I guess -- it's just hard because I don't have that much connection with my tribe itself. It's more through my family and what is a few people that I still do know, but going to college and funding it and doing all those things almost by yourself -- I feel like college is something that you need a network of people to back you up and when you don't have that it's a little difficult to even keep what your goal is in mind (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 8, pp. 16-17, lines 21-3). Family…That is a barrier for me, as well. It's very hard. If I was to listen to what the majority of them would say daily it would get to me and it would cause me not to want to come to school. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 8, p. 31, lines 14-18)

And my tribe, I don't talk to them because I asked them if I could get money for my books and they never called me back. And then I called them again and they never called me back. (Focus Group 3, Female Native Student 11, p. 9, line 18)

My mom, like she doesn't think I'm going to be able to finish. She doesn't think I'm going to stick with it. (Focus Group 3, Female Native Student 12, p.10, lines 1-2)
Another barrier impacting Native students is stereotypical course content and the promotion or acceptance of stereotypes in the classroom.

We’re just kind of marketed as these people that once were. And as you can see we still are. (Focus Group 1, Male Native Student 2, p. 41, line 24) A couple anthropology classes I've taken I've had to point out that we still exist. When they speak of an ancient people, I'm like, "Those are my people and I'm a descendant of them. They weren't wiped out. We're still here.” (Focus Group 1, Male Native Student 2, p. 42, lines 2-6)

And I think also for me history classes and political science courses and astronomy courses, science courses, that are not respectful of culture tend to leave me feeling maybe isolated and as if my "religion" isn't being respected in the classroom, which makes it difficult for me to learn from an objective point of view because I'm not being respected as an individual. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 10, pp. 9-10, lines 20-1)

And in terms of obtaining academic success, it's hard like … it's hard when you are in a history class and the version of history that you're being taught and expected to spit out onto paper is completely different from the version that you've been taught. So it's always a struggle between do I tell the truth or do I want to pass this class. And it's hard when you know what you know and you know what is honest, but you want to get a degree kind of because science classes, too, history classes, political science classes, even social studies classes, some of the things are just either -- there is nothing about any sort of Native American culture in there or what is in there is very stereotypical, very abstract, very generalizing and often not in the most constructive way. And so it's always hard. I've had several classes where I've had to -- I've talked to my teachers and my teachers have said, "I'm sorry, but this is the curriculum. You have to do this." So I have basically lied in order to get "A" on a paper or on an exam or something, so it does very much feel like you're being ignored. Yeah, in anthropology classes, the same thing. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 7, pp. 10-11, lines 15-26 & 1-14)

We’re still here. We might be one percent or so called 1.5 percent of the population, but we're here. And we're not only here in the world, but we're here at the university. (Focus Group 3, Female Native Student 12, p. 15, lines 2-5)
'Cause last semester I was talking to my friend who was taking a history class and a sociology class and they didn't have the right facts about Natives. And that's even in college, even in the books that they use. (Focus Group 3, Female Native Student 11, p. 21, lines 12-15 & 17-18)

**Barrier – Condescending tutors.** A significant barrier impacting Native student success was condescending math tutors.

I would say the math tutors have been the most frustrating. I used to think I had a good concept of math. And then going in there they honestly almost shattered my confidence in my math. They were extremely condescending. And I find myself to be an intelligent person. I don't like being talked down to. (Focus Group 1, Male Native Student 2, p. 12, lines 6-7)

And I mean there's been some specific classes that I've had trouble with. And obviously there's always a teacher, there's always a tutor who really just doesn't get why you don't get it or doesn't get why you can't do this. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 10, p. 7, lines 12-15)

**Barrier – Cost of books.** The costs and availability of books are a significant barrier to Native student success.

I'd say a barrier -- just recently a couple of classes that have -- the books, the availability of books, that's kind of always been an issue with me. And even like coming in and like you reserve them and stuff, sometimes they're not available for copying or for whatever. (Focus Group 1, Female Native Student 4, p. 18-19, lines 23-2)

**Barrier – Lack of transportation.** According to a few Native students who participated in this study, issues with transportation impact Native student success.

A lot of times transportation is hard to get here, but I know I have to be here. I can't miss days or else like I won't make it to where I'm going to be in life so I would have to say that. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 8, p. 11, lines 15-19)

I actually travel a distance to come to City also. For the first two years that I came here I lived in Fair Oaks and I took the bus and light rail every day to -- City is in South Sacramento and it was worth it. This is the college that carries my
program. There are Indians everywhere, but unfortunately there aren’t Native American studies everywhere. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 10, p. 24, lines 1-7).

Summary. Qualitative analysis connects and reinforces quantitative findings related to barriers including problems with bureaucratic admissions and records (paperwork/policy), lack of financial resources or inadequate finances, problems with financial aid services (paperwork/policy), and limited course offerings. Barriers included, according to one student, “I’d say just the simple bureaucracy” (Focus Group 1, Student 2, p. 17, line 9). Additional significant data within the focus groups included lack of support from one’s tribe and family, racial stereotypes within the curriculum reinforced by the lack of cultural competency of professors and fellow students, as well as condescending tutors and the cost and availability of books and transportation. In addition, data revealed an interesting concept about Native students feeling uncomfortable asking for help.

Resiliency Characteristics Contributing to Student Success: Qualitative Analysis

Resiliency

Qualitative analysis reveals the resiliency characteristics employed by American Indian community college students who participated in this study to be family and community, resistance/survivance, and awareness and ability to use resources (for example, programs like RISE).

Sources of motivation and support: Family and community. Relying on the support of family and community was revealed to be a resiliency characteristic.
Additional information reveals that when family cannot be relied upon for support, students turn to their community.

My greatest resources that possibly impact my academic success would be my girls because I don't know I guess once you have kids you kind of forget about yourself. So that's definitely something that keeps me going. And it actually at the same time helps you to remember yourself because you have to keep going for them so it would be my girls. (Focus Group 1, Female Native Student 4, pp. 28-29, lines 25-26)

And my cousin, [Blank], he was -- 100 percent I contributed (sic) me being here because of him just because he opened it up for me. I seen him as an example. I was like he's doing it and I can do it, too, because me and him, we grew up together. He's one year younger, but we always were competitive. We always played hard. We always -- I knew that if he could do it, I could do it because I seen him do it as an example and that motivated me. (Focus Group 1, Male Native Student 3, p. 18, lines 2-10)

My family, I feel like they support me…. my single mother, who has raised me all our lives without our father, she supports me all the way and supports me the most. She's always -- when I need a shoulder to cry on, when I need someone to talk to, my mom is always very supportive and I'm very grateful for her. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 9, p. 17, lines 4-11)

So my community has been a huge factor in my success. I guess you could say that through community college and the Native community I've created family. I have chosen family that in every aspect of my life I guess take up slack. What I can't do, someone in the Native community can (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 10, p. 17, lines 18-22). I have not made it one single day since I started college, and I'm sure I never will again, make it one single day without the help of my community. And the interesting thing about that is it's always been here. The community has always been here. I think it's just tapping in and realizing that we belong to a circle that's much larger than ourselves. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 10, p. 18, lines 13-18)

Sources of motivation and support: Resistance/survivance.

Resistance/Survivance is a resiliency characteristic Native students bring with them
because of historic and contemporary trauma associated with colonization, oppression, and forced assimilation.

I feel that being Native we're representing something more than ourselves. We're a nation that has been murdered and killed and we're still alive. And what better way to prosper than to at least get an education and to show other Natives that it's possible to succeed in this new world. (Focus Group 1, Female Native Student 6, p. 32, lines 7-12)

So I think that my tribe -- the pride in being a Tsalagi woman has really pushed me. So on those days where I might not necessarily be able to reach out for support and I guess affirmation, I can look inside. I can find that strength within myself. So, yeah, I am supported by my family, my community and my tribe very much so. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 10, p. 19, lines 6-11)

Sources of motivation and support: Professors. Although professors were mentioned as a barrier in relation to stereotypical course content and cultural incompetency, professors were also seen as a source of support for Native students.

I would say my greatest resource has also been my professors. (Focus Group 1, Female Native Student 4, p. 10, lines 17-18)

Since I'm a new student, the support that I get and the motivation has come from my professors and family members that are attending. (Focus Group 1, Male Native Student 3, p. 9, lines 22-24)

And it's great to have not only like that academic support network but to have a personal -- be on that personal level with your professors and with the students in your classroom that you know there is somebody for you there if you need them to be there. And I think having those resources, even if you never have to use them, in the back of your mind is such a morale boost and feels like so much support just to know that it's there. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 7, p. 26, lines 7-14)

Peer and program support: Friends, RISE and Native American studies. Support services including the RISE program were found to be assets in terms of resiliency as well as fellow students or peers.
I use the whole gamut, RISE, learning center, computer lab and math lab. And I think most of the support and the services that were brought to my attention was from my peers. (Focus Group 1, Female Native Student 6, p. 11, lines 11-14)

Greatest resources are definitely the people that I meet who know what's going on and who know how to use the resources. (Focus Group 1, Female Native Student 4, p. 10, lines 22-24)

I got to say RISE and fellow students. RISE pretty much has a lot of fellow students where I go to get questions answered. [Blank] has been a resource in getting -- I don't even go to counselors anymore. I just go to [Blank]. (Focus Group 1, Male Native Student 3, p. 27; lines 7-11).

The Native American studies program has been extremely helpful. It has been a huge resource. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 10, p. 6, lines 6-7)

What motivated me to keep going to this college was the Native studies program and that the way [Blank] does teach them. She teaches them very well and I learned a lot from her classes that I didn't know coming here. She showed me a different way of looking at things that I never would have looked at them before that way. So thanks to [Blank] and her Native studies program that I did learn a lot. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 8, pg. 21-11, lines 21-2)

And definitely RISE, which is a resource here on campus, which stands for Respect Integrity, Self-determination and Education. And they're great help. They provide us with computers, with books, which we can check out for a semester, counselors. It's a great social environment and they have computers and stuff. So those have greatly impacted my academic success. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 9, p. 27, lines 9-21)

me in my education, like RISE, the math lab, tutoring, the LRC, just my peers that I'm involved with in certain clubs or organizations have really have always supported me and pushed me towards not giving up and I really appreciate all the services that there are available to us on campus.(Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 9, p. 6, lines 1-5)

And they don't have to be a teacher. They don't have to be a counselor. They can be a fellow student in one of your classes and they will do what they can to help you be successful or at least get through that tough spot that you're in. And it is. It's just a sense of community. We are here. We are all going through the same thing. We can do this together. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 7, p. 28, lines 8-14)
Would say there's a lot of Native students I hadn't met in the Native program that actually will sit together and have study groups that help me. So just studying with my culture itself, it really helps because they kind of look at it as there's a lot of Indians that shouldn't be going to school or they're not smart enough to go to school, but we are smart enough to go to school and we can do this all together, so I really enjoy that. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 8, p. 28, lines 15-22)

The other day I was doing a presentation to elementary school kids about the importance of college and there was a little girl who was like, "I'm a Pueblo Indian." And I was like, "Oh, really?" And she goes, "Yeah." She said, "I want to study Native American culture." I was like, "You know, we have a Native American studies program on this campus." And her eyes glowed. She was just so -- she was so happy. I knew she was so happy. I had never seen a kid so happy in my life. It was so cute. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 9, p. 37, lines 11-19)

Qualitative analysis connects and reinforces quantitative findings of community and peer support as well as program support. Family support resiliency and the resistance/survivance resiliency characteristic were not found to be significant in terms of any correlations in the quantitative data but were found to be significant resiliency factors within the focus group discussions.

Qualitative Summary

Qualitative analysis reveals the academic and personal needs of American Indian community college students who participated in the focus groups of this study to be the following:

- support and recognition,
- academic counseling,
- financial aid,
Native student outreach,
recruitment and retention,
more caring professors,
support from family members attending college,
peers,
Native speakers/mentors from the community to tell their experiences and success stories,
drug and alcohol counseling,
programs (RISE) and other support services like the writing lab and math lab, and
student organizations.

Qualitative analysis connects and reinforces several quantitative findings related to needs including: academic advising, financial aid, family support, programs like RISE and other support services like the writing and math labs and peer support.

Qualitative analysis reveals the perceived barriers of American Indian students who participated in this study to be the following:

- the system itself,
- problems with admissions and records (paperwork),
- lack of financial resources or inadequate finances,
- problems with financial aid services,
- limited courses,
• tribe and family,
• racial stereotypes,
• condescending tutors,
• transportation, and
• the cost of books.

Qualitative analysis connects and reinforces quantitative barrier findings including: problems with bureaucratic admissions and records (paperwork), lack of financial resources or inadequate finances, problems with financial aid services, transportation, and limited course offerings. Barriers included, according to one student, “I’d say just the simple bureaucracy” (Focus Group 1, Student 2, p. 17, line 9).

Additional significant data within the focus groups included: lack of support from one’s tribe and family, racial stereotypes within the curriculum reinforced by professors and fellow students, as well as condescending tutors, the cost and availability of books, and transportation. In addition, data revealed an interesting concept about Native students feeling uncomfortable asking for help.

Qualitative analysis reveals the resiliency characteristics employed by American Indian community college students who participated in this study to be: family and community, resistance/survivance, awareness and ability to use resources (example: programs like RISE), and academic as well as peer support. Qualitative analysis connects and reinforces quantitative resiliency findings including friend/peer support. Family support resiliency was not found to be significant in term of any correlations in
the quantitative data but was found to be of mixed significance in terms of support as a resiliency factor within the focus group discussion.

Overview of Quantitative and Qualitative Results

Ultimately, students need to succeed academically to reach their goals. Students have needs, face barriers, and employ resiliency characteristics to cope with any given situation. Needs revealed by students included support and recognition, academic counseling, financial aid, Native student outreach, recruitment and retention, more caring culturally competent professors, support from family members attending college, peer support Native speakers/mentors from the community to tell their experiences and success stories, drug and alcohol counseling, programs (RISE) and other support services like the writing lab and math lab, student organizations and peers.

Barriers revealed by students included problems with bureaucratic admissions and records (paperwork and policy), lack of financial resources or inadequate finances, problems with financial aid services (paperwork and policy), and limited course offerings. Barriers were, according to one student, “I’d say just the simple bureaucracy” (Focus Group 1, Student 2, p. 17, line 9). Additional significant data within the focus groups includes lack of support from one’s tribe and family, racial stereotypes within the curriculum reinforced by professors and fellow students, as well as condescending tutors and the cost and availability of books. In addition, data revealed an interesting concept about Native students feeling uncomfortable asking for help.
Resiliency factors employed by American Indian community college students who participated in this study were resistance/survivance, awareness and ability to use resources (example: programs like RISE), as well as peer support. Family support resiliency was not found to be significant in terms of any correlations in the quantitative data but was found to be a significant resiliency factor within the focus group discussions. What was not found to be significant for the students in this study was pre-college academic preparation or high school experience in the context of community college student needs, barriers, and resiliency characteristics.
Chapter 5

CONCLUSION

We survive war and conquest; we survive colonialism, acculturation, assimilation; we survive beating, rape, starvation, mutilation, sterilization, abandonment, neglect, death of our children, our loved ones, destruction of our land, our homes, our past and our future. We survive, and we do more than just survive; we bond, we care, we fight, we teach, we nurse, we bear, we feed, we earn, we laugh, we love, we hang in there no matter what. (Allen, 1992, p. 43)

This chapter summarizes the study’s purpose, research questions, methodology, and data, bringing to contemporary educational discussion Native American community college students’ needs, the barriers they face, and the resiliency characteristics they employ to be successful. This study explored the experiences of 45 American Indian students at Sacramento City College and focused on student success by obtaining information via survey and focus groups. Using three core theories: Tribal Critical Race Theory, Community Cultural Wealth, and Reziliency Theory, a framework and equation were created to address the following research questions:

- What are the academic and personal needs of American Indian community college students?
- What are the perceived barriers American Indian students face at the community college level?
- What are the resiliency and other characteristics employed by American Indian community college students contributing to student success?
The purpose of this study was to determine the self-perceived needs, barriers, and resiliency characteristics impacting the academic success of American Indian community college students at Sacramento City College and provide further insight into the American Indian community college student experience. The researcher identified needs and resilient factors in Native students’ lives and gathered student opinions about barriers experienced in the attempt to obtain academic success. Resiliency strategies and barriers experienced by students will serve as factors that represent the extreme ends of a spectrum of variables impacting student success. Several factors established in the literature were explored in this study including family involvement and support, community involvement and support, pre-college academic preparation or high school experience, financial support, faculty support and coursework, and, finally, institutional commitment and support. Factors inhibiting and contributing to Native student success were determined. Needs, barriers, and resiliency characteristics were reviewed.

Theoretical Framework Issue

Additional issues arose when the researcher began to analyze the quantitative and qualitative data. The inclusion of the Cultural Community Wealth concept within the larger driving theoretical framework was problematic. Survey and focus group questions specifically related to the research questions about needs, barriers, and resiliency characteristics. None of the questions dealt directly with the different types of capital used by students to achieve academic success. Therefore, it was difficult at best to
attempt to code data from both the survey and focus groups into the different categories of capital. When this was attempted with the limited data that discussed resources, there seemed to be too much overlap between the different types of capital. The researcher began to speculate this occurred because certain types of capital fill in where other types are lacking, but this could not be supported with consistent data. It also was apparent that much of the data about capital was found within the resiliency characteristics data. It is recommended by this researcher that an additional study be done specifically to determine diverse types of capital and where it comes from and in what category it should reside, i.e., is it a resiliency characteristic or a need? Does a lack of capital equate to a barrier? Future studies should delve into the connections between Yosso’s Cultural Wealth Model and needs, barriers, and resiliency characteristics.

Even though Yosso’s Cultural Wealth Model did not directly apply to this study because of researcher oversight to include specific terms within the survey and focus group questions directly related to the different types of Yosso’s capital, the cornerstone of Yosso’s framework originates from a strengths-based theoretical perspective, which was present in this study. Strengths-based theory focuses on the strengths of the individual and assets of the community to deal with problems or issues that arise (Hammond, 1996; Stavros & Hinrichs, 2009). A strengths-based theoretical lens, when applied to education, creates a shift from deficit thinking and blaming the victim for their own victimization. A strengths-based approach is more generalized than Yosso’s Cultural Wealth Model but applies to the same notion that students come to educational
institutions with specific strengths, and it behooves the educational system to utilize these strengths to address the challenges students face within the system. In hindsight, this researcher should have included the strengths-based theory as part of the overall theoretical framework because the core notion of applying what students already know, the strengths and coping mechanisms or resiliency techniques students possess, to their current educational experience is at the heart of this study.

Findings

Findings of this study are reviewed in context of the theoretical framework and applied in the student success equation:

\[(\text{Needs Being Met} - \text{Barriers}) + \text{Resiliency Characteristics} = \text{Student Success}\]

Equation check-in boxes appear at the end of different sections to reveal specific needs, barriers, and resiliency characteristics. In addition, partial applications of the equation are inserted in specific areas to garner the full effects of applying the equation to specific issues.

This researcher took into account specific institutional barriers as determined and discussed by Brayboy (2006), i.e., deficit model thinking, assimilation strategies, the lack of cultural competency or understanding and finally institutionalized racism stemming from colonialism.
Meeting Students Needs

Native students have specific needs found to be significant to their academic success. These needs fell into three categories: family support, financial support, and college support/services. As discussed below, all three of these factors are found to be important to Native student success, as discussed in the literature.

Family Support

Family support is a significant need contributing to the academic success of the Native American community college student. In the 2008 study by Guillory and Wolverton, family was the most significant factor in terms of persistence. In addition to providing much needed financial support, family reinforces connection to culture or cultural knowledge, part of Brayboy’s (2006) TribalCRT theory. Cultural knowledge is passed from generation to generation and is a source of power. When cultural and academic knowledge combine, it can serve as a resiliency characteristic (Brayboy, 2006).

Support from family members attending college. Family members with college experience serve as role models to show Native youth a college education can be achieved and is worth it (Brown & Robinson Kurpius, 1997; Jackson & Smith, 2001). Students in this study discussed the importance of family members who attended college at the same time and served as a support system, helping out their cousins or sisters with paperwork or with just navigating the system. This finding coincides with the literature identifying family support as a major success factor for American Indian students (Brown & Robinson Kurpius, 1997; Dodd et al., 1995; Falk & Aitken, 1984; Lin et al., 1988;
Tierney, 1995). Families are the support system that reinforces and encourages members to stay in school. The educational background of family members, especially their college experiences (Brown & Robinson Kurpius, 1997; Dodd et al., 1995; Jackson & Smith, 2001) has been found to be important in the literature. In the case of this study, family members who were attending college were found to meet Native student needs and are a significant source of support.

\[
\text{Equation Check-in}
\]

\[
\text{Need} = \text{Supportive Family With Knowledge About the Education System (Bonus Point)}
\]

Financial Support

The type and amount of financial support can determine whether or not a student goes to college. Based on quantitative data, students in this study indicated they were likely to receive grants and scholarships and used these in addition to public assistance to pay tuition. Students who were provided with financial support were less likely to withdraw due to bureaucratic financial aid services.

*Financial aid.* Financial aid is greatly needed by most American Indian students because many of these students experience poverty (Belgrade & Lore, 2003; Gilbert, 2000; Kerbo, 1981; Powliss, 2008). A majority of the participants in this study fell below the $20,000 mark and almost one-fourth of these students fell into $0-2000 range. Financial aid allows for access and opportunity to achieve academic goals (Cabrera et al., 1990; Cabrera et al., 1993; Nora, 2003; Ramirez, 2011; Stampen & Cabrera, 1988).
Academic achievement is dependent upon many variables and funding or financial aid is one of those. Adequate funding can alleviate stress about paying rent and for much needed school supplies. This allows the student to focus on their coursework instead of worrying about how they will pay their bills. Because financial aid is a critical need, it is imperative it arrives on time and is accurate, otherwise the simplest miscalculation can become a barrier.

Financial aid was found to be a significant need in relation to academic student success for students in this study. Students indicated that because they were not working a lot and were taking classes, financial aid, especially the BOGG Fee waiver, helped them stay in school and impacted their academic success. In addition, students revealed if they had enough financial support to pay their bills, they would be better able to concentrate on their studies and not on balancing college classes with a job and family demands. Although many did this as well, they indicated financial aid was a much needed, necessary, and helpful resource. Students also recognized the connecting factors between financial support, cultural support, and community support in order to reach their educational goals and attain academic success.

\[
Equation \text{ Check-in} \\
Needs = Financial \text{ Support} + Cultural \text{ Support} + Community \text{ Support}
\]

Financial aid advising. Financial aid advising was found to be quantitatively significant in that students used it; they found it to be important and were satisfied with it. But the only issue as they indicated in the focus groups, they rarely received financial aid
advising from the financial aid office, but relied primarily on their peers and family for support through the process of obtaining financial aid.

\[
\text{Equation Check-in}
\]

\[\text{Need} = \text{Financial Aid or Adequate Financial Support} + \]

\[\text{Informed Financial Aid Advising}\]

\[(\text{Financial Aid Advising Usually Received From Family Members or Peers)}\]

In Guillory’s (2002) study, administrators in institutes of higher education identified only two persistence factors including adequate financial support and academic programs tailored to meet American Indian student needs (Lindley, 2009). Both of these factors are institutionally focused and both have been found to be important to Native American student success through this research study.

**College Support**

College support fulfills specific student needs including academic counseling or academic advising, culturally competent advisors and professors, recognition, outreach, and programming. A significant quantitative finding was students who had support from the college, financial support, and help coping with non-academic responsibilities would be less likely to withdraw due to bureaucratic financial aid services.

\[
\text{Equation Check-in}
\]

\[\text{Need} = \text{Support from College} + \text{Financial Support} + \]

\[\text{Help Students Cope with Non-Academic Responsibilities} \]
**Academic counseling.** Counseling services are one of the most important contributors to student success, if counselors are trained appropriately (Cole & Denzine, 2002; Kleinfeld et al., 1987). Counselors can fill specific needs of Native students. Counselors can serve as mentors if they are willing to learn about the various and unique cultures of the students they serve, specifically Native students. Counselors assist students in choosing a program of study and in suggesting specific courses where they believe the student will thrive and possibly find peer support (Schmidtke, 2008). Counselors can meet student needs by helping them understand the policies and procedures of the institution and by providing referrals to a variety of services that can support students (HeavyRunner & DeCeltes, 2002; Hornett, 1989; James, 1992; Kleinfeld et al., 1987; Ortiz & HeavyRunner, 2003; Reyhner & Dodd, 1995).

General support comes in the form of academic counseling. One Native student in this study indicated academic counseling sessions longer than 15 minutes were hard to schedule. According to the California Community College Student Success Task Force (2011), community colleges in California generally have a ratio of 1 counselor to 800-1800 students. So when students state they experience frustration when it comes to academic advising or counseling, they mean it. One student indicated a solution to the problem:

Example: “I think that the community college can better serve American Indian students by establishing a location or a specific counselor that's designated to assist Native American students with questions, guidance, and anything that they may have -- we need a place where we can feel comfortable knowing that this person understands a little more about us, our culture, our people, that will be able to better understand what we're trying to get across and articulate to them because
some people just like I said don't -- … some people are very intelligent, but when it comes to wording what you want to say and talking to somebody that you … you don't really say what you want to say to that person when you're there. You're just basically trying to get past that meeting or just uncomfortable with them. (Focus Group 1, Male Native Student 3, pp. 38-39, lines 11-26 & 1-2)

This idea provides consistency with one specific counselor to address individual Native student needs, but this counselor would be required to be culturally competent and know about the many tribal nations and contemporary Indian issues. In addition, this one counselor could be one of several Native student specialists on campus who would be able to determine and meet the contemporary needs of Native students and provide them with information and access to internal and external resources.

\[
\text{Equation Check-in} \\
\text{Need} = \text{One Native Culturally Competent Counselor to Serve All Native Students}
\]

*Cultural competency training.* Cultural competency is an important concept in education today. To be culturally competent, one must know about oppression and social justice issues as they pertain to ethnic minority groups and how they complicate everything from economics to math, to art and how they further impact student success and achievement. It is important for professors who speak as authorities on their subject matter to include information about, contributions of, and experiences of all people, not just the dominant cultural group.
Equation Check-in

Need = Cultural Competency Intervention & Training for Professors, Administrators & Staff

To continue to learn new information and to address stereotypes

When professors speak as authority figures on certain subjects and students know more about these topics than the professor, sometimes the professor has a negative experience and does not know how to handle this type of situation. They view the student as being combative or disruptive which ties into various stereotypes. At this juncture students lose all respect for their professor and this becomes a barrier. This is discussed more in the barrier section. Students need culturally competent professors who continue to learn new information about their disciplines and become culturally aware of the experiences and contributions of diverse groups within their discipline in order to speak with authority on diverse groups.

Caring professors. Studies reveal time and again that professors impact student success (Cole & Denzine, 2002; Dodd et al., 1995; Reyhner & Dodd, 1995). Professors can motivate students and give advice on how to access resources on campus. Professors have great influence on student perceptions of the campus climate, whether or not it is a racist environment, and how they see themselves in relation to this, as victims of discrimination or as empowered to resist the oppression (Brown & Robinson Kurpius, 1997; Hornett, 1989). Professors can be culturally sensitive and apply this to their
teaching style to reach more students. As reinforced in the literature, students indicated that more caring professors would assist in their academic success. This was also a significant finding in this study. Students in this study felt there were uncaring professors, a point addressed as a barrier in a later section.

\[
\text{Equation Check-in}
\]

\[
\text{Need} = \text{Culturally Competent Caring Professors}
\]

Native student recognition, outreach and programming. Through voicing their needs, Native students also thought about how student recognition, outreach, and programming could be implemented, and the effort or power that needed to enact this type of change. Students suggested the development of a Native American Studies Department or, in this case Division, with an assigned administrator, a dean. This division would include multiple disciplines like Ethnic Studies, History, and Art and would not only provide students with more diverse courses to take, but would bring recognition to Native students on campus. In addition, a greater awareness of contemporary Indian issues would be brought to campus and fellow students, professors, administrators and staff to better assist Native students in their academic success because they would have the power of a division to support the needed change.

This is one idea that could be considered by the institution, but it would require a major structural change in the way departments and divisions are created. At this time, Sacramento City College groups certain departments (with a chair or administrative leader) associated with similar disciplines together and places them within divisions
under one administrator, a dean. The institution may want to assess different options and how to better evaluate and meet student needs.

**Equation Check-in**

\[
\text{Need} = \text{Native Student Recognition} + \text{Outreach} + \text{Programming}
\]

Native students revealed they felt powerless and invisible. They conveyed that more support and recognition was needed for them as a group. In addition, students expressed a need for the campus community to have more Native events happening or a Native student presence and more Native student outreach.

> I think Native students probably the hardest part, at least for me from a Native perspective being at a community college, is that there is just a lack of recognition. And here it is so much greater here. We have so much more than other places do because we have a ton of Native students and we have a ton of Native studies teachers, many of whom themselves are Native American, and we have a lot of other faculty members who do genuinely care about the concerns of Native American students, but at the same time there is just a general -- and I mean it's the same sort of disregard that's just through the rest of the community that they don't see it as disregard and that's the hardest part is getting them to see it as how much Native students are being ignored and how much their needs are being pushed aside enough to then recognize that Native students need more -- we need some sort of support system that is stuck into the hardwiring of the education system itself and not just through finding our own community in the school.

(Focus Group 2, Student 7, pp. 30-31, lines 21-13)

Of significance in the above student quote was the need for the institutionalization of programming, outreach, and services recognizing Native students and their needs. With Native programming, invisibility would decrease and Native students would have a presence on campus. This invisibility is linked to institutionalized racism and is discussed further within the barriers section.
Figure 10. Application of the Student Success Equation/Bridges Model

Recruitment and retention. There is strength and support in numbers. Native students themselves expressed concern about the non-existent outreach to or the need for more recruitment and retention of Native students at Sacramento City College. Of significance was that fact students also recognized that not only their numbers in terms of Native student enrollment were low, but they also saw Native people were underrepresented in terms of faculty and administrators. This is important because the literature reveals students should have access to mentors of their same ethnic group to be able to relate and network within the system. Students also expressed concern there was no outreach to Native students in high schools in the local Sacramento and surrounding
areas. Because Native students rely on each other, there is an imperative need for more Native students to attend college.

**Equation Check-in**

\[
Need = \text{Native Student Recruitment and Retention} + \text{More Native Faculty, Staff & Administrators to Serve as Mentors} + \text{Outreach to Local High Schools to Recruit}
\]

*Support for and from Native student organizations.* Native student organizations are made up of both Native and non-Native students. Native students serve as peer support in that they too may be experiencing the same or similar scenarios as other Native students and can sympathize and provide support to their peers. Having someone else like you who is going through the same difficulties actually helps with developing coping skills and with perseverance or persistence. Students can observe the actions of other Native students and see which outcome is most productive. Non-Native students or peers become allies who can also support and inform Native students. Native student organizations function to meet the needs of this student group because these students feel the college does not meet many of their needs; college administrative support for Native student organizations is complicated.

Student organizations are formed to meet the needs of students and/or address specific issues not being addressed on campus by the administration, faculty, and staff. The college administration wants students to feel free to express themselves and supports the development of student clubs and organizations. But from a Native student’s perspective, there seems to be a need by the institution to restrict the actions of student
organizations through bureaucratic means to regulate resources and protect the image of
the institution. The result is the institution is viewed by the student as working against
the efforts of the student organization. This translates for the Native student into ‘the
institution does not care’ or worse yet, ‘the institution is racist’ and will do anything
through bureaucratic means to prevent the student organization from having cultural
events on campus. This perception is important to understand and ties into the feelings
students have about being invisible or that the institution does not recognize the needs of
Native students.

Native students need to be recognized and their perceptions need to be validated
because this connects to practical applications by the institution to meet Native students’
needs. One recommendation by a Native student in the focus groups was to have the
institution permanently integrate Native cultural events, speakers, workshops, and
activities within the structure of the institution. This researcher highly recommends that
all institutes of higher education integrate culture and diversity into the very fabric of the
college climate, from teaching and learning to programming so students can feel
comfortable in their learning environment, which will allow them to reflect more on the
content of the subjects they are learning and, in turn, will lead to their success. This
relates back to best practices pedagogy.
Equation Check-in

\[ \text{Needs} = \text{Administrative Support For Native Student Organizations} + \text{Clear Communication Between College & Student Clubs} + \text{Native and Non-Native Peer Mentoring & Support} + \text{Recognition & Validation of Native Students} + \text{Practical Application Within the Structure of the Institution, i.e., Programming} \]

\[ \text{Will Change Campus Climate} \]

Involvement of and networking with external Native community. Successful student programs often link the students to their community (Kirkness & Barnhardt, 1991). Both the student and the community benefit from this connection. Hands-on experience and future career connections are but a few of the benefits to the student. The community also benefits from volunteer labor and has the opportunity to make connections to a future employee. Businesses and organizations can view the actual product of the education system, the student, and voice their concerns or their amazement about the skills the student has learned. By connecting with the external community, business representatives can have a say in the skills future employees will need so students can find employment after graduation.

This is especially true for Native students seeking to become employed with their tribes (Schmidtke, 2008). By bringing in speakers from the external Native community, Native leaders become more vested in the education system preparing the workers of tomorrow, and students become motivated in knowing there will be lucrative careers in store. Additional benefits of incorporating the external Native community include an
enrichment of the campus community by infusing cultural awareness. This one action assists Native students in their pursuit of academic success by impacting the campus climate, thereby making Native students feel visible, validated, and more at home, like they exist and have a right to exist within this environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equation Check-in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Need</em> = Involvement and Networking with External Native Community + Bring in Resources from the Native Community to Meet Native Student’s Needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Drug and alcohol counseling.* One student in the focus groups suggested there was a need for Native student drug and alcohol counseling because drugs and alcohol have such an impact on the Native community. Currently, the Sacramento Native American Health Center has several Native-focused sobriety programs. A leader on campus could network with this organization to hold meetings for Native American students at Sacramento City College.

*Services.* Even though students have identified a few services like academic advising or counseling and financial aid services/advising as having an immense impact on Native student needs, additional services were found to be important, such as skill labs (writing and math) and peer/other tutoring. Programs that offered many of these services included RISE and EOPS. RISE was used by students who received financial aid and by those who used public assistance to pay for their education. In the data, RISE was found to be important and was associated with academic advising, skill labs, and peer/other tutoring. Students praised RISE over and over again for the resources and support the
program provides, especially the assistance with academic advising and obtaining
textbooks. RISE would be a good place to begin to make changes for Native students on
campus. This will be discussed later in recommendations for practice.

### Equation Check-in

\[
\text{Need} = \text{Services: EOPS, RISE, Tutoring, Skill Labs, Textbook Check Out Program}
\]

**Summary.** Several needs were expressed by students who participated in this
study. These needs fell into one of three categories: family support, financial support, or
college support/services. Significant needs were support from family members attending
college, financial support and advising, and college support in the forms of academic
counseling, cultural competency training, caring professors, Native student recognition,
outreach and programming, Native student recruitment and retention, support for Native
student organizations, involvement and networking with the external Native community,
drug and alcohol counseling, services like RISE and EOPS who provide advising, labs
and other resources.

**Barriers**

Barriers prevent or block student success. When viewed within Brayboy’s (1996)
TribalCRT theory, barriers in education are related to widespread racism and social
injustice embedded within the institution (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Russell, 1992;
Solórzano, 1997, 1998; Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001; Solórzano & Yosso, 2000,
2001, 2005). Educational institutions are not objective, racially neutral, or based on merit
or equal opportunity (Crenshaw, 1989, 1993; Delgado & Stefancic, 2000; Delgado Bernal, 2002; Ramirez, 2011; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001, 2002; Villalpando, 2003). It must be recognized that students of color continue to be marginalized and oppressed as evidenced by the achievement gap (Nevarez & Wood, 2011) and through inconsistent policy and practice (Yosso, 2005). Because racism is widespread and enduring, it is a “central rather than a marginal factor in defining and explaining individual experience” (Russell, 1992, pp. 762-763). Oppression is pervasive, persistent, and can be overt or covert in nature (Sherover -Marcuse, n.d.).

The TribalCRT framework assists in explaining pre-existing barriers that impact American Indian students. The pre-existing barriers are included in the Student Success Equation \[
\text{Equation Check-in}
\]

\[
\text{Barrier} = \text{Deficit Model Thinking} + \text{Assimilation Strategies} + \text{Lack of Cultural Competency/Understanding} + \text{Institutionalized Racism Stemming from Colonialism}
\]

It is important to note that quantitative data did not reveal anything about racism or stereotypes. It was only when students began to feel comfortable that they could open up and begin to discuss it. Focus group data revealed racism and stereotypes as being significant barriers interlocking with other barriers students experienced. Oppression and
assimilation strategies must be recognized as playing a role in Native students’ experiences in higher education. Assimilation has become part of the structure or very system of western education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equation Check-in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Barrier} = \text{Racism} + \text{Stereotypes} + \text{Oppression} + \text{Assimilation} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Internal versus external barriers.** Barriers like bureaucratic financial aid services or admissions practices, which are arcane or difficult to understand, comprehend or fathom, hinder Native student success and are internal and controllable through the college. Other barriers that fall into this category are the system itself, which is linked to the perpetuation of racial stereotypes, specifically making Native students an invisible minority on campus; stereotypes within the course curriculum or content reinforced by culturally incompetent, uncaring professors; limited number and variety of course offerings; condescending tutors; the costs and availability of books; and transportation issues.
External barriers over which the institution has no control over include lack of tribal support, lack of financial resources/support or inadequate finances, lack of family support, and too many family demands and how Native students feel about asking for help.

**Equation Check-in**

**External Barriers** = Lack of Tribal Support for Native Students + Lack of Financial Resources/Support or Inadequate Finances + Lack of Family Support + Too Many Family Demands + How Native Students Feel About Asking For Help
longer exist, serves as a significant barrier. Native students in this study recognized they have little representation, a small population; political power comes from sheer numbers.

\[
\text{Equation Check-in}
\]

\[
\text{Barrier} = \text{System Serves the Majority & Assimilates the Minority} + \text{Native Students}
\]

\[
\text{Minority Amongst Minorities Due to Small Population} + \text{Stereotype Indians No Longer Exist} + \text{Native Students Little to No Representation Due to Small Population}
\]

Native students equate power and being recognized as needing a larger population of Native students. Viewing this particular issue through TribalCRT (Brayboy, 2006) allows this researcher to look beyond the campus and at this issue from a broader perspective, which incorporates historic trauma from colonialism. Natives do not have a large population because historically they faced genocide and are now in the process of coming back from the brink of annihilation.

\[
\text{Equation Check-in}
\]

\[
\text{Barrier} = \text{Historic Trauma Based in Colonialism} + \text{Faced Genocide}
\]

Brayboy’s (2006) TribalCRT allows a connection to be made between contemporary issues like lack of recognition for Native students on campus and the federal recognition of tribes. A lack of recognition is problematic for Native students in that it mirrors the tribal/federal issue with tribal recognition. Tribes not federally recognized do not have access to resources. Native students know if they are not
recognized on campus that this could result in limited to no resources to assist them with their student success.

And that's the hardest part is getting them to see it as how much Native students are being ignored and how much their needs are being pushed aside enough to then recognize that Native students need more -- we need some sort of support system that is stuck into the hardwiring of the education system itself and not just through finding our own community in the school. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 7, p. 31, lines 9-13)

The above example contains many points needing to be addressed besides a lack of recognition at the college level. One would think the need for recognition has to do with self-confidence, or self-esteem, even identity, but in this instance, the roots of this problem run much deeper. Native people struggle to be recognized as human beings not stereotypes by non-Natives and Natives alike, as well as through their tribe. So the first issue is a matter of racism and stereotyping a group as if they no longer exist or as if they are invisible. If a group no longer exists, they are not entitled to resources that would help them be successful. This will be discussed further in the next section.

\[
\text{Equation Check-in}
\]

\[
\text{Barrier} = \text{Lack of Recognition on Campus for Native Students Mirrors Federal Recognition Issues + Limited to No Access to Resources + Stereotypes that Promote Natives No Longer Exist + Native Students Feeling Not Entitled to Resources That Aid in Their Success}
\]

The concept of recognition is also related to a tribe’s status with the federal government. If a Native person is an enrolled member of a federally recognized tribe,
they are entitled to resources from the tribe. The tribe gets these resources primarily from the federal government unless they have become self-sufficient. Not many tribes today are self-sufficient, but many are working toward that goal. Self-sufficiency is defined as the ability to provide for your own people as a sovereign nation without the assistance from other governments. What needs to be understood is that through treaty making, the federal government has redefined the status of Native nations. No longer are they completely sovereign, but domestic dependent nations who struggle with their very survival and the need for complete sovereignty on a daily basis.

Federal recognition comes with a price. Tribes rely on their federal recognition through treaties to obtain resources to provide for their tribal members. In this way, tribes are dependent on the U.S. federal government. It is important to note that treaties are land deals made hundreds of years ago by the U.S. federal government with hundreds of tribes. Through these treaties, land was exchanged for resources. Because land lasts forever, the federal government is responsible and obligated to provide resources to Native tribes forever. The federal government has broken every treaty it has ever made with all Native tribes and has purposefully terminated tribal recognition in the past.

\[
\text{Equation Check-in}
\]

\[
\text{Barrier} = \text{Lack of Trust Between Natives and Institutions/System}
\]

\[
\text{Due to Historic Traumatic Experiences} + \text{No Recognition of Historic Oppression}
\]

The concept of recognition rests along the lines of sovereignty, which is an inherent right for Natives. Although sovereignty is an inherent right, its effects lie in
being recognized by other nations, meaning it is helpful and at times necessary for a tribe to be recognized by other nations as a valid nation itself to be taken seriously and to be included in discussions impacting the tribe’s sovereign status and very survival. So the concept of recognition moves beyond racism for the Native student and into the realm of individual and tribal survival, which is linked to the Indigenous struggle against colonialism.

\[
\text{Equation Check-in}
\]

\[
\text{Barrier} = \text{Lack of Understanding Because Non-Natives Don't Know About the Significance of Sovereignty and Tribal Recognition} + \text{Tribes Have Difficulty Working Together} + \text{Recognition Means More and Connects to the Indigenous Struggle Against Colonialism}
\]

Ultimately tribes struggle with this concept of recognition because it makes them dependent on the U.S. federal government for resources guaranteed through treaty, while at the same time this recognition invalidates their sovereignty, impacting their very existence. Brayboy (2006) discusses the significance of sovereignty within TribalCRT and acknowledges Indigenous people’s desire to establish tribal sovereignty. Brayboy (2006) explained, “power is rooted in a group’s ability to define themselves, their place in the world, and their traditions” (p. 435). Power is essential and equates to inherent sovereignty. Because power is based in the community, it is shared (Brayboy, 2006). What follows is the ability to meet the needs of the people through the rights to self-identify, self-govern, and self-educate. The problem with governmental and educational
policies toward Indigenous people is the goal of assimilation which links to colonialism and a loss of sovereignty or power to self-identify and be recognized as Native.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equation Check-in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barrier</strong> = Governmental &amp; Educational Policies Toward Indigenous People Have Been Assimilation Focused, Linking Colonialism and Loss of Power or Sovereignty to Self Identify and Being Recognized as Native</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Female Native Student 7 acknowledged Native students at SCC have more support than at other places and this includes caring faculty, but there is another underlying issue at work. Native students feel they are being excluded and ignored and their needs are being pushed to the side. The student who reveals this information calls for a solution creating sustained change that becomes part of the institution. But the root problem is not lack of recognition. If it were just a self-esteem issue, then students could garner support from their own Native student community and creating a student organization would be enough. This is being done, and for many students it helps. But it is not enough because it does not address what Brayboy (2006) claims is at the root of the problem, racism with the intent of assimilation ingrained within the system, reinforced through the deficit model.
Equation Check-in

\[ \text{Barriers} = \text{Native Students Feel They are Being Excluded & Ignored} + \text{Native Student Needs are Not Being Met} + \text{Racism with the Intent of Assimilation Ingrained within the Educational System is Reinforced through the Deficit Model} \]

Through TribalCRT (Brayboy, 2006), we can see that stating Native student numbers are too small or insignificant results in not recognizing Native students as being considered significant even in their small numbers, which allows the institution to possibly overlook Native student needs. Oppression within the system has succeeded in making Native students invisible, which has led to the assumption that Native students no longer exist because they have all been assimilated and their needs are like any other student needs. Either way, if Native student numbers are so small they are considered insignificant or if people believe Natives no longer exist or they have all been assimilated, this scenario is extremely problematic in that Native students’ needs are not being met.

Equation Check-in

\[ \text{Barrier} = \text{Small Populations Used to Reinforce Insignificance of Native Student Population Results in Overlooking Native Student’s Needs} + \text{Oppression/Racism Reinforces Invisibility of Native Students and Assimilation Stereotype} + \text{Native Students Needs Are Like Any Other Student} \]
One other issue is at work in this situation is the pressure placed on the institutions to do more with fewer resources. Native students are often left out of studies done by institutions because their numbers are so small it is difficult to show any statistical significance. This may be another convenient way of dealing with limited resources. If it takes more effort to find out about the needs of a minority group with a smaller population size, what benefit is it to the institution to take the time and spend the manpower to do such specific research? Because there are so many students with needs already, it would not matter to research the specific needs of Native students when it could be assumed their needs are similar to other students. In doing research for this study, it was frustrating and difficult at best to find contemporary national or local statewide data on Native students. Many research articles only include Black or African American, Asian American, Latino, and White or Caucasian in their statistics. More often than not, Native student statistics are left out because of the statistical significance issue in conjunction with low population size. This researcher must mention that the PRIE Office at Sacramento City College collects data on all their students and they include data on Native students in their Fact Book and other publications and reports. They were ready and willing to share the data they had on Native students at Sacramento City College. Some of this data is included in the population section of Chapter 3.
Equation Check-in

\[
\text{Barrier} = \text{Native Students Feel They are Being Excluded Because of Statistically ‘Insignificant’ Population Size + Native Students Being Left Out of National, State, College Studies + Deficit Model Thinking}
\]

This type of exclusion of Native students goes back to deficit model thinking, lumping all students together because they do not have knowledge of the system or how to use it to meet their needs. So training and workshops take place to assimilate the student. This type of assumption is problematic in nature because the specific needs of Native students are never determined and in essence they are being assimilated into the larger student body, becoming invisible. This one small act of not including Native students in research done by institutions is an act of oppression because it creates and maintains an invisible minority who may have more specific needs. Although Native students are part of the general student population and many of their needs may be similar, they are a diverse group that deserves unique recognition. Every student deserves the opportunity to succeed and if it takes an extra effort to ensure they do, then as educators and administrators we do the extra work necessary to make sure every student’s needs are met because every student matters.

Native student invisibility. According to Starks (2010), Cole and Denzine (2002), Milem (2000), and Loo and Rolison (1986), Native students make up a small demographically invisible population in education institutes, which has a direct negative
impact on their success rates. Because data-driven decisions are significant to changes in policy and there is little to no data collected specifically on American Indian students due to their small population size, change does not take place. Data collected in this study with assistance from Sacramento City College’s PRIE Office will lead to data-driven decisions and recommendations for change that will impact Native student success.

Equation Check-in

\[ \text{Barrier} = \text{Quantitative Statistics are Limiting with Small Demographic Populations} \]

**Racism and oppression.** Ingrained racist stereotypes, in addition to historic trauma, that have impacted Native student identities and their very existence (Brayboy, 2006), create a fundamental barrier preventing the needs of Native students from being met. It is clear from the focus group data that American Indian community college students feel invisible at Sacramento City College and this is a root problem related to racism and issues embedded within the education system causing the achievement gap, yet to be resolved.

Equation Check-in

\[ \text{Barrier} = \text{Ingrained Racist Stereotypes Have Impacted Native Student Identities} + \text{Historic Trauma} + \text{Native Students Needs from Being Met} + \text{American Indian Community College Students Who Took Part in the Focus Groups Feel Invisible at Sacramento City College} + \text{Root Problem Related to Racism & Achievement Gap} \]
Figure 11. Application of the Student Success Equation/Bridges Model to Invisibility

Internal barrier – Racial stereotypes and biased course curriculum. Racist stereotypes and inaccurate course curriculum have been experienced by Native students at Sacramento City College. To not recognize that Natives are still here and that they are intimately connected to a historically traumatic past is a disservice in that Native identity is being questioned, co-opted by academia, and redefined. Essentially, this takes power away from the Native student who relies on the very institution to empower them. This is a form of assimilation.

Equation Check-in

Barrier = Racist Stereotypes in Course Curriculum Reinforced in Textbooks + Native Student Identity being Co-opted by Academia and Redefined + Takes Power Away From Native Student who Relies on the Institution to Empower them
Ingrained stereotypes within curricula and reinforced within the textbooks are problematic in that a barrier is created when students do not feel they are being respected or that their experience or identity is valid. What is important to note here is that professors must recognize the knowledge Native students have is just as valid, if not more so than what the textbooks states. This goes back to Brayboy’s (2006) TribalCRT where he discusses the three types of knowledge and how the educational system assumes academic knowledge to be more accurate and valid than cultural knowledge. When Native students are asked to regurgitate what they consider to be lies, it compromises their integrity and challenges them to rethink the value of a degree based in lies from an oppressive institution.

And it's hard when you know what you know and you know what is honest, but you want to get a degree kind of because science classes, too, history classes, political science classes, even social studies classes, some of the things are just either -- there is nothing about any sort of Native American culture in there or what is in there is very stereotypical, very abstract, very generalizing and often not in the most constructive way. And so it's always hard. I've had several classes where I've had to -- I've talked to my teachers and my teachers have said, "I'm sorry, but this is the curriculum. You have to do this." So I have basically lied in order to get "A" on a paper or on an exam or something, so it does very much feel like you're being ignored. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 7, pp. 10-11, lines 22-14)
Figure 12. Application of the Student Success Equation/Bridges Model to Barrier Biased System

*Internal barrier – Culturally incompetent professors.* When a student does not address inconsistencies or stereotypes in the subject matter with the professor and the instructor does not do anything, the problem is compounded. Of great concern to this researcher is that some instructors actually support the curriculum or the textbook and do not seek truthful information even when they are informed of the racial stereotypes and biased course curriculum promoted. This serves as a barrier to Native student success. Native students may storm out of classroom and withdraw from that class or all of their classes and may never return to the college, or the Native student might believe the
stereotypes and internalize the oppression they are forced to learn. In one example in the data, a Native student shares her frustration with Native people being lumped together when there is much tribal diversity. This is a prime example of deficit model thinking as explained in Brayboy’s (2006) TribalCRT in that the professor is not recognizing the student’s cultural knowledge of their own or any tribe’s as valid in an academic setting. Brayboy’s (2006) TribalCRT includes the Native student’s knowledge as part of his culture, knowledge, and power model and also discusses the problems with academics adopting deficit model thinking in order to assimilate Native students by ‘re-writing’ or reinterpreting Native history. He further explains that Native students take responsibility for their community survival, which is why this example is so important. When Native students speak to their professors about the inaccuracies in curriculum, they are taking a stand not just for themselves but for their fellow Native students, the Native community and their tribe.
Figure 13. Application of the Student Success Equation/Bridges Model to Barrier Deficit Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course of Action</th>
<th>Do Away with Deficit Model by Educating Professors about its Harmful Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Competency as a Campus Goal</td>
<td>Workshops/Seminars Educating the Educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need Caring Culturally Competent Professors</td>
<td>Step Toward Academic Success</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Equation Check-in

Barrier = Culturally Incompetent Professor who Refuses to Change Curriculum + Deficit Model Ideology + Sweeping Racist Generalizations about Natives

To generalize all Natives as having one culture is problematic and can break any trust that has been built with a student (Hornett, 1989; Huffman, 2001; Pavel & Padilla, 1993). Furthermore, by speaking to the professor, the Native student is taking responsibility for the survival of her community in demanding the correct information be shared. At the same time she is resisting assimilation. Educators need to do away with deficit model thinking and become more aware of historic and contemporary Native issues in order to be able to speak with authority on these topics in the classroom. If it is necessary, educators should be willing to change curriculum to show their commitment
of incorporating culturally relevant pedagogy as part of their mission (Tierney, 1995).

Educating the educator on Indian issues is as important as integrating diversity within the curriculum by adding an Indigenous perspective to all courses and all disciplines. This would be a significant amount of work, but it is appropriate and long overdue. Old and new programs alike should be designed with Indigenous students in mind (Pewewardy & Frey, 2004).

**Internal barrier - Uncaring professors.** Unknowing professors are often open to learning new information to add to their lectures because they care about the accuracy and validity of the information they provide students. Uncaring professors are problematic because they do o’t care enough to learn accurate information and often do minimal to nothing to make changes in the curriculum content.

You could stand in their face and scream at them and they just look at you like why are you telling me this? I'm not going to change what I'm saying. I don't care. So that is very -- it's very difficult to succeed in class then because like I said before you have to pretty much just do whatever they want you to do and not actually do what you know. (Focus Group 2, Student 7, pp. 34-35, lines 19-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equation Check-in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Barrier = Uncaring Professor**

Again this may be based on the deficit model, be in fear of losing authority within the classroom, or it may have to do with a whole host of issues. This is why educating the educator is so important. We can begin to understand why some educators do not care enough to make change. It may possibly be they just do not know how to make change or even where to begin. Knowledge that a change needs to take place is where
change must start. We also have to recognize negative outcomes can result from negative classroom experiences. Native students go through a range of emotions including disbelief, anger, and feeling insignificant or invisible, which are traumatic and serve as barriers to their success. If students are not getting the correct information from professors in various disciplines, then the work of one Native studies professor in educating and re-educating the entire campus seems futile. This is why there is a need to create a series of cultural competency workshops about educating the educator, an idea garnered from a female Native student from focus group 2. An additional suggestion from another female Native student in focus group 3 included involving the external Native community when developing the ‘Educating the Educator’ series of workshops and seminars.

*Internal barrier – Bureaucracy.* When asked about barriers in general, one focus group student replied, “I’d say just the simple bureaucracy (Focus Group 1, Male Native Student 2, p. 17, line 9) is a barrier.

*Internal barrier – Bureaucratic or restrictive admissions practices.* Quantitative data revealed significant correlations between a number of variables including students who would withdraw due to restrictive admissions practices were found to pay tuition with public assistance and would withdraw because of too many family demands, due to bureaucratic academic advising, or due to limited academic support. Specific problems with the Admissions and Records office were revealed within the qualitative data and were primarily focused on clerical error. More than one Native student indicated that
Admissions and Records would keep changing their major, which would cause problems with their financial aid. Another student indicated Admissions and Records would get false information and mix his name up with another person who had the same name. But this student could not figure out the problem because students are assigned student identification numbers. If the clerk were to check the data based on identification number, there should be no issue. And yet another student had a professor drop him from a class for not attending when he had attended class from the beginning of the semester (invisibility). When the student went to admissions and records to clear up the misunderstanding, the drop had been processed so the student had to pay back financial aid for that one class, which created an unnecessary financial hardship. This student had not been notified by Admissions and Records that he had been dropped from the class. It often falls upon the student to check their accounts daily for any discrepancies.

\[
\text{Equation Check-in}
\]

\[
\text{Barrier} = \text{Bureaucracy} + \text{Bureaucratic Admissions Practices} + \text{Bureaucratic Financial Aid Services}
\]

Need for evaluations. This researcher is unaware of evaluations being done on the services Admissions and Records provide to students. If no evaluations are done, how will improvements be made to fix the problems within the bureaucratic system? Native students who participated in this study experience problems not only with a bureaucratic Admissions and Records office, but also with Financial Aid Services.
Barrier – Bureaucratic financial aid services. Socioeconomic disadvantage or poverty has resulted in a majority of Native students needing financial aid. Financial Aid Services are problematic for many Native students. Additional hardship is caused by problems with financial aid being late. Students attempt to struggle through to complete the semester but administrators need to be aware that this has a negative impact on grades as well as retention and student success. From the information students provided in the focus groups, problems with Financial Aid Services are the most troubling and seem to be the most challenging barrier simply because funding is a resource linked to so many other factors like enrolling in and paying for classes or buying textbooks in order to do the readings to pass the class.

Equation Check-in

\[
\text{Barrier} = \text{Socioeconomic Disadvantage} + \text{Poverty} + \text{Financial Aid Services}
\]

Financial Aid Services are problematic in that students feel they are not getting the correct information about what they need to do to get their funding. Workshops geared toward Native students need to take place periodically every semester. This researcher realizes there are open financial aid labs, but this does not mean the Native student can attend or ask for help if they do not understand the information being provided. With inconsistent policies and procedures that make no sense, it is any wonder anyone receives financial aid. Native students in this study are learning they need to keep in constant contact with Financial Aid Services if they are to obtain the resources they need to be successful.
Equation Check-in

\[ \text{Barrier} = \text{Inconsistent Policies and Procedures with Financial Aid Services} + \]

\[ \text{Bureaucracy} + \text{Financial Hardship} \]

Even when students provide the necessary documents, funding is not a guarantee. With the bureaucracy in the form of paperwork, records, and proof required from the financial aid office multiple times in different formats, students just give up. This barrier is too great, especially when the student is on the brink of being homeless and hungry, and the paperwork and proof turned in come up missing. There is a definite need for student evaluations of this service.

Bureaucratic hoops within this office are complicated. Not only does financial aid answer to the student, which should be their first priority, but they answer to the President of the college, the District Office, the State Chancellor’s Office, and, ultimately, to State and Federal agencies. Funding students becomes complicated with a variety of policies to consider. Furthermore, recent changes have led to tightened restrictions on students because of a few criminals who took advantage of the system to use college funding for other matters.

New financial aid policies have placed community colleges in a bind because they must pay back the federal government for financial aid that has been distributed to the student who never attends classes. This financial burden falls to the district to collect on student debt. Change in one part of the system creates change in other areas. Educators are being asked to drop students who are not attending because these students should not
be receiving financial aid and the college is expected to pay back the monies out of their budget which is an added cost during this time of budget cuts for education.

The focus group findings indicated many Native students did not rely on their parents or families for financial support; instead, they relied on public assistance and financial aid. This specific issue is one that plagues many students. Officially, students who fall under a certain age within the federal regulations are automatically considered dependents on their parents, so parental income must be counted against the financial needs of the student even though the student may be completely financially independent of their parent(s) and the parents do not contribute at all to the educational needs of their adult offspring. This indicates a need for a federal policy change where students can and should be able to prove independence from their parents at younger ages, especially students who were foster children.

\[
\text{Equation Check-in}
\]

\[
\text{Barrier} = \text{Financial Aid Requirements} + \text{Federal Financial Aid Policies} + \\
\text{Independent Age of Student and Parental Income & Support} + \text{Financial Aid Student Workers Who Have No Power}
\]

Additional problems are caused by stopgap measures instituted by policies within Financial Aid Services. For example, students who go to the financial aid office are served by other students who do not know much about the broad federal and state regulations, and they do not have the power to make changes to student files. This becomes problematic because it is apparent students are hired to filter through students
who are serious about their education, or the ones who can persist. Student workers often cannot advise their peers as to what course of action to take other than what the computer program provides and they certainly do not have power to actually help or recognize and override problems within the system. Student workers reiterate what the computer states the office needs in terms of paperwork. If the student has questions that cannot be answered by the student worker, then additional appointments are needed to see someone who has significant power to make changes necessary for the student to receive their financial aid.

There is no flexibility in financial aid policies and no allies with power to assist Native students. There needs to be at least one person who covers Native student cases for policy inconsistencies to be addressed. In this office’s efforts to meet policy demands, the student feels her needs have been put aside and she is no longer the deserving client, but is treated as a suspicious, treacherous embezzler of funds that should be guarded and saved for true students who will be successful. But the stereotype is that students who are deserving, and who will become successful, will know how to navigate Financial Aid Services, and they will be rewarded with their financial aid money. Minority students including Native students are not characterized as deserving.

*Interconnection of services.* It is apparent that various services at the college, including Admissions and Records and Financial Aid Services are intertwined and work quickly to penalize the student but are very slow in reconciling any mistakes made on their part in favor of the student. This is an enormous barrier for Native students in that
by the time student records are repaired the student may have already withdrawn.

Moreover, it is evident services are interconnected. Failure to serve students in one department compounds the problem and makes it almost impossible for students to achieve academic success.

\[
\text{Equation Check-in}
\]

\[
\text{Barrier} = \text{Disconnection Between Student Services}
\]

\[
\text{Financial Aid Services & Admissions & Records}
\]

*Internal barrier – Limited number and variety of course offerings.* The limited number and variety of courses offered has become a barrier all students experience. During these times of budget cuts, colleges are limiting the number of course sections offered and the type of courses, as well. Students attempt to fit required courses into their schedule every semester but these courses fill up fast and additional sections are not available. So the end result is that the student must attend additional semesters and take filler courses that do not fulfill general education or specific major requirements. These filler units can add up and prevent a student from receiving financial aid to finish up their required units. With a new policy and drive toward enrollment management due to cuts in funding and a looming state deficit, the district office needs to maintain solvency to be prepared for a longer debt crisis. One way to do this is to cut courses. As course sections are cut, faculty become concerned about their salaries and tenure status. Unions get involved and the entire process becomes very complicated.
The Chancellor and District Office maintain that by cutting course sections now, the college will be able to maintain full-time positions and not have to lay off faculty. In the meantime, adjunct faculty course offerings have been minimized and full-time faculty salaries are being reduced. There seems to be no end to the deficit unless people want to truly address the needs of their community and support education by revising voter approved propositions and the way in which the state financially supports education.

**Internal barrier – Condescending tutors.** Students indicated in the quantitative survey data that they used math and writing labs as well as tutors and peers, which correlated with EOPS and RISE. More information about problems associated with these programs and services came from the focus groups. One student indicated a barrier was formed because of the “condescending attitude from the math tutors” (Focus Group 1, Student 2, p. 8, lines 19-20). Tutors should build up the student, not tear down their self-esteem. Training for service providers like tutors should be evaluated for inconsistencies and improvements should be made. Furthermore, services and programs designed to assist students should be evaluated periodically by students to ensure needs are being met. Evaluations provide much needed data to improve student services. Data can be used to adjust training and services.

**Internal barrier – Costs and availability of books.** The debate over the costs and availability of books has been an important topic of discussion over the past several years. Publishing companies, faculty, and students are driving forces in this debate. Publishing companies push for new editions of books every year while faculty and
students prefer to use the same text for a few years to remain consistent in the curriculum and cut down on the costs of books for students. But publishing companies do not make any money if they cannot sell new editions unless they buy up old editions of the book they publish and sell these for the same or for a slightly reduced cost. In the meantime, many professors have done their part in requesting additional copies of textbooks from the publishing companies to place on reserve at the college library so students have some type of access, albeit limited. Professors are also choosing less expensive texts with black and white photos. The simple fact is that none of this effort matters if students never have the money for books because they have to choose between eating and reading. To remedy the issue with students not being able to afford a textbook, some professors have chosen to go digital and provide free copies or access to free copies for students online. Other faculty have given up on assigning readings all together and have chosen to provide information in lectures because they determined that even if students had access to textbooks, they would not do the readings because students do not have time in their busy schedules of trying to raise families and work while attending college.

Internal barrier – Transportation issues. Transportation has been found to be a barrier in both the quantitative and qualitative data. The more difficult it is to get to campus, the less likely a student will go to class or remain enrolled in classes. This issue plagues Native students. Some students overcome this barrier while others do not know how to cope with this issue other than by withdrawing from the college. The college has addressed this issue somewhat with a bus pass included with student fees, but this is only
during the fall and spring semesters, not the summer. Another strategy has been student carpools. One other way to deal with this situation is to offer more courses online or at outreach centers where students can obtain easier access to learning.

\[
\text{Equation Check-in}
\]

\[
\text{Barrier} = \text{Limited Number and Variety of Course Offerings} + \text{Condescending Tutors} + \text{Cost & Availability of Books} + \text{Transportation Issues}
\]

External barriers are ones the institution has no control over but should be aware of to further understand the needs of Native students. The lack of tribal support and lack of family support coupled with too many family demands, as well as a lack of financial resources, are external barriers recognized by Native students in this study.

\text{External barrier – Lack of tribal support.} A few issues should be discussed about the lack of tribal support. First, more often than not Native students need to be enrolled in their tribe before they can get any type of resources from their tribe. If the individual is not enrolled, they may get access to meager funds in other ways but not necessarily through their affiliated tribe. But even if the student is enrolled, tribal support is often insufficient and varies depending on the solvency of the tribe. Some tribes have limited resources while others have access to more because of a treaty agreement, lease of certain lands in trust, and Native business development, which may or may not include gaming. If tribes have resources it does not mean they have chosen to provide an education for their enrolled members, as is the case in the following example:
And my tribe, I don't talk to them because I asked them if I could get money for my books and they never called me back. And then I called them again and they never called me back. (Focus Group 3, Student 11, p. 9, line 18)

Tribes are at a turning point. At no other time in post-contact history have tribes been more empowered to make their own sovereign decisions. Because tribes are taking into consideration their lack of financial resources today and have been limited in the past as to what they could do to obtain more funding to care for tribal members, many are in the process of dis-enrolling members to create a smaller pool to which to distribute these limited resources. This action succeeds in doing two things: 1) reduces the number of tribal members who get the limited resources and 2) allows certain families who are enrolled tribal members to discriminate against and essentially get rid of other families they have been quarreling with since they were placed on the reservation together. This is dangerous territory in that as tribes set precedence for dis-enrolling members, they endanger their very recognition and existence. As it is, tribally and federally set restrictions are not allowing younger generations to enroll so it is only a matter of time until tribes no longer exist.

This researcher is hoping the newest phase of expressing tribal sovereignty by dis-enrolling members is just that, a phase that tribes will outgrow. This researcher believes dis-enrollment is an outward expression of internalized oppression, taught by the federal government and experienced by individual Natives who now have some tribal power associated with sovereignty to act or react to their subjugation. Education is the key to awareness and this researcher believes tribes are not even aware of what they are doing to
themselves or their members when dis-enrollment occurs. To completely understand the full effects of oppression and resiliency, researchers need to observe the actions of tribal governments through time. There is a need for Native researchers to study this phenomenon and bring awareness to sovereign tribes.

External barrier – Lack of family support or too many family demands. In this study, families were found to not always be supportive of the Native student attending college. In fact, it was disturbing how often family, emotional, physical, and financial support had been withdrawn.

My mom, like she doesn't think I'm going to be able to finish. She doesn't think I'm going to stick with it. (Focus Group 3, Female Native Student 12, p.10, lines 1-2)

Student 10 from focus group 2 revealed she substituted community support for family support in times when her family was not able to support her.

As far as my family is concerned, my family has not always been supportive. I get a lot of, "When are you ever going to graduate?" "Do you really think that you're making a wise decision?" Choosing law at this time in my life seems nearly outrageous to some of my family members, but luckily what my family can't do for me my community can. And what my community can't do for me my family can. And I think what I've learned in between there is that I have through my tribe and through learning more about myself and culture is that my people have been through far worse than community college and that my relatives sacrificed their lives. They paid in blood so that I can be here. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 10, p. 18-19, lines 19-5)

For student 7 in focus group 2, family was a barrier she needed to overcome by cutting them out of her life. Unfortunately, this Native student experienced a negative family situation but was able to overcome it by coming to the understanding that family is fluid. Other expectations from family members besides going to college were also a
barrier one student needed to overcome. And even when parents were not supportive, one student found her sibling to be, and she credits him for her current success. One student in focus group 2 admitted that if he had listened to his family, he would not want to attend school. Student 8 in focus group 2 revealed students need a network of people to support them when they go to college. This researcher concurs that there needs to be an external network and an internal network of people, services, and resources for Native students to succeed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equation Check-in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barrier = Lack of Tribal Support + Lack of Family Support +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Many Family Demands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*External barrier – Lack of financial resources/support or inadequate finances.*

Financial issues or socioeconomic disadvantage is largely a result of an overarching problem with the U.S. market economy based in capitalism and reinforced by a class system that behaves more like a caste system. In reviewing poverty rates for Natives, it is clear there is another underlying barrier for Indigenous people rooted in historic oppression. When the federal government instituted mandatory boarding schools that only offered instruction and curriculum up to the eighth grade, and focused on teaching Native students gender-specific service skills like sewing and cooking for girls and metal work and taking care of livestock for boys, American Indians were condemned to intergenerational poverty.
The quantitative data revealed students who saw inadequate financial resources as a barrier to academic success did not feel they would have enough financial support to achieve their academic goal and would withdraw from a class or the college due to lack of finances. Financial resources are one key component to Native student success. Without financial support, Native students would face a significant barrier. Students who participated in this study saw socioeconomic disadvantage as a barrier and were less likely to enroll in classes if they were experiencing lack of funds. There can be no academic student success if Native students never enroll. In addition, the data reveals students who see socioeconomic disadvantage as a barrier, would withdraw because of lack of finances or due to restrictive admissions practices, bureaucratic academic advising, bureaucratic financial aid services, and limited academic support. This data was backed up by focus group comments about funding.

It's hard for you to be a student and be successful and concentrate on what the professor is telling you when in the back of your mind they're going to cut your power off the next day and you're trying to figure out in the back of your mind, "Who am I going to call to borrow this money? Who can I call? What can I do?" And I don't really want to call anybody to beg for money because I'm a grown person, but it's hard for me to pay bills because I'm not focused. (Focus Group 1, Student 3, p. 28, lines 5-13)

This researcher has noted earlier that everything within a system is interconnected. This includes barriers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equation Check-in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barrier = Inadequate Finances or Lack of Financial Support</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perfect storm scenario preventing Native students from achieving student success.

Quantitative data revealed students who would withdraw because of a lack of finances, restrictive admissions practices, bureaucratic academic advising, limited academic support, and having a limited number and variety of courses in which to enroll, would also be likely to withdraw because of bureaucratic Financial Aid Services. Qualitative data supported quantitative data in reinforcing that these barriers do exist and must be dealt with in order to succeed.

---

**Equation Check-in**

\[ \text{Barrier} = \text{Lack of Finances} + \text{Restrictive Admissions Practices} + \]

\[ \text{Bureaucratic Academic Advising} + \text{Limited Academic Support} + \text{Limited Courses} + \]

\[ \text{Bureaucratic Financial Aid Services} \]

---

**Course of Action**

Look at Existing Counselors or Next Hires to Serve this Function

- Grants
- Tribal Funds
- Need Academic Advisor for Native Students
- Step Toward Academic Success

**Barrier**

No Culturally Competent Academic Advising

---

*Figure 14.* Application of the Student Success Equation/Bridges Model to Academic Advising
No culturally competent academic advising combined with Native students feeling uncomfortable asking for help creates a perfect storm. First, when Native students need to ask for help, they are admitting they are not capable of navigating the system, which may lead to self-doubt, shame, fears, and feelings of inadequacy about being in college in the first place. Then when they do not ask for help, barriers are never forded and student success is no longer in reach.

**Equation Check In**

\[
\text{Barrier} = \text{Native Students Feel Uncomfortable Asking for Help}
\]

**Summary.** Internal and external barriers exist for Native students. Internal barriers are controllable through the college and include a system linked to the perpetuation of racial stereotypes, which specifically result in making Native students invisible on campus; an inaccurate course curriculum or content reinforced by culturally incompetent, uncaring professors; bureaucratic or restrictive admissions practices; bureaucratic financial aid services; limited number and variety of course offerings; condescending tutors; the costs and availability of books; and transportation issues. External barriers the institution has no control over include lack of tribal support, lack of financial resources/support or inadequate finances, lack of family support, too many family demands, and how Native students feel about asking for help. It is important for the institution to be aware of the external barriers because they impact student needs within the internal academic environment. Interconnection between barriers prevents students from achieving success.
Oppression is so ingrained within the education system, it is difficult to see Native students feel invisible because they are being treated as if they no longer exist. Native students themselves linked the two concepts of the small Native student campus population with little political power and the need for Native students to see more Native students, faculty, staff, and administrators on campus like them to reinforce a Native presence. At first, the researcher thought this particular issue had to do only with identity and self-esteem issues but with further in-depth analysis and in applying the theoretical framework, the invisibility or lack of recognition of Native students on campus mirrors the issue of federal recognition of tribes.

As Native students struggle to be recognized as humans, not stereotypes by the education institution, they are challenging the notion that Natives no longer exist and in so doing are reclaiming power over their individual and group identity as Natives. At the same time, they are claiming rights to resources that will help them become successful. Native tribes are doing the same thing with the federal government when they demand federal recognition of their sovereign rights. Without recognition, there is no access to resources, thus individuals and tribes would cease to exist. Identity is the cursory finding. Survival is the real issue. This dilemma is linked to the Indigenous struggle against colonialism relating to genocidal and assimilation strategies utilized by the federal government which have now transitioned to higher education.

Not being recognized by the institution means the Native student has become invisible. Native identity is questioned, co-opted by academia and redefined, which is an
act of assimilation. Essentially, this takes power away from the Native student who relies on the very institution to empower them to have their specific needs met. Likewise, when the federal government decided to terminate federal recognition of tribes in the 1950s, it no longer recognized approximately 100 different tribes and they lost their resources guaranteed through treaty to take care of their own people, as well as their power to identify as sovereign nations with unique histories and specific needs.

The problem with governmental and educational policies toward Indigenous people is the goal of assimilation linking back to colonialism and a loss of sovereignty or power to self-identify and be recognized as Native. If a student is no longer Native then what are they? This connects to the deficit model theory in that all students are treated in the same way in that they know nothing of academia; therefore, they know nothing. It is as if the education system attempts to strip the identity of students, assimilate them, and remold them into skilled workers needed to fill jobs and nothing more. This concept is confusing and terrifying. Oppression within the system has succeeded in making Native students invisible, which has led to the assumption that Native students no longer exist because they have all been assimilated. By ignoring or not recognizing Native students, this allows the institution to overlook their needs. Because data-driven decisions are significant to changes in policy and there is little to no data collected on American Indian students due to their small population size, change does not take place and Native student needs continue to be unmet. At the same, time barriers increase restricting Native student success.
Ingrained racist stereotypes within curriculum and reinforced within the textbooks have impacted Native student identities and their very existence. That, in addition to historic trauma (Brayboy, 2006), creates a fundamental barrier preventing the needs of Native students from being met. It is clear from the focus group data that American Indian community college students feel invisible at Sacramento City College and this is a root problem related to racism and issues embedded within the education system that causes the achievement gap.

Culturally incompetent professors who do not seek out truthful information even when they are informed by the Native student of the racial stereotypes and biased course curriculum act as another barrier to Native student success. To generalize all Natives as having one culture is problematic and can break any trust that has been built with a student (Hornett, 1989; Huffman, 2001; Pavel & Padilla, 1993). These professors can cause a number of negative reactions from Native students including withdrawing from the class or college. Worse yet, the Native student may internalize the oppression they are forced to learn. The culturally incompetent professor is a prime example of deficit model thinking as explained in Brayboy’s (2006) TribalCRT in that the professor is not recognizing the student’s knowledge of their own or any tribe’s culture as valid in an academic setting. Essentially, the culturally incompetent professor may be unknowingly re-writing or reinterpreting Native history. Some Native students feel they must take responsibility for their community survival by demanding the correct information be shared; hence, they counter these professors, thereby risking being labeled as a trouble
maker or being accused of disrupting class. At the same time, the Native student is resisting assimilation.

Educators need to do away with deficit model thinking and become more aware of historic and contemporary Native issues in order to be able to speak with authority on these topics in the classroom. If it is necessary, educators should be willing to change curriculum to show their commitment to incorporating culturally relevant pedagogy as part of their mission (Tierney, 1995). Educating the educator on Indian issues is as important as integrating diversity within the curriculum by adding an Indigenous perspective to all courses and all disciplines.

Uncaring professors are problematic because they do not care enough to learn accurate information and often do little to nothing to make changes in the curriculum content. Again, this may be based in the deficit model or for fear of losing authority within the classroom or a whole host of issues. This is why educating the educator is so important. We can begin to understand why some educators do not care enough to make changes. It may possibly be they just do not know how to make changes or even where to begin. But we have to recognize that negative outcomes can result from negative classroom experiences with uncaring professors and steps need to be taken about this issue.

Additional barriers are due to bureaucratic or restrictive admissions practices and financial aid services. It was found that students who would withdraw due to restrictive admissions practices were found to pay tuition with public assistance and would
withdraw because of too many family demands, due to bureaucratic academic advising, or due to limited academic support. Specific problems with the Admissions and Records office were revealed within the qualitative data and were primarily focused on clerical error.

Problems with Financial Aid Services are the most troubling and seem to be the most challenging barrier simply because funding is a resource linked to so many other factors, such as enrolling in and paying for classes or buying textbooks to do the readings to pass the class. Additional hardship is caused by problems with financial aid being late. Students attempt to struggle through to complete the semester but administrators need to be aware this has a negative impact on grades as well as retention and student success.

At the core of problems with financial aid is the need for correct information. Inconsistent policies and procedures result in Native students providing documents, records, and proof in duplicate because the paperwork is lost or never received by financial services. Even when students provide the necessary documents, funding is not a guarantee. This barrier is too great. Especially when the students are on the brink of being homeless, are hungry, and paperwork and proof turned in comes up missing.

With additional financial burdens falling on colleges because of new federal financial aid policies requiring colleges to pay back the government for aid that has been distributed to students who are not attending classes, change in one part of the system creates change in other areas. Educators are being asked to drop students who are not attending because these students should not be receiving financial aid, and the college is
expected to pay back the monies out of their budget, an added cost during this time of budget cuts for education. These changes are just the beginning. Because a few students have taken advantage of this system, this researcher is noticing the image of the student is changing. Instead of being a person who needs and deserves assistance, students are being seen as undeserving because there is always an opportunity for them to try to take advantage of the system. When this ideology is adopted by workers within Admissions and Records and Financial Aid Services, it serves as a barrier to student success.

There are problems with federal financial aid policies themselves. So many students fall within the age restriction where they are automatically dependents on their parents but receive no help or financial assistance from their parents, especially Native students who are at a socioeconomic disadvantage in the first place. When parental income is counted against student financial aid funding even though the parent does not contribute to the student’s living expenses or education it serves as an undue hardship for the student.

Stopgap measures in financial aid services are an outcome of overwork placed on too few people in conjunction with the new image of the student who is undeserving. Students who wait in line to see someone in financial aid are filtered through student workers who review student files on the computer. Student workers cannot advise their peers as to what course of action to take other than what the computer program provides and they do not have power to help or training to recognize problems within the system. Students become frustrated with the system because this barrier is too difficult to ford.
Additional appointments need to be set and financial aid is delayed even further. There is no flexibility in financial aid policies and no allies with power to assist Native students. Changes need to be made to policies in this department because administrators have lost sight of the main purpose of the college, which is student success. In this office’s efforts to meet policy demands, the student has been put aside and is no longer the deserving client, but a suspicious, treacherous embezzler of funds that should be guarded and saved for the college.

It is apparent various services at the college, including Admissions and Records and Financial Aid Services, are intertwined and work quickly to penalize the student but are very slow in reconciling any mistakes made on their part in favor of the student. This is an enormous barrier for Native students in that by the time student records are error-free, the student may have already withdrawn. Moreover, it is evident services are interconnected. Failure to serve students in one department compounds the problem and makes it almost impossible for students to achieve academic success.

Funding cuts have resulted in a limited number and variety of courses offered which has become a barrier all students experience. During these times of budget cuts, colleges are limiting the number of course sections offered and the type of course as well. Students are able to get the courses they need within the timeframe in order to graduate in a timely manner. The end result is students must attend additional semesters but because of budget cuts and enrollment management issues, students are being restricted on the number of classes they can take and the number of times they can repeat a class. The
district needs to maintain solvency to be prepared for a longer debt crisis. One way to do this is to cut courses. As course sections are cut, faculty become concerned about their salaries and tenure status. Unions get involved and the entire process becomes very complicated.

The Chancellor and District Office maintains that by cutting course sections now, the college will be able to maintain full-time positions and not have to lay off faculty. In the meantime, adjunct faculty course offerings have been minimized and full-time faculty salaries are being reduced. There seems to be no end to the deficit unless people want to truly address the needs of their community and support education by revising voter approved propositions and the way in which the state supports education. Although they may seem trivial, a few other issues, including condescending math tutors, the cost and availability of books, and transportation issues serve as barriers.

External barriers include a lack of tribal support, lack of family support or too many family demands, and lack of financial resources/support or inadequate finances. The data revealed students who see socioeconomic disadvantage as a barrier, would withdraw because of a lack of finances, due to restrictive admissions practices, bureaucratic academic advising, bureaucratic financial aid services, and because of limited academic support. This researcher noted earlier that everything within a system is interconnected. This includes barriers.
Resiliency Characteristics

Resiliency is defined as the skills or processes by which people cope with oppressive conditions. Native students have unmet needs and have experienced barriers rooted in racism and oppression; therefore, they have had to develop coping mechanisms or resiliency characteristics to survive and be successful. Because this study focuses on Native student success in higher education, the resources within the educational environment must be included. Knowledge on how to access these resources and what they provide is a resiliency characteristic.

Quantitative analysis revealed resiliency characteristics employed by American Indian community college students who participated in this study to be in the realms of scholarship/financial support, spiritual support, social/community support, and friend or peer/mentor support. Qualitative analysis revealed resiliency characteristics, some of which fall in similar realms as were found in the quantitative data, of community as family or sources of motivation and support; mentoring, friend, and peer support; support services that teach resiliency characteristics like RISE and the Native American Studies Program; caring professors and counselors as well as acts of resistance or survivance.
Equation Check-in


As established in the barriers section, racism is at the core of obstacles experienced by Native American community college students because it is ingrained within the institution. Resistance or survivance resiliency characteristics are imperative for the very survival of the Native person. This type of resiliency comes from the connections Native students have to their families, communities and tribes. These resistance or survivance characteristics have either been passed down from successive generations or have been built within the current generation to resist oppression. Female Native student 6 in focus group 1 also felt the connection to other Natives to resist genocidal acts and continue surviving. In addition, this student connected this type of resistance/survivance resiliency to success and prosperity of the individual and Native community.

I feel that being Native we're representing something more than ourselves. We're a nation that has been murdered and killed and we're still alive. And what better way to prosper than to at least get an education and to show other Natives that it's possible to succeed in this new world. (Focus Group 1, Student 6, p. 32, lines 7-12)
Social/community support as a resiliency factor is receiving support from the larger community including social groups, religious groups, and cultural groups and or tribes. Native students in the focus groups revealed that the Native community was important to their academic success.

Example: “I have not made it one single day since I started college, and I'm sure I never will again, make it one single day without the help of my community. And the interesting thing about that is it's always been here. The community has always been here. I think it's just tapping in and realizing that we belong to a circle that's much larger than ourselves” (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 10, pg. 18, lines 13-18).

To be able to have the skills to create family from the Native student community was an essential resiliency characteristic. And peers play a significant role in resiliency. Peer support or obtaining emotional support from friends or college peers is a resiliency factor. When students create relationships at college it helps them to feel more at home (Huffman, 2001) and this comfort translates to retention. Anyone including faculty, staff, administrators and peers can be mentors according to Tierney (1995).

Reyhner & Dodd (1995) recommend that mentors have some type of connection to the student, either they are from the same discipline or they have similar interests or they share the same or similar cultural backgrounds. In fact several authors reinforce hiring American Indian faculty and staff to provide the Native student with informed and adequate support (Falk & Aitken, 1984; Kleinfeld, Kyle, & Cooper, 1987; O’Brien, 1990; Pavel & Padilla, 1993; Reyhner & Dodd, 1995). Mentoring contributes to the retention of minority students (Pope, 2002; Jacobi, 1991). Central to Native student success are American Indian faculty and administrators (Schmidtke, 2008). These mentors reinforce
student self esteem which contributes to their success (Schmidtke, 2008). Native faculty, staff and administrators are leaders and stakeholders in student success who assist in connecting the student to the professional community (Schmidtke, 2008). Native educators and administrators are needed to mentor Indigenous students to become leaders in their tribal communities (Gilbert, 2000; Huffman, 2001).

Peer mentoring is important to student retention and success (Hoover & Jacobs, 1992). Peer support helps Native students deal with conflict, improve feelings of belonging, reinforce and clarify identity, and understand their values, beliefs, ways of learning and thinking are a burden but an asset to critical thinking and problem solving (Schmidtke, 2008; Tate & Schwartz, 1993). As stated earlier, peer mentoring can take place in many ways including tutoring, study groups (Brown & Robinson Kurpius, 1997) and student centers (Cole & Denzine, 2002), and student organizations (Reyhner & Dodd, 1995; Schmidtke, 2008). Peer groups create a sense of community, “help students deal with feelings of isolation and alienation, and can offer specific advice on study skills or other academic matters” (Schmidtke, 2008, p. 111).

When peers are connected to services and can show Native students how to successfully navigate the system as well as how to survive, this becomes a resiliency characteristic all its own. Services and programs such as RISE and the Native American Studies program connected to peer support and stood out as helpful. Social/community support as a resiliency factor correlated with spiritual support as a resiliency characteristic. Because spiritual support has to do with the ability to cope with factors
that may be out of one’s control, and finances often fall into this category, then the significant correlation between scholarship/financial support and spiritual support is important to note. Students indicated spiritual support as a resiliency characteristic was used when they faced inadequate financial resources as a barrier. Spiritual support resiliency also correlated with using public assistance and with using grants and scholarships to pay for tuition. Students enrolled in units were less likely to view spiritual support as a resiliency factor. This also makes sense because if they were enrolled in units then they would be more likely to use the scholarship/financial support resiliency characteristic than the spiritual support characteristic because the uncertainty of being enrolled in units had diminished.

The scholarship/financial support resiliency characteristic refers to skills or knowledge necessary to obtain financial support. Because financial support is both a need and barrier, this resiliency characteristic is important. Students who said they received financial aid and used grants and scholarships to pay tuition noted this resiliency characteristic as significant. This makes sense because students have obtained skills necessary to acquire resources and have incorporated these skills with this resiliency characteristic. Students who had earned units and those who were enrolled in units correlated with financial support as a resiliency factor. Furthermore this resiliency characteristic correlated with using peer and other tutoring. As revealed in the focus group data, peers have been a primary source of financial aid advising. Financial aid advising was used, found to be important, and students were satisfied with it when they
were able to get advising. This reveals to the researcher that financial aid advising was significant in terms of Native students learning resiliency skills but there were still problems with financial aid services that created a barrier. Students who indicated that financial support was a resiliency characteristic also ranked spiritual support as a resiliency characteristic.

Summary. Resiliency characteristics act as cushions between barriers and need to keep students in a tentative state of equilibrium. If resiliency characteristics do not work, there is an imminent danger of the Native student never achieving academic success.

Figure 15. Resiliency Model Relating to Needs and Barriers
Practical Application

In applying the equation for student success, \((\text{Needs Being Met} - \text{Barriers}) + \text{Resiliency Characteristics} = \text{Student Success}\), Native students needs, barriers, and resiliency characteristics have been identified. This researcher has taken this opportunity to create a student success model from the equation. The first model will be general and can be applied to any institution and any student racial/ethnic group. After the recommendations section, the second model is proposed, which will apply directly to Native Student success at Sacramento City College.

*Figure 16. Working Student Success Model*
The Working Student Success Model focuses on what the institution can and should provide for students in terms of needs, reducing or eliminating barriers, and reinforcing resiliency. The students’ needs take center stage as do institutional support and involvement of the external community, bringing together the Trifecta of Success ensuring the future employment of the student and continued reinforced connection between the college and community. Significant connections are made between people, programs, services, departments, divisions, and the external community. There is the incorporation of outreach, recruitment and retention as well as focus on student success. Elements of evaluation and cultural competency training are involved. In order to apply this model to Native students, we must review general recommendations and recommendations for Leadership, Policy, and Practice for each of the variables: needs, barriers, and resiliency characteristics.

*Needs Recommendations*

First and foremost, it is difficult to try and control any external factors impacting Native students like family support and financial need. The best any educational leader can do is to address needs the institution can meet that have a direct impact on the student’s academic success. Student needs can be met in a number of different ways by rethinking, re-educating, and re-structuring college support services. This researcher has many recommendations to fulfill Native student needs but primarily the recommendations stem from the students themselves.
Needs Recommendations for Leadership

A transformative and transformational leader with institutional support and connections to internal and external programs, people, and services could bring representatives from various programs, departments, and divisions within the college (outreach/recruitment and retention services, the Cultural Awareness Center, the Staff Development Center, advisors, professors, departments, Native student organizations, coordinators of existing programs like RISE and EOPS) together with external Native Tribal representatives and Native community members to create a Native student success consortium in which the primary mission is Native student academic success. Members of this consortium would be in charge of revising or creating policy and enacting practices that lead to several desired goals that meet defined Native student needs. As each program, department or division, meet their goals, there should be marked improvement in Native student success.

Native student success can be measured in a variety of ways including through traditional methods like GPA, units earned, units enrolled and completion of the student’s desired academic goal, whether this be obtaining a certificate, degree, or transferring to another institution. These numbers can be tracked with the help of the various departments involved, as well as the college’s research office and reported to the consortium every semester. Different programs, departments and divisions can keep their own records of the number of students contacted, admitted, and enrolled. The amount and type of programming done for, by, and about Native students can also be tracked.
The Staff Development Center could track the number and type of cultural competency workshops and seminars faculty, staff, and administrators have attended and how many of these professionals complete this training. Additional data could be tracked including the type of services, how frequently and by whom they are being used as well as the evaluations of the type and quality of services. Furthermore, Native student panels and focus groups should be scheduled yearly or biannually to get feedback from these students about the services and support they received and what needs have and have not been met.

*Needs Recommendations for Policy and Practice*

Institutional commitment is often regarded through the creation of policy, which not only informs but impacts practice. It is difficult to separate policy from practice because one informs the other so both will be discussed in this section.

Recommendations for policy change include increased faculty and staff development requirements in cultural competency proposed at the state chancellor’s level, adopted by the district and negotiated with the faculty and classified staff unions; policy created to connect segmented services and establish students as a whole versus as individual paperwork; policy requirements for Cultural Awareness Center yearly programming; outreach, recruitment, and retention policies to increase Native American student enrollment; policy written impacting internship development and connections with external Native communities and tribes; and greater state and federal policies pertaining to financial assistance for students who are enrolled tribal members.
Recommendations for practice include cultural competency training to fulfill increased faculty and staff development requirements, training to connect segmented services, review of curriculum for cultural competency components, Cultural Awareness Center yearly programming pertaining to local and national American Indian issues, actual outreach, recruitment and retention of Native American students, involvement of and connection to the external Native community to facilitate internships, job placement and adding to campus diversity, and the development of financial aid infrastructure to deal with greater state and federal policies pertaining to financial assistance for students who are enrolled tribal members.

*Cultural competency training.* Internal college policies pertaining to faculty and staff development and cultural competency can be instituted. Cultural competency training could be as mandatory as sexual harassment training. Faculty, staff, and administrators would be required to take a certain number of hours of cultural competency training a year. The Staff Development Center offers different types of training throughout the school year, and faculty and staff are required to attend ‘Flex’ workshops and seminars based on the hours they work and a variety of other factors. Workshops, panels, or seminars could be created and facilitated by faculty who work at the institution and/or by nationally known educators and speakers.

*Culturally competent curriculum.* In relation to cultural competency training, a review of curriculum for cultural competency components should be enacted through the curriculum committee. Faculty who put forth changes in curriculum or new curriculum
should be required to document sections where at least one student learning outcome is dedicated to cultural competency. If this is not done, then the committee will recommend the faculty member attend training prior to the approval of the course. This is already done for distance education.

*Reduce segmentation between departments.* Segmentation between departments limits or restricts services and is problematic. Policy can establish connection between departments and hold those in power accountable for performing tasks that contribute to student success. The segmentation of services has resulted in Native students not achieving success. These students need some assurance that different programs, departments and divisions are all working toward the same goal, their student success. In viewing the student as a number associated with different types of paperwork that is either complete or incomplete, the college is losing sight of the student as a whole, the student who can not afford to pay rent because their financial aid has not been released due to some small error in their paperwork. This student is getting ready to drop all of their courses and withdraw from the college, which impacts student success numbers.

Even though financial aid may be in a different office than admissions and records, representatives from these departments can be compelled to work together through the development of policy that restructures how students are served. Students can be viewed as a whole or in terms of a case file instead of individual forms handled by different departments. Staff in these departments, can be required to review the entire case file for inconsistencies that would prevent the student from receiving resources and
these students can be flagged for assistance and contacted by the department. An individual caseworker can be assigned and serve as the advocate for the student to handle the file and make sure everything is complete, from enrollment and academic advising to financial aid. This way students have at least one advocate working for them within the system. If there is a need to transfer the file to different departments then the first person to handle the file will be the one to follow up on the student within a given timeframe. This new system promotes working within and between departments to create a web of support, woven to ensure student success.

*Cultural programming.* Requirements should be established in policy for the Cultural Awareness Center to sponsor yearly programming representative of all racial/ethnic groups but specifically related to the needs of Native American students. Contemporary and historic Native American issues should be addressed several times a semester as well as Native American Day or other special days recognized by local tribes. The coordinator of the center should facilitate this type of programming by working with faculty, staff, students, and Native community leaders.

*Native student outreach.* Outreach and recruitment and retention policies specifically for Native American students currently do not exist. Outreach and recruitment and retention specialists should be required to go to Native community events to recruit Native students to Sacramento City College. Every year, California State University, Sacramento sponsors an outreach fair for Native high school students, and every year Sacramento City College is invited but is not represented by any of our
outreach or recruitment staff. Attendance at this event or others like it should be required through policy.

*Native community connections.* Outreach can serve a double purpose: to recruit Native students but also to create connections with the external Native community. This outreach could facilitate job placement and add to the campus diversity by inviting tribal representatives and Native community leaders to contribute to the knowledge and diversity of the campus by speaking or facilitating workshops.

*Campus programs and resources.* In addition, through outreach, prospective students should be made aware of the Native American Studies program on campus as well as other resources like RISE and EOPS they can access while attending Sacramento City College. This is where the consortium can help by creating a flyer, brochure, or website of all the resources available to Native students.

*Financial assistance and tribal involvement.* Policy should also work on state and federal levels pertaining to financial assistance for enrolled tribal members who are students. One important aspect often overlooked is that students enrolled in federally recognized tribes have an educational guarantee from the federal government through treaty and congressional acts. Tribes, educational institutions, and states who have a vested financial interest in community colleges should call upon the federal government to honor treaties with Tribal Nations and congressional acts to provide education to Native students enrolled in federally recognized tribes. An Act of Congress could be passed that pays tuition and fees directly to colleges and universities for any tribally
enrolled Native student. But this would only impact a small population of Native students. Affiliated students would not benefit from this type of program because they are not enrolled tribal members. Affiliated students could seek financial support from their tribes but this would be a difficult and arduous process because tribes provide for enrolled members first and there are limited resources from the federal government. If the tribe is financially solvent, there may be available funds, especially if the tribe views providing funds for education as a tribal investment. Students could sign contracts to work for the tribe for a certain number of years to pay off their college debt. In the process, they become more dedicated to their tribe and the tribe benefits from the educated workforce.

*Program overlap and limited resources.* During this time of budgetary crisis for higher education in California, it is important to use the existing resources in a more effective and efficient way. RISE and EOPS are two pre-existing programs that students state they use the most for academic advising and skill labs. By reviewing the funding sources of both RISE and EOPS and restructuring them into one encompassing program that meets students’ needs, funds could be better used to meet additional student needs or needs that aren’t being met now. Because students are satisfied with counseling provided by RISE, a grant could be written to create a position for a counselor to specifically serve Native American students in this program. An expansion of services and resources could be provided through RISE if grant monies or funding from tribes could be established.
It is important to meet the needs of Native students in order to ensure student success. When Native students succeed there are direct benefits to tribal and non-tribal communities in the form of an educated, diverse and dedicated workforce that pays state and federal taxes and provides a service to their community.

**Barriers Recommendations**

Recommendations are based in the theoretical framework, which provides a social justice lens reinforcing liberation ideology (Friere, 1970, 1973; hooks, 1994). In addition, the framework recognizes and validates the experiences of students of color and that data from these students are significant to finding solutions to issues they experience (Bell, 1987; Carrasco, 1996; Delgado, 1989, 1993, 1995a, 1995b, 1996; Olivas, 1990; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001, 2002).

**Barriers recommendations for leadership.** It takes a transformative and transformational leader to be able to see how the barriers interconnect and how to dissect each barrier to its core to address the needs of students and the needs of the college. First and foremost, the college needs to recognize that within the very system and at the root of the problem exists racism, which is ingrained in the deficit model reinforcing assimilation. Sustained change can and should take place on a number of different levels to meet student needs, break down barriers, and ensure student success. Each service, program, department, and division needs to be evaluated. Institutional commitment is regarded through changes in policy but this researcher believes that change is most apparent through actions and Native students need actions to break down the current
barriers preventing their success. There is a place for policy, and it is important for policies to be evaluated for their effects in reinforcing racism and oppression. But a majority of the recommendations in this section will have to do with the practical application of immediate changes that will impact Native students immediately.

_Barriers recommendations for policy and practice._ Recognize Native students on campus. This was also mentioned in the needs section as an integral component of the Native Student Success Consortium. Current programming is not enough to address the invisibility of Native students. There needs to be more school wide programming for Native students so that they feel they have a presence on campus. Some programming already does take place through the Ethnic Studies/Native American Studies Program in the form of their annual Welcome/Welcome Back, held every fall and minimally through Cultural Awareness Center programs which pay for speakers, but this is not enough. Additional programming could be organized and funded through the above existing resources like a Native Student Graduation Recognition Ceremony and more workshops could be organized for an by individual departments, Math, Science, Business, Ethnic Studies, History, Political Science, Sociology and Anthropology. Part of recognizing Native students on campus is recognizing that the knowledge Native students have is just as valid, if not more than what the textbooks states. It is imperative as educational leaders that we learn how to tap into the resources students provide about real world experiences and how they have learned to cope, make change and be resilient.
As discussed in the needs policy and practice section, there is a need to institute required cultural competency training. Staff Development has offered to sponsor Native speakers on a variety of topics. Through this program a permanent and ever changing workshop series to educate the educator can and should be established. Educating the educator on Indian issues is as important as integrating diversity within the curriculum by adding an Indigenous perspective to all courses and all disciplines. The external Native community should be included in developing the workshops and should be tapped for speakers thereby bringing in and validating the Native experience and presence on campus. Other ethnic groups can also be included in this process to make cultural competency training multicultural, but focus should be on each group not one over any other and no one should be left out.

Staff, faculty and administrators must contribute to this process through sharing their experiences and concerns about barriers that impact students and their ability to succeed. The institutions greatest resources are the people who work within it for they have insight like no other.

Cultural competency training can begin through this workshop series where faculty, staff and administrators can receive a certificate. Educators can begin to understand the experience of the Native students they are serving, develop empathy and become allies. This will do away with the culturally incompetent and uncaring professor barriers. If the workshop series is successful, it can also be integrated into the curriculum
and be offered to businesses to meet their cultural competency requirements by state and federal mandates.

At the same time informative and relevant evaluations need to be created and take place on a number of different levels in every department and program that serves students from financial aid to admissions and records and from counseling to tutoring. These evaluations can serve as a net to catch barriers that exist in order to further investigate root causes and address immediate needs. Training for service providers like tutors should be evaluated for inconsistencies and improvements should be made. Furthermore, services and programs designed to assist students should be evaluated periodically by students to ensure needs are being met. Evaluations provide much needed data in order to improve student services. Data can be used to adjust training and services.

Financial Aid workshops geared toward Native students need to take place periodically every semester. This researcher realizes that there are open financial aid labs but this does not mean the Native student can attend or ask for help if they don’t understand the information being provided. At the beginning of the changes to this department there needs to be at least one person who covers Native student cases in order for policy inconsistencies to be addressed.

To remedy the issue with students not being able to afford a textbook, some professors have chosen to go digital and provide free copies or access to free copies for students online. Other faculty have given up on assigning readings all together and have
chosen to provide information in lectures because they have determined that even if students had access to textbooks, they would not do the readings because students don’t have time and media is processed differently because of technology.

As far as transportation issues, some students overcome this barrier while others don’t know how to cope with this issue other than by withdrawing from the college. The college has addressed this issue somewhat with a bus pass included with student fees, but this is only during the fall and spring semesters, not the summer. Another strategy has been student carpools. One other way to deal with this situation is to offer more courses online or at outreach centers where students can obtain easier access to learning.

Tribes should invest in enrolled and affiliated members by providing financial and academic support in terms of tutoring. In order to benefit from the education of enrolled and affiliated members tribes should create contracts where loans will be forgiven when students work for the tribe in the area in which their discipline is needed. Furthermore, this researcher sees the need for a connection between internal and external networks of people, services and resources for Native students to succeed.

*Resiliency recommendations for leadership.* A transformational and transformative leader is one that supports and recognizes the strengths and skills in others. It is imperative that administrators, faculty and staff in institutes of higher education give honor to and respect diverse resiliency characteristics that Native students employ. It behooves the institution to look at resiliency factors as strengths of Native students in order to build on these and promote student success.
Resiliency recommendations for policy and practice. There are no recommendations for policy changes in this area. As for recommendations for practice, programs and services that teach skills are needed to build more resiliency characteristics and there is a call from Native students to have some formalized system where this can occur. This researcher recommends employing a cohort model for Native students. This way Native students can garner support from a group of students like themselves, learning the same skills to succeed. Additionally as part of that cohort program Native students will pair off with other Native students who have been at the college for at least a year. This way additional skills and information can be passed down from one generation of college students to the next ensuring some resiliency characteristics transfer.
Figure 16. Native Student Success Consortium
Overall Recommendations for Leadership

It will take a transformative and transformational leader to institute changes in policy and practice. A leader understands that services are interconnected. When students have a problem with one type of service, ex: financial aid, barriers arise. Policy must be evaluated for racist undertones and revised in order to begin removing the barriers that exist. Because the system is interconnected, removing one barrier and empowering others to change will begin the process of removing additional barriers. Once barriers are gone and Native students needs are met, student success will prevail.

A leader also recognizes the strength in individuals and their connections to family and community. Connections to the greater Native community need to be established for outreach and the understanding that comes with cultural awareness or knowledge.

A person who has access to resources both at the educational level and within the Native community would be a good hire for Sacramento City College either as a professor, academic counselor, financial aid advisor or administrator to oversee the Native Student Success Consortium. It will take more than one person to make the changes needed within the system. A team of likeminded interested faculty, staff and administrators would be ideal to work with to address the barriers and needs of Native students.
Overall Recommendations for Policy

Allow for students to have access to people with power in order for them to understand the policies and procedures. Too many people who do not have power to make changes or assist students with their needs are being used as stop-gap measures to prevent students from trying to take advantage of the system. In this environment of budgetary cuts and difficult financial times, more and more regulation is taking place in order to ‘manage’ enrollment. This regulation is actually preventing our students from being successful because there is no flexibility within the system to deal with the various problems of Native students. From the data it sounds like the problems are caused more by clerical error or by students not having the information they need to fill out the paperwork correctly. In any case, policy can be restricting and can overlap to create a barrier to student success. Newly instated policies must be reviewed for inconsistencies and ‘traps’ in which students can fall and never regain their steps to success.

Overall Recommendations for Practice

Financial aid workshops designed for and by Native students should happen at least twice a semester. A student peer buddy system established to pair new incoming students with students who are graduating or transferring should be established in order for students to pass on information about how to navigate the system. This would also serve to connect incoming Native students with outgoing Native students and would promote a network that would expand beyond Sacramento City College into the four-year
systems. Students would ideally remain in contact with each other and assist each other in transferring which would reinforce higher degree obtainment.

In response to the finding that instructors are still utilizing the deficit thinking model this researcher is going to be developing a series of workshops that address what to do in the classroom when students know more about a topic than the professor and more specifically, create workshops that are meant to inform educators about historic and contemporary Native American issues. Educating Educators workshop/seminar series should be offered as FLEX credit for faculty and staff campus wide. Through this process curriculum and teaching would change and professors would feel more confident in discussing Native issues in their classes which would in turn impact Native and non-Native students eliminating stereotypes.

Every person who works for admissions and records or for financial aid should have the ability to fix any given situation instead of waiting for their supervisors to review the case and act on it weeks to months later. By allowing students access to people with power to help, they feel empowered to take their educational success into their own hands.

In addition the institution needs to be able to monitor and evaluate services/ programs that provide students with resources in order to make changes to better serve this population.

And then if we had more of an organized effort in that way structured through the university rather than just Native people trying to help each other. (Focus Group 3, Student 13, p. 17, lines 21-23).
This idea has inspired this researcher to create a model by which internal and external barriers can be removed with a two prong approach: restructuring of existing services and incorporation of new policies to meet student’s needs.

*Figure 17. Application of the Student Success Equation/Bridges Model*
Recommendations for Further Research

It is recommended by this researcher that an additional study be done specifically focusing on Yosso’s (2005) Cultural Capital Wealth model in order to determine the diverse types of capital that impact Native American students. Where these types of capital come from and in what category they should reside, (i.e., is it a resiliency characteristic, a need or does a lack of capital equate to a barrier) should be determined. Future studies should delve into the connections between the Cultural Capital Wealth model and needs, barriers and resiliency characteristics.

Additionally, more research on resiliency characteristics needs to be done to determine which characteristics students come to higher education with and which characteristics they need to learn. If this can be determined, then workshops teaching specific skills can be offered and students could build skills immediately, which would contribute to their overall timely success.

The efficacy and effectiveness of the Native American Studies program on Native American Community College Students is a needed study. An overall evaluation of the Native Studies program would provide this researcher with data that could be utilized to better the program, serve students better and possibly serve more students. This evaluation would contribute to outreach because the researcher would need to obtain information from various sources. It would also allow for an internal audit of the program, whom it serves and its purpose. This audit would allow the researcher to make fundamental changes to the program in order to better serve students. Additional
research should be done correlating tribal affiliation, tribal enrollment and grade point average to determine the long-term effects and impact of the achievement gap.

Limitations

There are several limitations to this study. The limited small sample size living primarily in the Sacramento and surrounding area and the fact that the students who participated in this study do not represent all the Native students at the college nor within the United States is a limitation. The urban location of the community college is a limitation because fewer Natives who live on any reservation are in attendance. The fact that the researcher who is conducting the study is a self-identified, non-enrolled Lakota and an adjunct faculty member who teaches the only Native studies classes at the college is another limitation. This researcher knew in passing a majority of the students who participated in this study. Students were not asked to provide documentation of their tribal enrollment, GPA, units enrolled or units taken. The number and type of survey and focus group questions were a limitation. This researcher did not ask students questions about racism and oppression and how they either saw or didn’t see this impacting their educational success. In addition no questions were asked about capital.

Conclusion

Institutes of education promote and reinforce assimilation, requiring a complete transformation of Native students, which serves as a reminder of colonization and historic
trauma. When policies and procedures make no sense to the student and they cannot connect them in any way to their experience, these policies act as oppressive forces that prevent student success. Oppressive policy is a reminder of early experiences of Natives with boarding schools and higher education, which is part of historic trauma.

Native students are losing their footing on the bridge to success when it comes to problems with services. According to students offices are not communicating with each other. Admissions and Records is not communicating with Financial Aid and vice versa. There is no one-stop-shop where a student and take care of everything at one time. As a recommendation, because of the use of new technology that assists in student recordkeeping, the offices of admissions and records should combine with the registrar’s office and with financial aid, reduce the number of workers and take students case by case to deal with inconsistencies and problems with their data/files. Workers in this system would have the power to change things directly with access to managers or administrators who would approve these changes daily so that financial aid will be on time and accurate.

Cultural competency training and evaluations of all programs and services need to take place because leaders must have a place to begin, a place to understand where changes need to happen. The situation cannot continue in its present state. Faculty, staff and administrators play a integral role in creating and facilitating workshops and fair and accurate evaluations.
Native students should feel entitled to a quality education with fair representation of their diverse tribal groups because it has been guaranteed over and over again through treaties, which are land deals. In exchange for land, Native people were to receive education and a variety of other resources that would assist them and their tribes in being self-sufficient. This will happen when tribes team up with institutes of education to demand restitution funding from the federal government.

From a researcher’s standpoint, this study has been difficult yet rewarding. Problems with research and data collection alone have been taxing, not to mention the countless hours writing and rewriting the information to accurately represent Native students who participated in this study so their voices will be heard.

This researcher began this study wanting help Native students. In seeing them struggle though the years with so many different issues, it became imperative that something be done. In the end, the story that unfolds in these pages is as much the story of the researcher as a Native student herself, as it is the story of the Native student’s who participated in this research.

Now that needs, barriers and resiliency characteristics have been determined, it is time to apply this information and make changes to systems of education so that Native students can achieve their long awaited success and begin to contribute to their communities, tribes/nations.

The following example is a reminder that future generations of Native students are coming and they will expect nothing less than success on their own terms from a
place of power and strength in who they are and what they need to do to continue the survival of our people.

The other day I was doing a presentation to elementary school kids about the importance of college and there was a little girl who was like, "I'm a Pueblo Indian." And I was like, "Oh, really?" And she goes, "Yeah." She said, "I want to study Native American culture." I was like, "You know, we have a Native American studies program on this campus." And her eyes glowed. She was just so -- she was so happy. I knew she was so happy. I had never seen a kid so happy in my life. (Focus Group 2, Female Native Student 9, p. 37, lines 11-19)
Appendix A

Survey of Student Success

Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability. If you do not know the answer or do not wish to answer a question, please leave it blank or go to the next question. Please complete this survey by checking the appropriate box for your selected response, writing your answers in the blank line, or space below the statement. If a question/answer does not relate to you or your experience please place N/A indicating that it does not apply to you.

Demographic Information

D1. Are you: Female □  Male □

D2. What is your age?*  __________

D3. What is your marital status?

Single □  Married □  Domestic Partnership □  Divorced □  Separated □

D4a. Do you have children who live with you?  Yes □  No □

D4b. If yes to the above question, please indicate how many children live with you

__________

D5. What is your annual (yearly) household income range?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-2000</th>
<th>2001-5000</th>
<th>5001-8000</th>
<th>8001-10,000</th>
<th>10,001-12,000</th>
<th>12,001-15,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15,001-18,000</td>
<td>18,001-20,000</td>
<td>20,001-25,000</td>
<td>25,001-30,000</td>
<td>30,001-35,000</td>
<td>35,001-40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40,001-45,000</td>
<td>45,001-50,000</td>
<td>50,001-55,000</td>
<td>55,001-60,000</td>
<td>60,001-65,000</td>
<td>65,001-70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70,001-75,000</td>
<td>75,001-80,000</td>
<td>80,001-85,000</td>
<td>85,001-90,000</td>
<td>90,001-95,000</td>
<td>95,001-100,000 +</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D6. Do you receive financial aid?  Yes □  No □

D7. What is your race/ethnicity: (mark all that apply)*

American Indian/Native American □  Asian/Pacific Islander/Filipino □
African American/Black  □  Latino  □
□  Caucasian/White  □  Mexican American
□  Other:______________________  □  Other:_______________________

D8. What is/are your tribal affiliation(s):

________________________________________________________________________

D9. Are you an enrolled member of your tribe?  Yes □  No □
D10. Is your tribe federally recognized?  Yes □  No □
D11. Do you receive financial support from your tribe?  Yes □  No □
D12. If you chose yes please indicate what type of financial support:

________________________________________________________________________

D13. Do you live on a reservation?  Yes □  No □
D14. Do you live in an urban area?  Yes □  No □
D15. Do you live in a rural/non-reservation area?  Yes □  No □
D16. Approximately how many miles do you commute from home to college?

__________

D17. How many community college, tribal college or junior college credit hours have you
earned prior to this semester?*  ______

D18. From where did you obtain these credit hours or units:

________________________________________________________________________

D19. Did you graduate from: high school □  GED □  Neither □
D20. Did you take college preparatory courses in high school?  Yes □  No □
D21. What is the highest level of education obtained by your Father?
Not a high school graduate □ High school diploma or GED □

Some college, did not complete □ Associates degree □ Bachelor’s degree □

Master’s degree □ Doctorate □ Unknown □

D22. What is the highest level of education obtained by your Mother?

Not a high school graduate □ High school diploma or GED □

Some college, did not complete □ Associates degree □ Bachelor’s degree □

Master’s degree □ Doctorate □ Unknown □

D23. With whom do you live while pursuing your education? (mark all that apply)

I live alone □ Spouse/Partner □ With my child or children □ My parent(s) □

Other relatives □ Friends who are students □ Friends who are not students □

D24. What is your overall GPA? _____

D25. What is your current major: ___________________(if undecided, please state undecided)

D26. In which college(s) are you currently enrolled?

____________________________________________________________________

D27. For how many units are you enrolled (in each institution listed above)

____________________________________________________________________

D28. Do you mostly take classes: daytime (before 5pm) □ evening (after 5pm) □ online □

D29. What are your educational goals?
A few classes at the community college □ A Certificate □ Associates Degree □ Bachelor’s Degree □ Master’s Degree □ PhD □

D30. After finishing your studies, do you plan to?

- Transfer to a four-year college □
- Get a job or begin a career □
- I am undecided about this □
- Other plans not listed □

D31. Since high school, which of the following types of schools have you attended (do not count the one you are attending) (Please mark all that apply)

- Private school or training program □
- Public vocational-technical school □
- Another community or technical college □
- 4 year college or university □
- Tribal college □
- None □

* qualifying criteria questions

Are you interested in being involved in a follow up focus group or interview?

- Yes □
- No □

If you answered yes to the above question and signed the consent form that indicates you are interested, please provide contact information below:

Contact Information: ____________________________________________________________
(Please either provide a phone number or email address. If you are providing an email address please make sure there are no identifying names or numbers in the address.)

If you have questions or concerns about the focus group session or interview please contact Tamara Cheshire at 916-925-4217. Thank you for taking the time to help with this study.
Survey of Student Success continued
Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability. If you do not know the answer or do not wish to answer a question, please leave it blank or go to the next question. Please complete this survey by checking the appropriate box for your selected response, writing your answers in the blank line, or space below the statement. If a question/answer does not relate to you or your experience please place N/A indicating that it does not apply to you.

SECTION 1 – QUESTIONS REGARDING CAPITAL OR RESOURCES AND BARRIERS
(Family involvement and support & Community involvement and support)

S1Q1. How supportive is your immediate/extended family of your attending this college?
Extremely □ quite a bit □ somewhat □ not very □ not at all □ N/A □

S1Q2. How supportive are your friends of you attending this college?
Extremely □ quite a bit □ somewhat □ not very □ not at all □ N/A □

S1Q3. How supportive is your community of you attending this college?
Extremely □ quite a bit □ somewhat □ not very □ not at all □ N/A □

S1Q4. How supportive is your tribe of you attending this college?
Extremely □ quite a bit □ somewhat □ not very □ not at all □ N/A □

S1Q5. How often do you participate in tribal or Native community activities?
Often □ Sometimes □ Rarely □ not at all □ Never □

S1Q6. Which best represents the quality of your relationships with the following people at this college?
(please circle the choice that best reflects your experience)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People</th>
<th>Quality of your relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Helpful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S1Q7. How much have your experiences at this college contributed to your knowledge, skills and resources base?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences</th>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring job or work-related knowledge /skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using computing information technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working effectively with others/understanding people of other ethnic groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding yourself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing to the welfare of your tribe or community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing clearer career goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining information about career opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S1Q8. To what degree do each of the following student characteristics below serve as barriers to your academic success? Rate each characteristic according to the scale provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Characteristics</th>
<th>Major barrier</th>
<th>Moderate barrier</th>
<th>Minor barrier</th>
<th>No barrier / No effect on success</th>
<th>N/A (does not apply)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of motivation to succeed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate preparation for college-level work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate study skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First generation to attend college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuting/living off campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic disadvantage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecision about major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecision about career goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate financial resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical health problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental or emotional health problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lack of support from significant others (spouse, partner, parents, family, community, peers, tribe)
Too many family demands
Too many job demands
No social integration (peer group interaction, extracurricular activities)
No academic integration
Distance from permanent home
Inadequate coping skills
Other: ______________________

S1Q9. How likely is it that the following issues would cause you to withdraw from class or from this college?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors/Issues</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat likely</th>
<th>Not likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working full time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring for dependents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academically unprepared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of finances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive admissions practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic financial aid services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic academic advising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgmental attitude of faculty or staff toward students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited academic support services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No available housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited number &amp; variety of courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racially biased professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to a 4 year college or university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: ______________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 2 - QUESTIONS REGARDING YOUR PRECOLLEGE ACADEMIC PREPARATION OR HIGH SCHOOL EXPERIENCE:

S2Q1. In general, how would you rate your high school
   Above Average □   Average □   Below average □   Not sure □

S2Q2. When you were in high school, which of the following was helpful or served as a barrier in preparing you for college?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Very Helpful</th>
<th>Helpful</th>
<th>Neither helpful nor barrier</th>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Major Barrier</th>
<th>Does not apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taking college preparatory courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking college or university courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellow classmates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends at school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic preparation (learned skills)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in pre-college programs (Upward Bound, Alpha Academy, AVID)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting a four-year institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting a community college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Bridge Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, specify:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 3 – QUESTIONS REGARDING FINANCIAL SUPPORT

S3Q1. Do you believe you have enough financial support to achieve your academic goal(s)?

Yes □    No □

S3Q2. Indicate which of the following are sources you use to pay your tuition at this college

(please respond to each item)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Major Source</th>
<th>Minor Source</th>
<th>Not a source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>my own income/savings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parent income/savings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse/significant other’s income/savings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employer contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grants and scholarships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student loans (bank, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal monies (per cap, individual Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monies, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION 4 – QUESTIONS REGARDING FACULTY AND COURSEWORK

S4Q1. To what extent have your professors contributed to your academic development?

Very □    Somewhat □    Not very □    Not at all □    N/A □

S4Q2. To what extent are your professors involved in your academic success?

Very □    Somewhat □    Not very □    Not at all □    N/A □

S4Q3. How important is each of the following to your academic success:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors Regarding Faculty &amp; Coursework</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not very</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear &amp; interesting lectures or lab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement and respect from professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good use of classroom technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair exams and other evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good textbooks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful homework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear course materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in groups in class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear expectations about requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor availability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance to choose between many sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to computers and other resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling welcome in the class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in learning communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing remedial/developmental coursework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in service learning programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION 5 – QUESTIONS REGARDING INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT/SUPPORT**

**S5Q1.** How often do you use the following services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic advising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job placement assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer or other tutoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill labs (math lab, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid advising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer lab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer credit assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services to student with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S5Q2. If used, how satisfied are you with the following services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic advising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job placement assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer or other tutoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill labs (math lab, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid advising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer lab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer credit assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services to student with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S5Q3. How important are the services to you at this college?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic advising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job placement assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer or other tutoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill labs (math lab, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid advising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer lab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer credit assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services to student with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S5Q4. How much does this college emphasize the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Very little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging time spent on studying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing support needed to ensure your success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging interaction among students from diverse backgrounds (racial/ethnic, economic, social, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping you cope with non-academic responsibilities (family, work, childcare, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Providing support to thrive socially
Providing financial support
Contribute to the welfare of your community
Solving complex real-world problems
Understanding yourself
Rules and regulations/policy
Voting in local, state, tribal or national elections
Attendance at campus events and activities (speakers, cultural events, athletic events, etc.)

S5Q5. How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this college?
   Excellent ☐  Good ☐  Fair ☐  Poor ☐

S5Q6. Would you recommend this college to a friend or family member? Yes ☐ No ☐

S5Q7. If you could start over again, would you go to the same institution you are now attending?
   Definitely yes ☐  Probably yes ☐  Probably no ☐  Definitely no ☐

Section 6 - Resiliency
Which of the following were, or have been, the most important resiliency factors with regard to your academic success? Please rank only the top five with “1” being the most likely factor, and “5” being the least. (For example, if scholarship money was most important in helping you stay in college, that would be marked “1”, if mentoring possibilities were second most important, this would be ranked “2” and so on, through “5”.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resiliency Factors (contributing to academic success)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S6R1. Scholarship/Financial Support (any scholarships or monetary support that helped you stay in school)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6R2. Mentors (mentoring provided by college faculty or others)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6R3. Salary (knowing a stable job will probably be available upon graduation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6R4. Role Model (wanting to serve as a role model for students of color, as well as all students)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6R5. Family Support (emotional support from either family of origin: parents/siblings/aunts/uncles/grandparents, or your own family: life partner/children)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6R6. Time spent with family (opportunity to have greater quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time with children and family due to your work/school schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6R7. Friend/Peer Support (emotional support from friends or college peers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6R8. Social/Community Support (support from the larger community, e.g. civic group, social groups, church groups, tribe)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6R9. High School Preparatory Support (vocational guidance or high school prep courses that have been instrumental to your college success)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6R10. Spiritual Support (support for a Higher Power, through prayer, chanting, meditation, ceremony, etc. If support was more social in nature, please use number 8 Social/Community Support instead)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6R11. Other Factor (please provide a description of the factor: (And note its importance in the right-hand column)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6R12. Other Factor (please provide a description of the factor: (And note its importance in the right-hand column)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taken from Holt, Mahowald and DeVore (2002), Ranking Resiliency Factors.

If you have questions or concerns about the focus group session or interview please contact Tamara Cheshire at 916-925-4217. Thank you for taking the time to help with this study.
Appendix B

Focus Group Questions

Focus group and individual interview questions

Questions will be based on the original research questions as outlined in this study:

What are the academic and personal needs of American Indian community college students?

What are the perceived barriers that American Indian students face at the community college level?

What are the resiliency and persistence characteristics employed by American Indian community college students that contribute to student success?

1. What is your tribal membership or affiliation? Where were you raised?

2. Where do you currently reside?

3. As of right now, how many community college units have you taken?

4. How do you feel about your experience as a community college student?

5. What educational services or resources have been helpful to you? What is it about these resources or services that have made them helpful?

6. Which educational services have been frustrating? What is it about these services that have made them frustrating?

7. What do you see as the barriers to obtaining academic success?

8. How does your family, community, tribe feel about you attending college?

9. What is your primary goal at this community college and what has motivated you to attend this college in particular?

10. What are your greatest resources that you believe positively impact your academic success?
11. What cultural values have helped you to achieve success at the community college?

12. What are the greatest barriers that could prevent you from achieving your goals?

13. What are the needs of Native students at the community college level?

14. What factors could cause Native students to not complete their educational goals?

15. Which of these factors is most important? Could you rank them in order of importance?

16. How can the community college better serve American Indian students?

17. How will completing your educational goals affect your ability to get a job?
Appendix C

Consent Forms

Survey Consent Form

You are invited to participate in a study conducted by Tamara Cheshire, Adjunct Professor of Anthropology and Ethnic Studies/Native American Studies at Sacramento City College, Adjunct Professor of Anthropology at California State University, Sacramento and doctoral student in the Educational Leadership and Policy Program at California State University, Sacramento. It is my hope to learn about factors impacting American Indian community college student success. As an American Indian community college student, your experience with education is important to understanding how Native students succeed.

If you decide to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete a survey while in attendance at the Indigenous student ‘Welcome/Welcome Back’ event held fall semester 2011, which should take no longer than 30-45 minutes. If you decide to volunteer for the second phase of the study consisting of a focus group or interview, this will take place at a later date, held at Sacramento City College (exact location to be determined by the researcher), which will take no longer than sixty minutes. A separate consent form will be provided for the focus group or interview.

Some of the questions in the survey may seem personal and you do not have to answer the questions if you do not want to. You have the right to skip any questions and/or stop participating at any time without consequence and upon request you may be provided with contact information to a college counselor or outside counseling services. Surveys that are not complete may not be usable by the researcher. The long-term goal of this study is to help American Indian students succeed at the community college level. There is no guarantee that you will receive any benefits from this study.

Information obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by law. If your permission is to be required for disclosure, you will be asked to complete a separate form at a later date. Steps will be taken to ensure participant privacy like assigning pseudonyms or numbers to participants.

Your decision whether or not to participate will not prejudice your future relations with Sacramento City College or with California State University, Sacramento. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and to discontinue participation at any time without penalty.

If you have any questions, please ask. If you have any additional questions, later on please feel free to contact Tamara Cheshire at 916-925-4217. She will be happy to answer them. Or you can contact Dr. Carlos Nevarez at 916-278-2282. You will be given a copy of this form to keep.
You are making a decision whether or not to participate in this study. Your signature below indicates that you have read the information above and have decided to participate in the survey phase of this study.

Print Participants Name _____________________ Signature: __________________________ Date: ________

Contact Information: ____________________________________________________________

Researcher’s Name ________________________ Signature: __________________________ Date: ________

Researcher’s Phone Number (include area code): _________________________________
Focus Group/Interview Consent Form

You are invited to participate in a study conducted by Tamara Cheshire, Adjunct Professor of Anthropology and Ethnic Studies/Native American Studies at Sacramento City College, Adjunct Professor of Anthropology at California State University, Sacramento and doctoral student in the Educational Leadership and Policy Program at California State University, Sacramento. It is my hope to learn about factors impacting American Indian community college student success. As an American Indian community college student, your experience with education is important to understanding how Native students succeed.

If you decide to participate in this phase of the study consisting of a focus group or interview, this will take place at a later date, held at Sacramento City College (exact location to be determined by the researcher), which will take no longer than sixty minutes. You will be contacted to schedule a meeting time.

Some of the questions asked during the focus group/interview may seem personal and you do not have to answer the questions if you do not want to. You have the right to skip any questions and/or stop participating at any time without consequence and upon request you may be provided with contact information to a college counselor or outside counseling services. The long-term goal of this study is to help American Indian students succeed at the community college level. There is no guarantee that you will receive any benefits from this study.

Information obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by law. If your permission is to be required for disclosure, you will be asked to complete a separate form at a later date. Steps will be taken to ensure participant privacy like assigning pseudonyms or numbers to participants.

Your decision whether or not to participate will not prejudice your future relations with Sacramento City College or with California State University, Sacramento. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and to discontinue participation at any time without penalty.

If you have any questions, please ask. If you have any additional questions, later on please feel free to contact Tamara Cheshire at 916-925-4217. She will be happy to answer them. Or you can contact Dr. Carlos Nevarez at 916-278-2282. You will be given a copy of this form to keep.
You are making a decision whether or not to participate in this study. Your signature below indicates that you have read the information above and have decided to participate in the focus group/interview phase of this study.

Print Participants Name _____________________ Signature: __________________________Date:_____

Contact Information: ________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

Researcher’s Name _____________________ Signature: __________________________Date:_____

Researcher’s Phone Number (include area code): ________________________________
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