

Effect of Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society Advisor Mentorship on Student Success

A Dissertation submitted
to the Graduate School
Valdosta State University

in partial fulfillment of requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in Adult and Career Education

in the Department of Leadership, Technology, & Workforce Development
of the Dewar College of Education and Human Services

May 2026

AMY K. HANCOCK

M.Ed., Georgia Southwestern State University, 1988
B.S.Ed., Georgia Southwestern State University, 1986

© Copyright 2026 Amy K. Hancock

All Rights Reserved

This dissertation, "Effect of Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society Advisor Mentorship on Student Success," by Amy K. Hancock, is approved by:

**Dissertation
Committee
Chair**

DocuSigned by:
Christopher Waugh
FF07FC1CA5D3477...

C. Keith Waugh, Ph.D.
Professor of Adult Learning and Development

**Dissertation
Committee Member**

DocuSigned by:
John Lairsey
E7092B2079CD40E...

John D. Lairsey, Ed.D.
Assistant Professor of Leadership, Technology, and
Workforce Development

**Committee
Members**

DocuSigned by:
Pamela A. Dobbins

Pamela A. Dobbins, Ed.D., B.S.N., RN
Program Coordinator, New Teacher Institute, M.Ed. in Adult
and Career Education

**Associate
Provost for
Graduate
Studies and
Research**

Becky A. K. da Cruz
Becky A. K. da Cruz, Ph.D., J.D.
Professor of Criminal Justice

Defense Date

March 12, 2026

FAIR USE

This dissertation is protected by the Copyright Laws of the United States (public Law 94-533, revised in 1976). Consistent with fair use as defined in the Copyright Laws, brief quotations from this material are allowed with proper acknowledgement. Use of the material for financial gain without the author's expressed written permission is not allowed.

DUPLICATION

I authorize the Head of Interlibrary Loan or the Head of Archives at the Odum Library at Valdosta State University to arrange for duplication of this dissertation for educational or scholarly purposes when so requested by a library user. The duplication shall be at the user's expense.

Signature *Amy Hancock*

I refuse permission for this dissertation to be duplicated in whole or in part.

Signature _____

ABSTRACT

Student success, as seen by graduation and transfer rates for community colleges, has long been a topic of discussion. Although the graduation and transfer success of Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society (PTKHS) members is evident, little research has been done identifying the relationship between the success rates of the members and the support mechanisms of chapter advisor mentorship levels at community colleges. The purpose of the study was to examine the effect that advisor mentorship had on the success rates through graduation and transfer of Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society students. Guided by Nora and Crisp's mentoring framework and using Crisp's College Student Mentoring Scale (CSMS) of four mentoring dimensions: psychological and emotional support, degree and career support, academic subject knowledge support, and the existence of a role model, the quantitative study explored how advisor mentoring contributed to graduation and transfer success of PTKHS members. Descriptive and inferential statistical analyses revealed consistently strong alumni perceptions of advisor mentorship across all measured constructs. Although no statistically significant differences were identified among completion groups, the results were consistent with literature indicating that advisor mentorship positively contributes to student persistence and academic engagement. The results were consistent with literature supporting the value of structured mentorship within PTKHS and highlighted the importance of the use of mentorship activities and advisor professional development in mentorship strategies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| Chapter I: Introduction to the Study | 1 |
| Background..... | 1 |
| Statement of the Problem..... | 7 |
| Theoretical Framework..... | 7 |
| Research Questions..... | 8 |
| Significance of the Problem..... | 9 |
| Limitations and Delimitations..... | 10 |
| Definition of Terms..... | 14 |
| Chapter II: Review of Literature..... | 18 |
| Mentoring..... | 18 |
| Mentoring Theory | 20 |
| Mentoring Framework | 20 |
| Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society | 29 |
| Community Colleges, Graduation, and Transfer Rates | 30 |
| Chapter III: Methods and Procedures | 33 |
| Definition of Study Population and Sampling Procedures | 33 |
| Measures | 34 |
| Procedure | 35 |
| Data Analysis | 36 |
| Research Questions..... | 37 |
| Chapter IV: Results of the Study..... | 42 |
| Conclusions..... | 56 |
| Summary..... | 58 |
| Chapter V: Discussion..... | 61 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Overview..... | 61 |
| Summary of Findings..... | 62 |
| Recommendations for Future Research..... | 65 |
| Conclusion | 67 |
| Appendix A: Permissions Letter from Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society Survey Instrument..... | 77 |
| Appendix B: Survey Instrument..... | 86 |
| Appendix C: Survey Permission..... | 88 |
| Appendix D: Institutional Review Board..... | 77 |
| Appendix E: Histograms..... | 90 |

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society Alumni by Category 44

Table 2: Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society Alumni by Participation in Chapter Meetings or
Fellowship 46

Table 3: Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society Alumni by Participation in Regional or International
Events 47

Table 4: Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society Alumni by Participation in Edge Training Programs . 47

Table 5: Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society Alumni by Participation in College Project or Honors
in Action 48

Table 6: Internal Consistency of Survey Constructs..... 50

Table 7: Tests of Normality for Each Construct..... 51

Table 8: Test Results for CSMS Constructs by Alumni Group..... 52

Table 9: Spearman’s Rho Correlations Between Questions 4-6 and CSMS Constructs 53

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to my dissertation committee for their guidance, support, and commitment throughout this journey.

A special thank you to my committee chair, Dr. C. Keith Waugh, for never giving up on me and for providing continued guidance and encouragement every step of the way. Your patience, belief in me, and willingness to invest your time made this accomplishment possible.

I am also deeply grateful to Dr. John Lairsey and Dr. Pamela Dobbins for their support and for seeing me through to the end. Your insight, feedback, and encouragement were instrumental in helping me complete this work.

To my husband, Billy, thank you for being my constant support system from day one and on every day that followed, even when I doubted myself. To my family, Anna, Callie, and Cody, thank you for your encouragement, patience, and for always believing in me. I couldn't have made it without you.

To my grandson, Cason, thank you for the smiles and hugs that came exactly when I needed them most. You are always a bright light and there is nothing better than hearing you say, "Dr. Mamie".

To my parents, thank you for giving me, from a young age, the determination to set a goal and see it through to the end. That foundation carried me all the way to this moment. I wish Daddy could have been here to see it.

To my Phi Theta Kappa family, thank you for showing me over the years that being an advisor is so much more than a title. It is an opportunity to make a meaningful difference. Through this role, I discovered what it truly means to be a mentor and supporter, not only to my chapter members but also to students and advisors across the Georgia Region.

Finally, thank you to my extended family, my work family, and my friends who encouraged me, supported me, and stood beside me. Even on those days when I didn't think I would be able to complete it, you told me I could. I am truly grateful for each of you.

"I can do all things through Christ who strengthens me." Philippians 4:13

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my sister, Laura Beth Tucker (1962-2024).
She would have been so proud to call me Dr. Amy.

Chapter I

Introduction to the Study

Background

With an average grade point average of 3.6, Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society members are considered among the top students in the community college setting (“By the numbers,” 2019). With an eligibility requirement of meeting or exceeding a minimum of a 3.0 grade point average, these students have reached a high academic standard and are on track for college completion through graduation or transfer to a four-year institution of higher education. Not all students who are eligible choose to join the honor society. Still, those who do will have access to the many benefits that belonging to the national organization affords. One of the advantages is having a designated Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society advisor for the chapter offering membership (Phi Theta Kappa, 2018a).

Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society (PTKHS) is a nationally recognized international honor society that has been in existence for over a century. Established in 1918, the honor society has provided recognition for the academic excellence of high-achieving students and provided them with program activities centered on the four hallmarks of PTKHS – scholarship, fellowship, leadership, and service. The organization provides local chapters at accredited institutions offering an associate degree program, commonly known as community colleges, with the resources for members to be recognized for their academic accomplishments and engage in personal and professional development opportunities through a plethora of programs, chapter development activities, and involvement in local, regional, and national events. Within the

national organization are four divisions. Each of the divisions has regions, and the regions are divided into local chapters. Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society determines the divisions and regions by the proximity of the location of the colleges to one another. A college must apply to the national organization for inclusion into the society for a local chapter and follow the Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society constitution and by-laws (Phi Theta Kappa, 2018c).

Typically, the eligibility requirements for membership are to be a current student at an accredited associate degree-granting institution, have completed at least 12 hours of coursework, and have a 3.5 grade point average or above. PTKHS bylaws allow students pursuing an associate degree to meet the minimum of 12 hours and a 3.0 grade point average and those in certificate degree programs of one year to be eligible after a minimum of 6 hours with a 3.0 grade point average or higher. Each chapter has the option to adjust eligibility standards if it is per the guidelines in the organization's constitution. Full-time, part-time, fully online, and dual-enrolled high school students are all able to join once meeting the eligibility requirements of the organization and the local chapter. A one-time payment for dues is required, which covers costs associated with the organization, the region in which the local chapter resides, and the local chapter. Chapters use the costs for programming, events, and benefits provided by the local chapter, such as receiving a graduation stole at no additional cost to the member.

Student success, as seen by graduation and transfer rates for community colleges, has long been a topic of discussion. Community colleges in the United States are known as access institutions that offer credit and noncredit courses. Of the over 1,100 recognized community colleges by the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC, 2018a), the clear majority (89%) of them are public institutions. Students enrolled in credit courses make up for a slightly larger number (59%) than those in noncredit courses. Of the enrollment in credit courses

of 7.1 million in 2017, the majority (63%) attend on a part-time basis. The total enrollment at community colleges experienced a 1.7% decline from 2016 to 2017 (AACC, 2018b). Most community college students commute, as only 28% of public institutions have on-campus housing, while tuition costs at community colleges are considerably less (35%) than four-year institutions (AACC, 2018a).

Over the last several years, student success through graduation and transfer rates has been examined on the national level and by Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society. The national completion rates for the fall 2011 cohort was 37.5 percent (Shapiro et al., 2018). Transfer rate findings reveal 31.5 percent of students who first enrolled at a community college in fall 2010, transferred to a four-year institution within six years (Shapiro et al., 2017).

Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society completed a study to investigate the completion and transfer rates of its members as compared to the national averages. Random samples of members were tracked for six years, beginning in the 2008/2009 school year. Findings revealed Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society members have an 85 percent completion or graduation rate. Compared with the national rate of 37.5 percent, Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society members completed college at a rate of three times more than other community college students (Marlowe et al., 2016). The transfer rate of Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society members moving to a four-year college was 71 percent (Marlowe et al., 2016) while the transfer rate of other community college students was 33 percent (Jenkins & Fink, 2016).

Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society compiles data on graduation and transfer rates into a national profile of student success for each state comparing the national average, the state's average, and the state's Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society average. Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society sends these profiles to regional coordinators for each Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society region,

chapter advisors, college presidents, and other stakeholders considered relevant by the organization. The differences between the graduation and transfer rates for Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society members and all other community college students are data points used by the organization and local chapter advisors to show the value of Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society to college administration to gain support on campus.

Although the graduation and transfer success of Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society members is evident, little research is done identifying the relationship between the success rates of the members and the support mechanisms of chapter advisor mentorship levels at community colleges. At least one advisor leads each Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society local chapter. The advisor is expected to meet the minimum level of requirements to serve in the role. The organization expects the advisor to oversee chapter operations on behalf of the college and Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society, submit the Chapter Annual Report each year, invite eligible students to become members at least once per year, and report new members to Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society at least once per year. Beyond the minimum duties, the advisor may add other responsibilities and activities to their role that align with the policies and expectations of the local college administration.

The role of a mentor can become part of the advisor's responsibilities and play a part in the success of Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society students. A lack of research on the effect of an advisor's mentorship on completion and transfer rates makes it difficult to analyze the correlation. Since additional responsibilities would include being a mentor to students, this role is not considered mandatory by advisors at each chapter. Examples of mentorship activities may include advising students on their academic path, providing guidance and building leadership skills for members in projects critical to chapter development and growth, and encouraging

student engagement through exposing them to travel opportunities to local, regional, and national events. A problem is many advisors only perform the minimum requirements and do not become a mentor to chapter members. According to a Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society staff member, as of November 2018, there are approximately 3,000 advisors at chapters in the 29 regions of PTKHS. Since early 2018, PTKHS has created a Five Star Advisor Plan to cover topics such as the role of chapter advisor, finding chapter members, engaging members, participating in regional and international events, developing student leaders, and supporting undergraduate research. The plan is a self-paced online course designed to engage advisors and encourage them to move beyond merely enrolling members. Since its inception and as of 2018, 23 percent of advisors have enrolled in the course, with 6 percent of all advisors completing the course to become a Five Star Advisor. With active engagement in mind and exposing students to new opportunities, 27 percent of advisors attended PTKHS's international convention in Kansas City, Missouri in April 2018. Five percent of advisors attended the week-long Honors Institute for members and advisors in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania in June 2018 (B. Ellis, personal interview, November 14, 2018). A lack of additional support and guidance through mentoring activities and the encouragement to participate in regional and international events which play a role in personal and professional development of students could affect the success of the Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society members.

In this study, the College Student Mentoring Scale (CSMS) developed by Gloria Crisp provides a way to examine the level of mentorship received in mentoring relationships (Crisp, 2009). The survey delves into four key areas to factors found in successful mentoring relationships which are psychological and emotional support, degree and career support, academic subject knowledge support, and the existence of a role model. PTKHS advisors are

able to offer the levels of mentorship through their interactions with their chapter members. To provide psychological and emotional support, an advisor can provide a listening ear and provide encouragement and emotional support as needed. One-on-one conversations, as well as group sessions during chapter meetings, are fertile ground for establishing a supportive relationship that could carry on throughout the chapter member's time at the college and even beyond (Crisp, 2009).

Even though students have academic advisors to guide them through their degree and career planning, PTKHS advisors have unique opportunities to discuss strengths, weaknesses and abilities that could impact decisions on degree and career choices. An advisor taking the time to talk through realistic expectations and the implications of their choices could make a significant impact on decisions relating to the courses they take that will lead them toward their career goals (Crisp, 2009).

Successful completion of coursework towards a degree or the opportunity to transfer to a four-year college relies heavily on the academic achievements of the students. PTKHS students have already proven their academic abilities through the eligibility requirements for joining the local chapter, but things happen and grades can sometimes fall lower than the students want them to be. The academic support provided by PTKHS advisors is not to take the place of professors or academic support staff but instead is to challenge the students to find the academic support through college resources that are available and give suggestions and guidance on improving academic performance to the standard held by PTKHS members. Student success and graduation depends on academic performance and that additional push and support by PTKHS advisors can make a significant difference (Crisp, 2009).

PTKHS advisors can also serve as role models for the members. When students are able to experience a positive example of success in academics, as well as in personal behaviors, they tend to follow those behaviors and strive to be successful both academically and personally (Crisp, 2009).

Determining the level of mentorship received by Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society members and its relationship to their completion and transfer success was the primary goal of the study.

Statement of the Problem

Much of the prior literature on mentoring at the college level focuses on four-year institutions. It does not give a clear understanding of the role of mentors for community college students, particularly in the area of student success for Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society members. However, given the accessibility of advisors for members in Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society chapters, the role of the advisors as mentors has not been explored. The problem addressed in this study was that a low percentage of advisors move beyond the basic requirements as advisors into the role of mentor. Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society advisors must be aware of the research on the importance of mentoring its members to increase success rates through graduation and transfer.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework guiding the study was based on a concept created by Nora and Crisp (2007) after extensive reviews of theoretical perspectives as they established a valid and reliable mentoring scale. Crisp (2009) indicated theories by Cohen (1995), Kram (1988), Schockett and Haring-Hidore (1985), Levinson et al. (1978), Miller (2002), and Roberts (2000) provided the foundation for the content of the framework. The theoretical framework identified

four latent variables that include: (a) psychological and emotional support, (b) degree and career support, (c) academic subject knowledge support, and (d) the existence of a role model. The alignment of the CSMS, the survey used in this study, was done within the four constructs of the latent variables (Crisp, 2009). The survey questions collected information from the PTKHS alumni that served to analyze the types of mentorship activities provided by PTKHS advisors and their relationship with college completion or transfer for PTKHS students.

Research Questions

Four research questions guided this study:

RQ1: What is the frequency and percentage of Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society alumni who 1) earned a degree or certificate from the community college; 2) transferred from the community college to a four-year college/university prior to graduating from community college with a degree, or; 3) left the community college before earning a degree and did not continue with education?

RQ2: According to Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society alumni, how active were alumni in their chapter as measured by the frequency in which they 1) attended chapter meetings or fellowship activities; 2) attended a regional or international event, such as regional conferences, Catalyst Convention or Honors Institute; 3) participated in a PTKHS Edge training program for chapter members, and; 4) participated in the chapter's College Project or Honors in Action project?

RQ3: Are there statistically significant differences between Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society alumni who 1) earned a degree or certificate from the community college; 2) transferred from the community college to a four-year college/university prior to graduating from community college with a degree, or; 3) left the community college before earning a degree and

did not continue with education in the types of advisor mentorship activities as measured by four facets of the College Student Mentoring Scale?

RQ4: Is there a statistically significant relationship between Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society alumni who 1) earned a degree or certificate from the community college; 2) transferred from the community college to a four-year college/university prior to graduating from community college with a degree, or; 3) left the community college before earning a degree and did not continue with education with the type of advisor mentorship activities as measured by each item of the College Student Mentoring Scale?

Significance of the Problem

A lack of prior research on the topic of advisors as mentors was a problem found by researchers. Information on mentors in general and also on college graduation and transfer rates are more accessible than the specific topic. The lack of research on community college success rates, as indicated in a report by the Lumina Foundation for Education, show researchers have given new attention to community colleges; however, it is not reflected in published research (Bailey & Alfonso, 2005). Townsend et al. (2004) found only 8 percent of the 2,321 reviewed articles published between 1990 and 2003 mentioned community colleges.

The results of the study contribute to the understanding of the relationship of advisor mentorship and graduation and transfer outcomes among Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society students. The statistical analysis revealed factors associated with completion and transfer outcomes, supporting recommendations for the implementation of mentorship activities associated with student success. A common thread that runs across chapters is the role of advisors. The level of engagement by the advisors varies from a low level of involvement of only submitting eligible members for membership to a high level of engagement of mentoring and

active interactions. If a positive relationship between mentorship and graduation and transfer rates was supported by the analysis, the results may be shared with Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society for consideration in advisor training materials and related communications to promote mentoring activities.

Limitations and Delimitations

The response rate of the surveys was a limitation. While online survey formats have become popular and yield higher response rates than paper surveys, there are also factors that contribute to a lower response rate (Saleh & Bista, 2017). Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society provided the number of maximum participants of 1,527 alumni association members from the 2021 yearly report which is required of Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society recognized alumni associations. Because the survey link was sent to alumni association advisors with the request to distribute to alumni association members and because the survey was anonymous, the actual amount of alumni association members receiving the survey link was not determined. A goal of a minimum of 750 participants was set. Of the possible 1,527 eligible participants, 90 respondents were recorded, with 71 respondents fully or partially completing the survey. Of the 71 participants who fully or partially completed the survey, 32 were excluded by selecting more than one demographic question of identifying their status as one of the following: 1) earned a degree or certificate from the community college where the PTKHS membership was gained; 2) transferred from the community college where the PTKHS membership was gained to a four-year college/university prior to graduating from community college with a degree, or; 3) left the community college where the PTKHS membership was gained before earning a degree and did not continue with education. The exclusions left 39 participants who met the criteria.

Included in a research paper by Saleh and Bista (2017) examining a wide range of factors related to survey response rates in academic research, the author presented 11 recommendations in order to increase the response rates of online surveys. These recommendations were followed in the research design. The recommendations by Saleh and Bista (2017) are as follows:

1. Elicit the aid of authority figures, known personnel or organizations to the target population to distribute the survey, when possible.
2. Target a population that is more likely to hold interest in the research.
3. Consider offering an incentive for completing the survey.
4. Make every effort to craft a survey that is short and concise.
5. Inform the population in the invitation letter of the approximate time it will take to complete the survey.
6. Whenever possible, reduce the number or eliminate open-ended survey items.
7. Assure the participants of the anonymity and confidentiality of their responses.
8. Explain how the collected data will be handled, who will have access to them, and how the data will be stored and/or disposed of after the study is completed.
9. Personalize invitations to participate in the study and make them look professional.
10. Send at least one, but not more than three, reminders to the target population to motivate them to complete the survey.
11. Be aware of the time constraints related to time-of-year for the target population.

To ensure the validity of the survey as coming from a reputable source, Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society as the authority figure of PTKHS agreed to send the survey link to the PTKHS alumni association advisors who in turn were asked to distribute the survey link to their alumni association members. The emails with the links were sent soon after the completion of the

required alumni association yearly report by PTKHS in order to ensure the most accurate and up-to-date information was available.

The target population was alumni association members of PTKHS recognized alumni associations. The members of the alumni associations had been a part of a PTKHS chapter while in college and had chosen to join the alumni association after leaving the college in which they had become a PTKHS member. Their interest was assumed because of their affiliation with PTKHS through active membership in the PTKHS and the continued association with PTKHS through the alumni association.

A monetary or gift incentive was not offered for the completion of the survey. In the letter accompanying the survey, an explanation was given that the completion of the survey would be of value to PTKHS in training advisors on the importance of mentoring the PTKHS members while they were in their chapters at the college where they received their membership.

The selected survey was the College Student Mentoring Scale by Gloria Crisp (2009). The Likert style survey contained 25 survey questions. In addition, three dichotomous questions were asked about their status as alumni after leaving the college where they became a member, and four dichotomous questions were asked about their involvement in PTKHS programming while a chapter member at the college where they became a member.

A letter of invitation was sent to be distributed with the survey link. Invited participants were informed of the estimated time for completion of the survey that it should take no longer than 20 minutes.

The College Student Mentoring Scale survey contained only Likert style responses with five scales. There were no open-ended survey items. In addition to the Likert scale, there were

seven dichotomous questions relating to their status as alumni members and their participation in PTKHS programming while a chapter member.

In the invitation letter and consent form for the survey, participants were informed of the anonymity of the survey. No one, including the researcher, would be able to associate any response with the identity of the participants. No personally identifiable information will be collected through the use of the Qualtrics electronic survey which used an anonymous link. The survey cannot link responses with identities. No personal information was collected other than descriptors indicating completion status through graduation, transfer or non-completer. The online survey did not collect IP addresses or identifiable information. Data was removed from Qualtrics by exporting it for further processing and was kept on a password protected computer. The data will be destroyed three years after the completion of the research by erasing it from the computer hard drive and physically destroying any device such as a USB drive that contains the data.

Invitations were sent through Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society and the alumni advisors with the intent to make them less likely to go to spam or junk folders since PTKHS members routinely receive email communications from them. Invited participants were aware that the survey was approved through PTKHS.

The initial survey was sent with a projected deadline of one month for completion. A reminder email was sent midway through the time-period. An additional reminder was sent with one week remaining, which included a one-week extension on the deadline.

The time of the year was deemed appropriate because of the yearly reporting deadline with PTKHS alumni association chapters and the timing of the PTKHS Catalyst Convention held during the survey period. At Catalyst, alumni associations in attendance meet and the PTKHS

regional coordinators and alumni association advisors were encouraged to remind alumni association members to complete the survey which was emailed to them.

Bias could be a limitation of the study as I have been an advisor for several years. Also, analysis was only being done on certain variables of student success through graduation and transfer rates. A limitation might be other variables aside from advisor mentorship affects these rates.

Delimitation of the study could be the choice to only include Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society members of the regions' alumni associations and ask them to provide self-reported data. The selection of participants could limit the number of responses that are received.

Definition of Terms

Key terms covered in this study are defined as follows:

Alumni. Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society members are considered alumni when they leave the chapter in good standing through graduation, transfer, or other means (Phi Theta Kappa, 2018f).

Chapter Bylaws. Operational rules for the chapter established at chartering; revisions must be approved and filed with HQ (Phi Theta Kappa, 2018f).

Community college. Refers to an associate-degree granting institution (AACC, 2018a). This definition includes the comprehensive two-year college as well as many technical institutes, both public and private (Cohen et al., 2014).

Completion. Obtaining a credential from an institution of higher education, which includes a certificate, associate, bachelor's degree, or higher (Marlowe et al., 2016).

Divisions. Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society's chapters are organized into four geographic divisions (Phi Theta Kappa, 2018f).

Hallmarks. The tenets and key values of the Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society - Scholarship - studying the Honors Study Topic and sharing scholarly activities with others; Leadership - taking leadership roles and developing leadership skills; Service - participating in service-learning through Honors in Action Projects and College Projects; and Fellowship - collaborating with members, college, community, region and/or beyond (Phi Theta Kappa, 2018f).

Honor Society. Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society's administrative and managerial operations are based in Jackson, Mississippi. The Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society building is called the Center for Excellence (Phi Theta Kappa, 2018f).

Honors Institute. Annual, five-day intensive examination of the Honors Study Topic for members and advisors; Honors Institute takes place in June at a four-year college/university campus (Phi Theta Kappa, 2018f).

Honors Study Topic. A study topic is developed every two years that is interesting, in the news, interdisciplinary, international, important, intellectual, theme-oriented, and action-oriented. The Honors Study Topic is the basis for research projects (Phi Theta Kappa, 2018f).

Mentorship. The guidance provided by a mentor, especially an experienced person in a company or educational institution, to advise or train.

Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society. The international honor society of 2-year colleges. The purpose of Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society is to recognize the academic achievement of college students and to provide opportunities for them to grow as scholars and leaders (Phi Theta Kappa, 2018a).

Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society advisor. A faculty or staff member at a community college that is selected to serve in the role of overseeing the local chapter and following the requirements and guidelines of the Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society organization (Phi Theta Kappa, 2018a).

Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society Catalyst. Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society's Annual Convention usually held in April with approximately 4,000 attendees and features Hallmark Awards presentations, renowned speakers, college and corporate booths, and educational sessions (Phi Theta Kappa, 2018f).

Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society chapter. A local group of members affiliated with the international headquarters of Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society through the issuance of a charter and completion of the requirements of a chapter (Phi Theta Kappa, 2018a).

Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society member. To be eligible for a membership invitation, a student must complete a minimum of 12 hours of associate degree course work and earn a grade point average of 3.0 or higher or the grade point average as indicated in the chapter bylaws approved by Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society. Once a student is eligible to join, he/she is expected to pay a one-time due to qualify for member benefits (Phi Theta Kappa, 2018a).

Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society region. The international organization of Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society is divided into four divisions. Each division is divided into regions based on location. Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society has 29 regions headed by a regional coordinator and associate regional coordinator. Regional officers from regional chapters are elected to serve one-year terms as the regional student leadership team. Each region

holds regional conventions and leadership conferences, creates training opportunities for officers and members, and offers awards (Phi Theta Kappa, 2018a).

Regional Coordinators. A Regional Coordinator, a chapter advisor appointed by HQ to oversee regional activities, leads each of Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society's 29 regions (a state or multiple states). They support the mission of Phi Theta Kappa in partnership with PTKHS staff to provide advisor guidance and education, convene regional conferences, train regional officers, and develop positive relationships with the region's chapters and colleges. Many regions also have an Associate Regional Coordinator (Phi Theta Kappa, 2018f).

Transfer. A student's move from a two-year college to a four-year college, regardless of hours earned at the two-year college (Marlowe et al., 2016).

Chapter II

Review of Literature

This chapter provides a review of the literature of mentoring, Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society, theoretical framework for mentorship, and completion and transfer success of community college students. The purpose of the study was to determine the level of advisor mentorship received by Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society members and its relationship to their completion and transfer success.

Mentoring

According to Irby and Boswell (2016), the use of the word “mentoring” first appeared in the English language during the eighth and ninth centuries as part of Greek literature. In Homer’s *The Odyssey* (1990), the word mentor is used to describe a main character’s friend and advisor after he is left fatherless with no one to serve as his guide through life. Also, the goddess Athena takes on the role of Mentor throughout the poem. Olwell (2016) explains that much of what is displayed in the role of the Mentor is seen in mentoring today. Mentors are willing to speak up for mentees and save them from making unnecessary mistakes. They also challenge them to achieve greater things than what they aspire to do. Part of a mentor’s role is to offer help and guidance so the mentee can create a plan and implement the plan.

Not until the latter part of the eighteenth century was the term found in print in America. From 1778 until the early 1900s, mentoring was used in the context of the proper conduct and etiquette of young men and women. By 1913, a group of men formed a mentoring group,

possibly the first formal one in America. Much of the mentoring activities were focused on youth in social settings (Miller, 2002).

In the 1980s, mentoring became part of language found in professional journals and used by organizations and universities to establish mentoring programs. By 1993, journals appeared devoted exclusively to mentoring and focusing on mentoring programs, especially in higher education (Miller, 2002).

Mentoring activities are now found throughout university and college systems. Professors mentor graduate students. Professional women mentor female students underrepresented in science, technology, engineering, and math fields. Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society advisors mentor high-achieving community college students. Communications professor Pamela Kalbfleisch likens mentoring to nurturance and care. She describes it as “more than a simple exchange of information and accomplishment of ability,” but as “the human connection of two people: one more advanced in a particular area, one less advanced; both joined in a common commitment to achieving success” (2002, p. 64).

In a discussion on mentoring and leadership, Marquardt and Loan (2006) pointed out requirements for a mentor in helping others reach their potential as having useful insights and skills in working with others, but also have the desire to help. “For most, this is not a natural talent, but the necessary insights and skills can be learned. The desire, of course, is more a matter of choice” (p. 46). A mentor will want to exhibit behaviors and create activities that fit the needs of the mentee. Serving as a role model, demonstrating genuine interest, providing opportunities to expand thoughts, providing honest and supportive feedback, and encouraging through motivation are all helpful (Marquardt & Loan, 2006).

Mentoring goes beyond regular duties and is often seen as doing things above and beyond for the student. Informal settings that take place outside of a classroom or office setting are found to encourage conversation. These informal settings can include places to meet for a short-term casual chat or on a college-related trip (McKinsey, 2016). The mentoring relationship does not need to include personal or private information to be effective. McKinsey (2016) explained from a student's perspective that "it's personal, but it has appropriate boundaries. [The mentor] teaches me – it has a directional flow – but he reveals himself too, he lets me into his thinking process. He always keeps the right balance, and it's mostly about the mentee, about helping me understand my strengths and goals. It makes me want to give back at some point, to pass it on to others" (p. 9).

Mentoring Theory

Common characteristics of mentoring in the community college setting emerge in theories, and facets within each are found to be relevant to the study of advisor mentorship. As discussed below, the theory and framework exhibit a connection to the mentoring practices examined that align with the success of students.

Mentoring Framework

The term mentoring has been widely used, however, the lack of a consensus on its operational meaning has been a concern. Also, the connection shown between mentoring and academic success for students at the community college level has been absent for the most part (Crisp & Cruz, 2009; Jacobi, 1991). Jacobi (1991) found mentoring is broadly used in business management, psychology, and education. Crisp and Cruz (2009) also found mentoring is most commonly found in the four-year educational sector. In a review of literature on work conducted between 1990 and 2007, Crisp and Cruz (2009) discovered little research centered on community

colleges. However, they did find activities with a mentoring component had a positive impact on the success of students at other levels. Of the 42 empirical studies reviewed, only two did not reveal positive outcomes for students who were engaged in mentoring activities. Higher grade point averages and increased persistence to graduation were observed among students who participated in mentoring activities. After a theoretical literature review, Crisp and Cruz (2009) noticed the lack of a theoretical base for mentoring in educational settings. Attempts were made in the studies between 1990 and 2007 to validate mentoring in higher education through a theoretical lens, but none were found (Crisp & Cruz, 2009).

Nora and Crisp (2007) further reviewed theoretical perspectives to establish a framework that could be validated and serve as a base for a mentoring scale complete with internal consistency reliability and construct validity. Crisp (2009) indicated theories by Cohen (1995), Kram (1988), Schockett and Haring-Hidore (1985), Levinson et al., (1978), Miller (2002), and Roberts (2000) provided the foundation for the content of what would be measured in a study. Kram (1985, 1988) established four phases in a mentoring relationship, including initiation, cultivation, separation, and redefinition, with two broad categories of career development and psychological support. Levinson, et al. (1978) brought the idea to the forefront that mentoring relationships are essential in every stage of development in life, and often, the level of success one has is based on mentoring throughout life. After five years of work with mentoring, Miller (2002) found the corporate world and the educational world had much in common when it came to mentors. The development of a mentoring culture is essential to the success of student growth. Roberts (2000) concluded mentoring needed a consensus on what it was in different settings. Mentoring does seem to have a central theme of coaching, role modeling, and assessing its effectiveness. Schocknett and Haring-Hidore (1985) laid the basis for psychosocial and

vocational mentoring assessment through factor analysis, which led to the ability to formulate questions for further study.

The concept created by Nora and Crisp (2007) is the framework that guides this study. It identified four latent variables that include: (a) psychological and emotional support, (b) degree and career support, (c) academic subject knowledge support, and (d) the existence of a role model. The first variable, psychological and emotional support, focuses on a supportive relationship where the mentor and the mentee establish a link through mutual understandings and agreements. The mentor provides support and encouragement. The second variable, degree and career support, centers on what the mentee needs to complete a degree and find a suitable career. Discussing goals and making plans for the future are important factors relating to the second variable (Crisp, 2009).

The third variable, academic subject knowledge support, focuses on academic challenges and uncovering strategies to aid in academic success. The mentor also approaches the education of mentees not only as finding ways to help during struggles but also to encourage each mentee to continue rising to the occasion and going further academically to a higher level. The fourth variable, the existence of a role model, concentrates on the relationship that is established and what is gained from the mentor taking a personal interest in the mentee. Accomplishments, as well as failures, are shared as a way to guide mentees toward the achievement of goals, and the relationship is enriched through the sharing of experiences (Crisp, 2009).

Crisp et al. (2017) reported that the framework is associated with increased connectedness between students and the educational environment, and that mentoring constructs are linked to positive student success outcomes. Once student success is realized, the long-term result is higher degree attainment (Espinoza & Espinoza, 2012; Gross et al., 2015). Mentoring

has been shown to improve the persistence and high grades of college-level students (Collings et al., 2014; Khazanov, 2011), and the long-term care and support of mentoring are part of that (Baker & Griffin, 2010).

Crisp (2009) explained the alignment of the CSMS with the four constructs of the framework. Items are measuring psychological and emotional support related to “encouraging the students to discuss problems, talking openly about personal issues, providing emotional support, and talking about social issues” (p. 181). Degree and career support were assessed using items on “examining degree options, assisting the student in making decisions associated with their degree choice, and guiding an assessment of the student’s skills and encouraging educational opportunities” (p. 181). Academic subject knowledge support was measured by items relating to “assisting in the achievement of academic aspirations, encouraging discussion regarding problems with coursework, and providing ongoing support regarding coursework” (p. 181). The existence of a role model was assessed using items related to “the student having someone whom they admire and look up to regarding college issues, someone who sets a good example, and someone who shares personal examples of difficulties they have overcome to accomplish their academic goals” (p. 181).

The minimum responsibilities of a chapter advisor for Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society are related to chapter operations on behalf of the college, completion of a yearly annual report for Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society, inviting eligible students, and reporting the new students at least once a year. The local chapter and college determine additional responsibilities. The Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society Five Star Advisor training provides the prospect for advisors to not only learn the basic requirements but also to expose them to opportunities for giving support to the students through various avenues. The training plan includes topics on engaging members

through chapter meetings and activities, coaching students for academic and scholarship success, encouraging students to participate in transfer and career readiness tools provided by PTKHS, and supporting undergraduate research efforts for PTKHS students. Also, making available participation and travel opportunities to regional and national PTKHS events as a mentoring function is aligned with Lunsford's mixed-method study that revealed these activities provided the effective support mentors needed to give (2011). The advisors who elect to participate in the self-paced training can learn skills relating to support, which can be found to align with the four constructs of the CSMS scale (Phi Theta Kappa, 2018e; Crisp, 2009).

Henry et al. (2011) conducted research on course-embedded mentoring for first-year students. Of the 85 sections of first-year composition courses offered at the select university, 35 of the sections were part of a writer's mentor program. Data was collected to determine if the constructs of the CSMS scale were present in the mentoring program as viewed by the students. The analysis indicated the constructs were part of an effective mentoring program and in particular, course-embedded mentoring yielded benefits to students involved in the program.

Eells' (2017) study explored the impact a veteran mentoring program has on veteran students as they transition to civilian life. Veteran students at three universities were given a survey which consisted of demographic questions, specific questions about the mentor and transitioning and the College Student Mentoring Scale (CSMS). Responses from the 71 veteran students provided results showing mentoring programs do have a positive impact on transitioning to civilian life. They found all four variables of degree and career support, academic subject knowledge, psychological and emotional support and the existence of a role model were found in the mentoring programs provided.

The researcher used a descriptive quantitative approach in order to take the large amount of data that would be gathered through the survey and reduce it to a manageable form with tables, graphs and charts. The participants came from three universities that were selected after narrowing down the number originated from a Google search. The criteria for selection were based on the availability of an active veteran mentoring program with veterans and mentors participating and the veterans were only assigned to one mentor instead of being in a group mentoring program (Eells, 2017).

CSMS was selected as the survey for the study because the four mentoring variables it measured were found to be common in the themes of mentoring in the literature review. The survey had also been validated and seemed to be the most appropriate tool to collect data (Eells, 2017). Chan (2014) confirmed the validity of the CSMS in a study of 231 undergraduate students at universities in Hong Kong. This study also found the CSMS to be internally consistent.

Eells (2017) used the data collected to test the hypotheses and answer the research questions based on the veteran students' perception of the mentoring support they were receiving. The CSMS produced cumulative scores ranging from 25 to 125. For this study, the scores ranged from 80 to 121 indicating positive mentoring experiences of the veteran students. Each variable was then analyzed to determine the perception of each participant. Overall, the study showed veteran mentoring programs do have an impact on veterans transitioning from the military to civilian life.

Baier (2014) used the CSMS in a study about the role of mentoring relationships on persistence in freshman college students. The researcher analyzed the perceptions of mentorship both at the beginning and end of the semester. Baier (2014) found mentoring had a positive effect on students and the participants of the study overwhelmingly indicated they valued the

mentorship they received. Holt and Fifer (2018) adapted the CSMS to assess first-year students' perceptions of mentoring they received during a first-year semester-long seminar. The researcher provided conclusions that three of the four functions in the CSMS were identified in the mentoring practices. Since the presence of goal setting and career paths were not as apparent in the study, the researcher recommended additional training and the incorporation of strategies to support students in this area.

Horton (2015) studied the impact of mentoring on college-related stress and college adjustment for first-year, first-generation college students. The College Student Mentoring Scale (Crisp, 2009) was one of five surveys used in the study. An online survey was administered to one hundred and thirty first-year, first-generation college students at Texas Women's University. The CSMS questionnaire assessed the four theoretical variables of mentoring which are emotional/psychological support, degree/career support, academic support, and role model (Crisp, 2009) as it related to a mentoring relationship on college-related stress and college adjustment.

Four of the surveys were used to measure the students' stress levels and how well they have adapted or adjusted to college. The CSMS survey was the only one to assess the relationships of those factors with the degree of mentoring received and mentoring in general. Horton (2015) selected the CSMS survey because it had previously been used to assess mentoring relationships in undergraduate students which was her target audience. The elements of Nora and Crisp's (2007) mentoring model guided the literature review and study. Research suggested their four domains of mentoring were found to benefit students in their first year of college. According to Horton (2015), the degree of mentoring received, whether a high level or low level, did not make an impact on students' stress and adjustment. The levels were determined

by the scores on the CSMS. Those with scores of 93 and above were designated as a high degree of mentoring. Those below were in the low degree of mentoring group. The statistically significant association identified through the analysis showed that involvement in mentoring, regardless of degree, was related to lower college-related stress and higher adjustment among first-year, first-generation college students.

The lack of impact discovered on the quality of mentoring could be attributed to the use of CSMS. It has been found to be valid for use in measuring mentoring behaviors, not the quality of a relationship. The CSMS is designed to measure if the relationship exhibits the four domains, not to measure their quality (Horton, 2015).

Using a correlational study, Kim (2015) examined the relationships between Nora and Crisp's (2007) four mentoring variables and intent to persist and intent to complete among African American male community college students. The study also considered which, if any, of the four variables predicts intent to persist and intent to complete. The Challenge-Support-Outcome model served as the framework. This seesaw model from Sanford (1966) suggests when challenges are balanced by support, academic success follows.

The target population of the study was African American male community college students. The sample was drawn from African American male students enrolled in three Maryland community colleges who were enrolled in different academic programs. The use of the students in the sample created a snapshot view of three different sets of participants. The study did not measure the actual persistence or completion, only their perceptions and predictions. It also did not measure the effectiveness of individual mentoring programs (Kim, 2015).

Kim (2015) used the College Student Mentoring Scale survey instrument with the sample of 205 students during the fall of 2014. The data was collected via paper survey. The four

mentoring variables from Crisp (2006) were used as independent variables while the intent to persist and intent to complete were dependent variables. Because of Crisp's (2006) previous work, the survey instrument was found to be reliable and valid.

Analysis of the data revealed that the mentoring variables were neither significantly correlated with nor predictive of intent to persist among African American male community college students. The mentoring variables were, however, correlated and predictive of intent to complete for the same group of students. The top two predictors for intent to complete were academic subject knowledge support and the existence of a role model (Kim, 2015).

Kim's (2015) findings and Crisp's (2010) findings contradict each other on the intent to persist and the four mentoring variables. Crisp used the CSMS in a study that found mentoring experiences in community colleges were an indirect contributing factor on students' intent to persist. The difference could lie in the participants used in each study. Kim focused on African American males and Crisp used a wider participant pool comprised of whites, Hispanics, Asian Americans, and African Americans. Examination of the CSMS results indicated that students expressed a greater intent to complete than intent to persist. Statistical analysis demonstrated that none of the four mentoring variables functioned independently; stronger associations were observed when variables were examined in combination. Therefore, a comprehensive plan for mentoring including multiple variables are more effective (Kim, 2015).

Crisp (2009) concluded with the findings of a research study to determine the properties of the CSMS demonstrated reliability and validity. In the 2006 study, participants were selected from a stratified random sample of courses offered at a community college in the south-central area of the United States ($n = 351$). The internal consistency reliability of the items measuring each of the four constructs was established by calculating Cronbach coefficient alphas. The

research questions were addressed using a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Results of the CFA indicated the constructs were valid.

Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society

Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society is recognized as the official honor society for community colleges. Since its founding in 1918, more than 3.5 million members have been inducted from all 50 of the United States, plus Canada, Germany, the Republic of Palau, Peru, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, the British Virgin Islands, the United Arab Emirates and U.S. territorial possessions. The society continues to induct approximately 13,000 members per year (Phi Theta Kappa, 2018g).

The honor society focuses on recognizing the academic achievement of college students at associate degree granting institutions. Through a member's participation in the four hallmarks of scholarship, leadership, service, and fellowship programming, the opportunity for individual growth and development is given (Phi Theta Kappa, 2018c).

To be eligible to join Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society, students must be enrolled in an associate degree granting institution, have completed at least 12 credits hours of coursework, and meet the minimum required grade point average of 3.0 or higher. A one-time membership fee is required that varies by institution. Still, membership is for a lifetime unless an issue happens to cause it to be revoked according to Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society constitution and by-laws (Phi Theta Kappa, 2018d).

Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society, based in Jackson, Mississippi, has four divisions based on geographic location. Within the four divisions are 29 regions. Each region is led by a regional coordinator and an associate regional coordinator, along with a regional officer team elected annually from participating chapters. Each region is made up of local chapters at associate

degree granting public, private, and technical colleges. Each chapter has at least one advisor that must meet the minimum requirements from Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society and is allowed to be involved in all aspects of the chapter on a local, regional, and national level. Advisors may also serve as mentors to the members in the local chapter (Phi Theta Kappa, 2018c).

Community Colleges, Graduation, and Transfer Rates

A community college is defined by the Cambridge Dictionary (n.d.) as a “local two-year college at which students can learn a skill or prepare to enter a university.” The American Association of Community Colleges further expands the definition by describing community colleges as an “American invention that put publicly funded higher education at close-to-home facilities, beginning nearly 100 years ago with Joliet Junior College. Since then, community colleges have been inclusive institutions that welcome all who desire to learn, regardless of wealth, heritage, or previous academic experience” (American Association of Community College, 2018b). With the beginning of community colleges in the late 1800s to early 1900 came an opportunity for citizens to earn a college diploma. Before this time, only the wealthy could afford an education at a university, but the rise of community colleges made education available to all (Witt et al., 1994).

In the early part of the 20th century, junior colleges, as the community colleges were known then, were growing. By 1922, over 200 junior colleges were founded and operational within 37 of the 48 states in existence at the time with a total enrollment of approximately 20,000. In only ten years, the number of junior colleges had grown to 440 with an enrollment around 70,000, an average of 160 students per institution (Cohen et al., 2014).

After World War II and as thousands of servicemembers returned from war, they found themselves unemployed. In 1944, the GI Bill of Rights was approved by Congress which

provided federal tuition assistance and living allowances to veterans who wanted to enroll in American colleges and universities. In 1945, 88,000 enrolled in college and it grew to more than two million in 1950 (Thelin, 2011). The GI Bill caused a significant rise in college enrollments and expanded access for low-income students, adult students and women (Cohen et al., 2014). The growth of community colleges can also be attributed to the inclusion of technical or vocational curriculum over the years in addition to the two-year academic emphasis (Thelin, 2011).

As community colleges have grown over the years, so has the need to improve completion and transfer rates. For example, reported statistics indicate that the enrollments in community colleges increased by 667 percent between 1963 and 2006, but the completion rates of community college students were at a low 22.5 percent (Baldwin et al., 2017; see also Provasnik & Planty, 2008; Knapp et al., 2012). Administrators, educators, and policymakers at the federal, local, and state levels, in turn, have begun to do more to consider student success as an issue to be addressed (Bailey et al., 2007).

Due to the nature of community colleges and the open access to students, a diverse array of people with a variety of goals become students. Some want to obtain a college degree or certificate and move into the workforce. Others plan to attend a community college for a short time and transfer to a four-year university. The reasons for choosing a community college are as vast as the goals set by the students. With its proximity to many students as well as the accessibility and affordability, a community college can be a viable option. Even with the positive attributes of a community college come barriers for retention affecting graduation and transfer rates. Students have work and family commitments that impede their progress and do not allow them to take advantage of student programs such as advising and learning communities.

The lack of institutional resources hinders students from receiving services they need, and lack of funds causes faculty professional development to go lacking in areas to learn techniques for supporting students through the process of graduation or transfer (Seidman, 2012).

Previous research has documented that even with obstacles, mentoring can be a way to obtain student success. A study of a sample of community college students on persistence rates with a structural modeling analysis indicated mentoring was found to indirectly influence their intent to commit to earning a college degree and also played a role in their social and academic integration in college (Crisp, 2010). Research also indicates faculty and staff interactions, and mentoring activities are essential to students' academic progress and success (Museus & Neville, 2012; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005).

Chapter III

Methods and Procedures

Definition of Study Population and Sampling Procedures

The population for the study was Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society alumni members from regions with recognized PTKHS alumni associations. This population was selected because of the likelihood of a higher response rate from alumni in areas that have a designated alumni advisor and active alumni members. This population was also chosen to gather data from PTKHS members who are considered alumni because they have transferred out of a community college, graduated from a community college, or are no longer a student at a community college for reasons other than transfer or graduation. Having served as an advisor for a Georgia chapter of Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society and associate regional coordinator, now regional coordinator, for the Georgia Region for approximately twelve years, I had access to alumni association advisors and Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society staff members serving as alumni association representatives within the organization.

Written support was obtained from Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society to contact alumni association advisors and alumni members relating to the study (see Appendix A). As of November of 2018, there were currently 29 regions in Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society, with all but three regions having at least one alumni association chapter within their regions. Twenty of the regions have a recognized regional alumni association while the remaining nine have a PTKHS alumni association as part of a four-year college (Phi Theta Kappa, 2018b). Alumni

association advisors and staff members at PTKHS were able to assist with the distribution of the surveys by email, alumni association websites, and alumni association social media channels. A total number of participants was tabulated after the survey period ended and considered those returned as undeliverable and those not completed to yield a response rate.

Measures

Data was collected using the College Student Mentoring Scale (CSMS). The CSMS, developed by Dr. Gloria Crisp, Professor of Adult and Higher Education at Oregon State University, is a 25-item survey used to evaluate the effectiveness of mentoring relationships (Crisp, 2009; see Appendix B). Crisp (2009) validated the CSMS by using confirmatory factor analysis on data gathered from college students in the United States. Using goodness of fit values, factor and error variances were found to be positive. All variances were found to be statistically significant ($p < .001$). The acceptable goodness of fit values validated the instrument. Crisp (2009) also made goodness of fit comparisons with other models testing by ethnic groups and gender which supported the validity.

The internal consistency coefficients were examined by Crisp (2009). Cronbach coefficient alphas for each of the four latent variables were found to be substantial. The value of coefficient alpha for Psychological and Emotional Support was highly reliable at .912. Substantial reliability was found for Degree and Career Support ($\alpha = .903$), Academic Subject Knowledge Support ($\alpha = .883$), and the Existence of a Role Model ($\alpha = .845$).

Permission has been obtained from Dr. Crisp for the use of the survey, and the process was done per the guidelines (see Appendix C). As an addition to the survey, dichotomous responses of yes/no to determine their status as a PTKHS alumni, their status as a transfer student to a four-year institution, their status as a graduate of a community college with an

associate degree or certificate, or their status as a non-completer at a community college was included. Dichotomous responses of yes/no were also asked on the member's involvement in chapter events, regional events, international events, and PTKHS programs, Competitive, Transfer and Employment Edge, College Project, and Honors in Action. The 25-item survey, included in Appendix A, used a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 equaling strongly agree to 5 equaling strongly disagree. Participants were asked to identify the degree to which, while as a Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society member, the advisor provided each of the mentoring experiences.

Procedure

The research process began with the approval of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Valdosta State University (see Appendix D). Upon approval, I began the formal data collection. An electronic version of the College Student Mentoring Scale (CSMS) was used as the instrument to collect data of the target population. An initial email was sent to Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society alumni association advisors explaining the reason for the survey, informing them of the endorsement by Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society, and giving instructions on accessing the survey. A link was provided in the email for the survey, and a deadline of one month was given to complete the survey. Following Valdosta State University's Institutional Review Board (IRB) guidelines, a consent statement was included in the email to be used for all forms of communication with the link as a way to address informed consent requirements for anonymous survey research.

Three weeks after the initial email, a reminder email was sent. Alumni association advisors were asked to send an email with the link to accessible alumni members and to post the link with a provided outline of the survey and its importance on their alumni association website

and social media avenues. All emails and web-based survey requests included the IRB consent statement.

Returned surveys were examined regardless of whether they were fully or partially completed. To ensure independence of observations, responses from individuals who identified themselves in more than one demographic group were excluded.

Data Analysis

The purpose of the study was to examine the effect advisor mentorship had on the success rates through graduation and transfer of Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society students. Descriptive and inferential statistics were utilized to analyze questionnaire results using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software. This study used Gloria Crisp's *College Student Mentoring Scale* that was designed to measure a student's perception of mentoring support they received during college. In this study, the participants have already left college, but were either graduates, transfers or non-completers of a community college. The survey included an initial section which collects demographic information about the participants. The demographic section included questions about the participant's current status of a Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society member in relation to being a graduate with a degree or certificate from the community college holding the PTKHS membership record, being a transfer student to a four-year college from the community college holding the PTKHS membership record or being a student who did not complete or transfer to a four-year college from the community college holding the PTKHS membership record. Part two of the demographic data included questions about the student's participation in Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society chapter meetings or fellowship activities, regional or international events, PTKHS Edge programming for chapter members and the

chapter's College Project or Honors in Action project while at the community college where he or she became a member.

Four research questions guided this study. The initial two research questions concerned the demographic data collected. The demographics of the study were separated into a frequencies chart in order to show the percentage of alumni surveyed based on graduation, transfer, and non-completer.

Research Questions

The sample was analyzed in regards to the following research questions:

RQ1: What is the frequency and percentage of Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society alumni who 1) earned a degree or certificate from the community college; 2) transferred from the community college to a four-year college/university prior to graduating from community college with a degree, or; 3) left the community college before earning a degree and did not continue with education?

To determine the frequency and percentage of Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society alumni and their status as a member who either earned a degree or certificate, transferred from the community college to a four-year college prior to graduation, or left the community college before earning a degree or certificate and did not continue with an education, a frequency and percentage table was constructed.

Demographic information was collected to provide descriptive statistics for the study. Participants were asked to provide data for the following information: membership in a Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society recognized alumni association; status as a Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society member as one who graduated with a degree or certificate from the community college that holds the PTKHS membership, one who transferred to a four-year college before graduating from the

community college that holds the PTKHS membership or one who left the community college before earning a degree and did not transfer to an educational institution.

The target population was Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society alumni who are members of a recognized PTKHS alumni association. Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society provided the number of maximum participants of 1,527 alumni association members from the 2021 yearly report which is required of Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society recognized alumni associations. Because the survey link was sent to alumni association advisors with the request to distribute to alumni association members and because the survey was anonymous, the actual amount of alumni association members receiving the survey link was not determined. A goal of a minimum of 750 participants was set. Of the possible 1,527 eligible participants, 107 respondents were recorded with 98 respondents fully or partially completing the survey. Returned surveys were examined regardless of whether they were fully or partially completed. To ensure independence of observations, responses from individuals who identified themselves in more than one demographic group were excluded. Of the 98 respondents, 93.2% reported earning a degree or certificate from their community college, 43.0% reported transferring to a four-year institution before completing a degree, and 2.8% reported leaving before graduation without transferring.

RQ2: According to Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society alumni, how active were they in their chapter as measured by the frequency in which they 1) attended chapter meetings or fellowship activities; 2) attended a regional or international event, such as regional conferences, Catalyst Convention or Honors Institute; 3) participated in a PTKHS Edge training program for chapter members, and; 4) participated in the chapter's College Project or Honors in Action project?

To determine the participation level of the participants in PTKHS activities while they were at the college which holds their membership, the yes/no questions were designed to collect

information on their participation of activity level in chapter meetings or fellowship activities, regional or international events, PTKHS Edge programming or the chapter's College Project or Honors in Action project

RQ3: Are there statistically significant differences between Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society alumni who 1) earned a degree or certificate from the community college; 2) transferred from the community college to a four-year college/university prior to graduating from community college with a degree, or; 3) left the community college before earning a degree and did not continue with education in the types of advisor mentorship activities as measured by four facets of the College Student Mentoring Scale?

The types of mentorship activities received from Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society advisors during the member's time at the community college were collected with the College Student Mentoring Scale developed by Gloria Crisp (Crisp, 2009). Permission to use the tool was received by the author through personal electronic communication on October 15, 2019. The CSMS was developed to measure a student's perception of mentoring support they received during college and used a five-point Likert scale to identify the degree to which, while as a Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society member, the advisor provided the mentoring experiences that make up items that were categorized into separate areas, known as facets. The four facets of the CSMS are 1) Psychological and Emotional Support which encompasses a sense of listening, providing moral and emotional support, identifying problems, and providing encouragement as well as the establishment of a supportive relationship in which there is mutual understanding and link between the student and the mentor; 2) Degree and Career Support which includes an assessment of the student's strength, weaknesses, abilities, and includes assistance with setting academic/career goals and decision-making; 3) Academic Subject Knowledge Support which is

centered on the acquisition of necessary skills and knowledge; on educating, evaluating, and challenging the student academically; on employing tutoring skills and focusing on subject learning in contrast to mentoring that focuses on life learning; and on establishing a teaching-learning; and 4) Existence of a Role Model which is concentrated on the presence of a role model in the student's life as well as the opportunity for the student to learn from the mentor's current and past actions, as well as achievements and failures (Crisp, 2009).

Twenty-five questions were asked on the survey to gather the PTKHS members' perspective on their mentoring experiences from their PTKHS advisors during their time at the community college where they were part of PTKHS.

Cronbach's alpha was used to measure the internal consistency for the set of survey items to determine if respondents were consistent in their responses. Cronbach's alpha was calculated for each of the four constructs to assess the internal consistency of the instrument, which yielded a reliability coefficient of $\alpha = .97$ on three of the constructs and $\alpha = .96$ on one of the constructs, considered to indicate excellent reliability.

RQ4: Is there a statistically significant relationship between Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society alumni who 1) earned a degree or certificate from the community college; 2) transferred from the community college to a four-year college/university prior to graduating from community college with a degree, or; 3) left the community college before earning a degree and did not continue with education with the types of advisor mentorship activities as measured by each item of the College Student Mentoring Scale?

To analyze responses and see how the three groups compare to one another in answering questions about the types of advisor mentorship activities during their time as a Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society member at the college where they became a member, responses to the College

Student Mentoring Scale (CSMS) were first aggregated into four facet scores. Because the data were ordinal and non-normally distributed, Spearman's rank-order correlations were used to examine relationships between alumni group status and each CSMS facet.

The distributional characteristics of the data and the nature of the CSMS constructs warranted the use of Spearman's rank-order correlations which were conducted to examine the relationships between CSMS constructs and Questions 4, 5, and 6.

Chapter IV

Results of the Study

Chapter 4 presented results from the data analysis of the main research questions in this study. Preliminary analysis consisted of demographic analysis about the participant's current status of a Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society member in relation to being a graduate with a degree or certificate from the community college holding the PTKHS membership record, being a transfer student to a four-year college from the community college holding the PTKHS membership record or being a student who did not complete or transfer to a four-year college from the community college holding the PTKHS membership record. Part two of the demographic data included questions about the student's participation in Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society chapter meetings or fellowship activities, regional or international events, PTKHS Edge programming for chapter members and the chapter's College Project or Honors in Action project while at the community college where he or she became a member.

Correlation analysis was used to examine the relationship between alumni association members' perceptions of mentoring support they received from PTKHS advisors while they were a member of PTKHS at the college at which they became a member and their success as measured by college completion. These analyses were conducted to better understand whether perceived mentoring support was associated with differences in educational outcomes among alumni. The analysis examined the relationship between perceived advisor mentorship and student success outcomes following participation in PTKHS.

The four research questions under analysis were:

RQ1: What is the frequency and percentage of Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society alumni who 1) earned a degree or certificate from the community college; 2) transferred from the community college to a four-year college/university prior to graduating from community college with a degree, or; 3) left the community college before earning a degree and did not continue with education?

RQ2: According to Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society alumni, how active were they in their chapter as measured by the frequency in which they 1) attended chapter meetings or fellowship activities; 2) attended a regional or international event, such as regional conferences, Catalyst Convention or Honors Institute; 3) participated in a PTKHS Edge training program for chapter members, and; 4) participated in the chapter's College Project or Honors in Action project?

RQ3: Are there statistically significant differences between Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society alumni who 1) earned a degree or certificate from the community college; 2) transferred from the community college to a four-year college/university prior to graduating from community college with a degree, or; 3) left the community college before earning a degree and did not continue with education in the types of advisor mentorship activities as measured by four facets of the College Student Mentoring Scale?

RQ4: Is there a statistically significant relationship between Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society alumni who 1) earned a degree or certificate from the community college; 2) transferred from the community college to a four-year college/university prior to graduating from community college with a degree, or; 3) left the community college before earning a degree and did not continue with education with the types of advisor mentorship activities as measured by each item of the College Student Mentoring Scale?

For RQ1, demographic information was collected to provide descriptive statistics. To determine the frequency and percentage of Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society alumni and their status as a member who either earned a degree or certificate, transferred from the community college to a four-year college prior to graduation, or left the community college before earning a degree or certificate and did not continue with an education, a frequency and percentage table was constructed. Participants were asked to provide data for the following information: membership in a Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society recognized alumni association; status as a Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society member as one who graduated with a degree or certificate from the community college that holds the PTKHS membership, one who transferred to a four-year college before graduating from the community college that holds the PTKHS membership or one who left the community college before earning a degree and did not transfer to an educational institution.

Table 1 displayed the distribution of alumni into one of the three PTKHS status categories, the frequency in which each appeared, and the data presented in percentages.

Table 1
Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society Alumni by Category

| Variables | Yes (<i>n</i>) | Yes (%) | No (<i>n</i>) | No (%) |
|------------------------------------|------------------|---------|-----------------|--------|
| Graduated | 89 | 93.2 | 9 | 8.4 |
| Transferred | 46 | 43 | 52 | 48.6 |
| Left Before Graduation or Transfer | 3 | 2.8 | 95 | 88.8 |

The target population was Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society alumni who are members of a recognized PTKHS alumni association. Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society provided the number of

maximum participants of 1,527 alumni association members from the 2021 yearly report which is required of Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society recognized alumni associations. Because the survey link was sent to alumni association advisors with the request to distribute to alumni association members and because the survey was anonymous, the actual amount of alumni association members receiving the survey link was not determined. This limitation is common in surveys distributed through organizational contacts since the exact response rate cannot be confirmed and the results should be interpreted with appropriate care (Dillman et al., 2014). A goal of a minimum of 750 participants was set. Of the possible 1,527 eligible participants, 107 respondents were recorded with 98 respondents fully or partially completing the survey. Returned surveys were examined regardless of whether they were fully or partially completed. To ensure independence of observations, responses from individuals who identified themselves in more than one demographic group were excluded. Of the 98 respondents, 93.2% reported earning a degree or certificate from their community college, 43.0% reported transferring to a four-year institution before completing a degree, and 2.8% reported leaving before graduation without transferring.

For RQ2, yes/no questions were designed to collect information on the participation level of the participants in PTKHS activities while they were at the college which holds their membership. Their participation in the activity level was determined by asking their participation in chapter meetings or fellowship activities, regional or international events, PTKHS Edge programming or the chapter's College Project or Honors in Action project.

Table 2 showed the distribution by frequency and percentages of the participants who participated in chapter meetings or fellowship activities among the three groups of those who either earned a degree or certificate, transferred from the community college to a four-year

college prior to graduation, or left the community college before earning a degree or certificate and did not continue with an education.

Table 2

Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society Alumni by Participation in Chapter Meetings or Fellowship

| Frequency | (n) | (%) |
|-------------------|-----|-----|
| Participation | 91 | 85 |
| Non-participation | 4 | 3.7 |

The distribution by frequency and percentage of alumni who participated in chapter meetings or fellowship activities, the most accessible and frequent engagement opportunities within PTKHS, was indicated in Table two. A large majority, 91 alumni (85%), reported participating in these activities, while only 4 alumni (3.7%) indicated they did not.

The descriptive statistics showed high levels of chapter-level engagement among PTKHS alumni during their time in college. High levels of participation suggested that chapter meetings and fellowship activities serve as important avenues for connection and involvement within the chapter. This level of engagement may have contributed to members’ sense of belonging and the availability of mentoring opportunities with the advisors.

The distribution by frequency and percentages of the participants who participated in regional or international events among the three groups of those who either earned a degree or certificate, transferred from the community college to a four-year college prior to graduation, or left the community college before earning a degree or certificate and did not continue with an education were indicated in Table 3.

Table 3*Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society Alumni by Participation in Regional or International Events*

| Frequency | (n) | (%) |
|-------------------|-----|------|
| Participation | 80 | 74.8 |
| Non-participation | 15 | 14 |

The distribution of alumni participation in regional or international events, such as regional conferences, the Catalyst Convention, or the Honors Institute was indicated in Table 3. These events represented higher-level engagement opportunities within the Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society (PTKHS).

Among respondents, 80 alumni (74.8%) reported participating in at least one of these events, while 15 alumni (14%) indicated they had not. The reported participation rates corresponded with a high level of involvement in PTKHS experiences beyond the local chapter level.

The distribution by frequency and percentages of the participants who participated in a PTKHS Edge training program for chapter members among the three groups of those who either earned a degree or certificate, transferred from the community college to a four-year college prior to graduation, or left the community college before earning a degree or certificate and did not continue with an education was indicated in Table 4.

Table 4*Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society Alumni by Participation in Edge Training Programs*

| Frequency | (n) | (%) |
|---------------|-----|------|
| Participation | 57 | 53.3 |

Non-participation 38 35.5

The distribution of Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society (PTKHS) alumni who participated in a PTKHS Edge training program during their time as chapter members was indicated in Table 4. These training programs provide personal and professional development for students within the society.

More than half of the respondents, 57 alumni (53.3%), reported participating in an Edge training program. In contrast, 38 alumni (35.5%) reported not participating. Interpretation of the results indicated while Edge programs reached a majority of alumni, there may be opportunities to expand participation further.

The distribution by frequency and percentages of alumni participation in the chapter's College Project or Honors in Action project among the three groups of those who either earned a degree or certificate, transferred from the community college to a four-year college prior to graduation, or left the community college before earning a degree or certificate and did not continue with an education was indicated in Table 5.

Table 5

Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society Alumni by Participation in College Project or Honors in Action

| Frequency | (n) | (%) |
|-------------------|-----|------|
| Participation | 79 | 73.8 |
| Non-participation | 16 | 15 |

The summary of alumni participation in either the College Project or the Honors in Action project, two core service and research-based initiatives within the Phi Theta Kappa Honor

Society (PTKHS) was indicated in Table 5. These projects are designed to promote student leadership and campus-community engagement.

According to the responses, 79 alumni (73.8%) reported participating in one or both of these chapter-led initiatives. Conversely, 16 alumni (15%) reported not participating. Descriptive statistical results reflected a strong level of involvement in high-impact chapter projects among PTKHS alumni.

For RQ3, the types of mentorship activities received from Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society advisors during the member's time at the community college were collected with the College Student Mentoring Scale developed by Gloria Crisp (Crisp, 2009). Permission to use the tool was received by the author through personal electronic communication on October 15, 2019. The CSMS was developed to measure a student's perception of mentoring support they received during college and uses a five-point Likert scale to identify the degree to which, while as a Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society member, the advisor provided the mentoring experiences that make up items that were categorized into separate areas, known as facets. The four facets of the CSMS are 1) Psychological and Emotional Support which encompasses a sense of listening, providing moral and emotional support, identifying problems, and providing encouragement as well as the establishment of a supportive relationship in which there is mutual understanding and link between the student and the mentor; 2) Degree and Career Support which includes an assessment of the student's strength, weaknesses, abilities, and includes assistance with setting academic/career goals and decision-making; 3) Academic Subject Knowledge Support which is centered on the acquisition of necessary skills and knowledge; on educating, evaluating, and challenging the student academically; on employing tutoring skills and focusing on subject learning in contrast to mentoring that focuses on life learning; and on establishing a teaching-

learning; and 4) Existence of a Role Model which is concentrated on the presence of a role model in the student’s life as well as the opportunity for the student to learn from the mentor’s current and past actions, as well as achievements and failures (Crisp, 2009).

Twenty-five questions were asked on the survey to gather the PTKHS members’ perspective on their mentoring experiences from their PTKHS advisors during their time at the community college where they were part of PTKHS. These items provided a measure of participants’ perceptions across the four facets of mentoring identified within the CSMS framework. The responses offered insight into how alumni experienced advisor support during their membership.

Cronbach’s alpha was used to measure the internal consistency for the set of survey items to determine if respondents were consistent in their responses. Cronbach’s alpha was calculated for each of the four constructs to assess the internal consistency of the instrument, which yielded a reliability coefficient of $\alpha = .97$ on three of the constructs and $\alpha = .96$ on one of the constructs, considered to indicate excellent reliability as indicated in Table 6.

Table 6

Internal Consistency of Survey Constructs

| Construct | No. of items | Cronbach’s α |
|---|--------------|---------------------|
| Construct One: Psychological and Emotional Support | 8 | .97 |
| Construct Two: Degree and Career Support | 6 | .97 |
| Construct Three: Academic Subject Knowledge Support | 5 | .97 |
| Construct Four: Existence of a Role Model | 6 | .96 |

Normality of the data was assessed using skewness and kurtosis values and visual inspection of histograms. Across all four constructs, the distributions deviated from normality. Construct one (skewness = 1.54, kurtosis = 1.47), Construct two (skewness = 1.06, kurtosis = 0.27), Construct three (skewness = 1.06, kurtosis = 0.15), and Construct four (skewness = 1.50, kurtosis = 1.31) all demonstrated positive skew and peakedness beyond the recommended threshold of ± 1 for approximate normality as indicated in Table 7. Visual inspection of the histograms supported this conclusion that all four constructs deviated from normality. Histograms were presented in Appendix E.

Table 7
Tests of Normality for Each Construct

| Construct | Skewness | Kurtosis | Normality |
|---|----------|----------|--------------------|
| Construct One: Psychological and Emotional Support | 1.54 | 1.47 | Violated Normality |
| Construct Two: Degree and Career Support | 1.06 | 0.27 | Violated Normality |
| Construct Three: Academic Subject Knowledge Support | 1.06 | 0.15 | Violated Normality |
| Construct Four: Existence of a Role Model | 1.50 | 1.31 | Violated Normality |

Because the assumption of normality was violated, non-parametric analysis was done to provide robust alternatives when working without normally distributed data. Non-parametric tests were conducted to examine whether there were differences among Phi Theta Kappa alumni who (a) earned a degree or certificate from the community college, (b) transferred to a four-year

institution before earning a degree, or (c) left without completing a degree and did not continue their education, on four constructs of the College Student Mentoring Scale (CSMS). Results indicated no statistically significant differences for Construct one, $p = .629$; Construct two, $p = .897$; Construct three, $p = .805$; or Construct four, $p = .912$. Because all p -values exceeded the .05 threshold, the null hypothesis that there are no differences among the three alumni groups on the four CSMS constructs was retained as indicated in Table 8. Based on the non-parametric analyses conducted, no statistically significant differences were found in perceived advisor mentorship across alumni completion status groups.

Table 8

Test Results for CSMS Constructs by Alumni Group

| CSMS Construct | Graduated (Degree/Certificate) | Transferred (Before Degree) | Left Without Completing | p-value |
|---|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| Construct One: Psychological and Emotional Support | - | - | - | .629 |
| Construct Two: Degree and Career Support | - | - | - | .897 |
| Construct Three: Academic Subject Knowledge Support | - | - | - | .805 |
| Construct Four: Existence of a Role Model | - | - | - | .912 |

Note. No statistically significant differences were found among the three alumni groups on any of the four College Student Mentoring Scale constructs (all p values $> .05$).

For RQ4, responses were analyzed to see how the three groups compare to one another in answering questions about the types of advisor mentorship activities during their time as a Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society member at the college where they became a member, responses to the College Student Mentoring Scale (CSMS) were first aggregated into four facet scores. Because the data were ordinal and non-normally distributed, Spearman’s rank-order correlations were used to examine relationships between alumni group status and each CSMS facet.

The distributional characteristics of the data and the nature of the CSMS constructs warranted the use of Spearman’s rank-order correlations which were conducted to examine the relationships between CSMS constructs and Questions 4, 5, and 6. No statistically significant correlations were found between Question 4 and Construct 1 ($\rho = .12, p = .292$), Construct 2 ($\rho = .01, p = .911$), Construct 3 ($\rho = .01, p = .937$), or Construct 4 ($\rho = .06, p = .611$). Similarly, Question 5 was not statistically significantly correlated with Construct 1 ($\rho = -.01, p = .960$), Construct 2 ($\rho = -.06, p = .601$), Construct 3 ($\rho = -.05, p = .634$), or Construct 4 ($\rho = -.05, p = .633$). Finally, Question 6 also showed no statistically significant correlations with Construct 1 ($\rho = .01, p = .912$), Construct 2 ($\rho = .04, p = .712$), Construct 3 ($\rho = .02, p = .836$), or Construct 4 ($\rho = .03, p = .792$). Correlation analyses revealed no statistically significant relationships between responses to Questions 4, 5, and 6 and the CSMS constructs as indicated in Table 9.

Interpretation of the results indicated that alumni perceptions of advisor mentorship were not influenced by whether they earned a degree, transferred, or discontinued their studies.

Table 9

Spearman’s Rho Correlations Between Questions 4-6 and CSMS Constructs

| Question | Construct | P | p-value |
|----------|-----------|---|---------|
|----------|-----------|---|---------|

| | | | |
|--|---|-------|------|
| Q4: Earned a Degree or Certificate from the Community College | Construct One: Psychological and Emotional Support | .115 | .292 |
| Q4: Earned a Degree or Certificate from the Community College | Construct Two: Degree and Career Support | .012 | .911 |
| Q4: Earned a Degree or Certificate from the Community College | Construct Three: Academic Subject Knowledge Support | .009 | .937 |
| Q4: Earned a Degree or Certificate from the Community College | Construct Four: Existence of a Role Model | .056 | .611 |
| Q5: Transferred from the Community College to a Four-year College/University Prior to Graduating College with a Degree | Construct One: Psychological and Emotional Support | -.005 | .960 |
| Q5: Transferred from the Community College to a Four-year College/University Prior to Graduating College with a Degree | Construct Two: Degree and Career Support | -.057 | .601 |
| Q5: Transferred from the Community College to a Four-year College/University Prior to Graduating College with a Degree | Construct Three: Academic Subject Knowledge Support | -.052 | .634 |
| Q5: Transferred from the Community College to a Four-year College/University Prior to Graduating College with a Degree | Construct Four: Existence of a Role Model | -.052 | .633 |

| | | | |
|--|---|------|------|
| Q6: Left the Community College Before Earning a Degree and Did Not Continue with Education | Construct One: Psychological and Emotional Support | .012 | .912 |
| Q6: Left the Community College Before Earning a Degree and Did Not Continue with Education | Construct Two: Degree and Career Support | .040 | .712 |
| Q6: Left the Community College Before Earning a Degree and Did Not Continue with Education | Construct Three: Academic Subject Knowledge Support | .023 | .836 |
| Q6: Left the Community College Before Earning a Degree and Did Not Continue with Education | Construct Four: Existence of a Role Model | .029 | .792 |

Note. No statistically significant correlations were found between Questions 4–6 and the CSMS constructs (all p values > .05).

Overall, the descriptive analysis revealed strong educational attainment and engagement among PTKHS alumni. The inferential analysis found no statistically significant differences or relationships among alumni groups on measures of mentorship. The analysis revealed consistently positive alumni perceptions of their PTKHS experience across educational outcome groups.

Conclusions

The analysis conducted for RQ1, “What is the frequency and percentage of Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society alumni who (1) earned a degree or certificate from the community college, (2) transferred to a four-year college prior to graduation, or (3) left the community college before earning a degree and did not continue their education?” found the following:

The descriptive data revealed a high rate of educational success among PTKHS alumni. Of the 98 respondents, 93.2% reported earning a degree or certificate from their community college, and 43% reported transferring to a four-year institution before completing a degree. Only 2.8% indicated leaving before graduation without transferring. According to the descriptive statistics, most participants reported achieving significant educational milestones, which is consistent with the established academic reputation of PTKHS members as highly motivated and successful students. The findings aligned with prior PTKHS national studies showing member completion rates nearly triple those of the national average for community college students (Marlowe et al., 2016).

The analysis conducted for RQ2, “According to Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society alumni, how active were they in their chapter as measured by the frequency in which they 1) attended chapter meetings or fellowship activities; 2) attended a regional or international event, such as regional conferences, Catalyst Convention or Honors Institute; 3) participated in a PTKHS Edge training program for chapter members, and; 4) participated in the chapter’s College Project or Honors in Action project?” found the following:

Engagement among alumni respondents was consistently strong across all areas of chapter involvement. Eighty-five percent of alumni reported participation in chapter meetings or fellowship activities, 74.8% participated in regional or international events, 53.3% engaged in

PTKHS Edge training programs, and 73.8% participated in the College Project or Honors in Action project. As shown in the findings of the study, most PTKHS members were actively involved in leadership and professional development activities that extend beyond basic membership. The pattern of participation observed in the descriptive statistics is consistent with the organization's emphasis on scholarship, leadership, service, and fellowship, demonstrating that PTKHS provides an environment beneficial to engagement and experiential learning.

The analysis conducted for RQ3, "Are there statistically significant differences between Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society alumni who 1) earned a degree or certificate from the community college; 2) transferred from the community college to a four-year college/university prior to graduating from community college with a degree, or; 3) left the community college before earning a degree and did not continue with education in the types of advisor mentorship activities as measured by four facets of the College Student Mentoring Scale?" found the following:

Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the four CSMS constructs—psychological and emotional support, degree and career support, academic subject knowledge support, and role modeling—ranged from .96 to .97, indicating excellent reliability of the instrument. However, data analysis revealed that all four constructs violated the assumption of normality, requiring the use of non-parametric statistical procedures. Results from the data indicated no statistically significant differences among the three alumni groups for any of the four mentorship constructs (all p-values > .05). Analysis of the data revealed that perceptions of advisor mentorship were consistent across all groups, regardless of whether alumni graduated, transferred, or left before completion.

The uniformity of responses indicated that PTKHS advisors provide a similar level of mentorship to members, independent of their eventual academic outcomes. This consistency in advisor engagement may reflect organizational standards and advisor training expectations that promote equitable support for all students.

The analysis conducted for RQ4, “Is there a statistically significant relationship between Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society alumni who 1) earned a degree or certificate from the community college; 2) transferred from the community college to a four-year college/university prior to graduating from community college with a degree, or; 3) left the community college before earning a degree and did not continue with education with the types of advisor mentorship activities as measured by each item of the College Student Mentoring Scale?” found the following:

To further examine the potential relationship between mentorship and student outcomes, Spearman’s rank-order correlations were conducted between alumni group status and each CSMS construct. Correlation coefficients ranged from $-.057$ to $.115$, with all p-values greater than $.05$, indicating no statistically significant relationships between alumni status and mentorship variables. These findings suggested that while PTKHS members perceive strong and positive advisor mentorship overall, these perceptions do not statistically predict whether students complete a degree, transfer, or discontinue their education.

The lack of significant correlations may be attributed to several factors, including the relatively small sample size, little variation in alumni feedback and overall positive views of their mentoring experiences reported.

Summary

The chapter presented the results of the quantitative analysis conducted to address the four research questions examining the relationships between Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society advisor mentorship and student success as measured by graduation and transfer outcomes. Descriptive statistics summarized participants' demographic characteristics and levels of engagement in PTKHS programming, including chapter meetings, regional or international events, PTK Edge activities, and participation in College Project or Honors in Action initiatives. Reliability analyses demonstrated excellent internal consistency of the College Student Mentoring Scale (CSMS) (Crisp, 2009), with Cronbach's alpha coefficients indicating strong reliability across the four mentoring constructs of psychological and emotional support, degree and career support, academic subject knowledge support, and the existence of a role model, consistent with the mentoring framework established by Nora and Crisp (Nora & Crisp, 2007).

Because assumptions of normality were not met, non-parametric analyses were conducted. This examined the differences between alumni groups and relationships between mentoring variables and completion outcomes. Results revealed no statistically significant differences across the four mentoring constructs among alumni who graduated, transferred, or left without completing, and correlation analyses did not identify statistically significant relationships between mentoring variables and completion status. These findings suggested that mentoring experiences within PTKHS may be relatively consistent across members. The lack of statistical significance may also indicate that student success is influenced by other factors rather than only advisor mentorship, including personal circumstances, the support given in other areas of the college, and various other commitments such as family and work.

The high levels of perceived support across all constructs point out the role advisors play for meaningful connections and engagement among PTKHS members, even when statistical

differences are not shown. The discussion in the subsequent chapter builds upon these conclusions to examine implications, limitations, and recommendations for future research.

Chapter V

Discussion

Overview

The purpose of this study was to examine the effect of advisor mentorship on PTKHS alumni success as measured by college completion and transfer outcomes and the advisor mentorship activities used in the study from the College Student Mentoring Scale developed by Gloria Crisp (Crisp, 2009) which were psychological and emotional support, degree and career support, academic subject knowledge support, and existence of a role model.

Four research questions guided the analysis and provided a framework for the descriptive and inferential findings:

RQ1: What is the frequency and percentage of Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society alumni who 1) earned a degree or certificate from the community college; 2) transferred from the community college to a four-year college/university prior to graduating from community college with a degree, or; 3) left the community college before earning a degree and did not continue with education?

RQ2: According to Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society alumni, how active were alumni in their chapter as measured by the frequency in which they 1) attended chapter meetings or fellowship activities; 2) attended a regional or international event, such as regional conferences, Catalyst Convention or Honors Institute; 3) participated in a PTKHS Edge training program for

chapter members, and; 4) participated in the chapter's College Project or Honors in Action project?

RQ3: Are there statistically significant differences between Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society alumni who 1) earned a degree or certificate from the community college; 2) transferred from the community college to a four-year college/university prior to graduating from community college with a degree, or; 3) left the community college before earning a degree and did not continue with education in the types of advisor mentorship activities as measured by four facets of the College Student Mentoring Scale?

RQ4: Is there a statistically significant relationship between Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society alumni who 1) earned a degree or certificate from the community college; 2) transferred from the community college to a four-year college/university prior to graduating from community college with a degree, or; 3) left the community college before earning a degree and did not continue with education with the type of advisor mentorship activities as measured by each item of the college Student Mentoring Scale?

Summary of Findings

By considering the broader body of literature through history, mentoring has been described as a relationship and connection where a more experienced individual provides guidance and encouragement to support the development of another. This is a concept seen as far back at Greek literature and continues with more contemporary educational perspectives (Irby & Boswell, 2016; Olwell, 2016). The perceptions of mentoring by the alumni reflect that mentoring is a process grounded in guidance and support.

The descriptive analysis revealed high levels of academic attainment among respondents, which is consistent with PTKHS members' academic performance. As mentoring continues to

play an important role in higher education (Miller, 2002), these findings offer insights on how advisor mentorship operates within PTKHS and reinforce the value of mentoring in helping students grow and succeed. The completion and transfer rates among PTKHS members confirmed the organization's value in fostering student success at the community college level. High participation rates were observed in chapter, regional, and international programs and events in the promotion of student involvement and activities that align with the four hallmarks of PTKHS: scholarship, leadership, service, and fellowship. The analysis of the findings revealed alumni reported strong perceptions of mentoring support across the four constructs of the CSMS, including psychological and emotional support, degree and career guidance, academic support, and the presence of a role model. Research has emphasized the role of mentors in providing encouragement, feedback and support for growth that are consistent with the participants' perceptions (Marquardt & Loan, 2006).

The inferential analysis found no statistically significant differences or relationships between mentorship constructs and educational outcomes examined, the positive mentoring scores suggest PTKHS advisors provides consistent and meaningful support to all members, The mentoring scores, along with the high alumni success rates of those who graduated or transferred, indicated the mentorship provided by PTKHS advisors may create an influence of stability contributing to members' persistence and engagement. Even though no statistically significant differences were found among alumni groups, this result supports research showing that mentoring often plays a broad supportive role in shaping students' experiences rather than directly determining outcomes (Kalbfleisch, 2002).

These findings help extend what we know about mentoring by showing its importance as a supportive, yet still underexamined, part of student success in community colleges (Crisp &

Cruz, 2009; Jacobi, 1991). Interpreting these findings through the lens of Nora and Crisp's (2007) mentoring framework suggested that the four components of mentorship which are psychological and emotional support, degree and career support, academic subject knowledge support, and the existence of a role model were perceived consistently among all participants. This pattern showed that PTKHS advisors provide mentoring experiences that have an impact on students, whether they graduate, transfer, or leave without completing a degree. Research has shown mentoring can have a lasting effect on shaping students' educational experiences and the impact on their educational and career paths (Levinson et al., 1978). Prior research has documented that interactions with faculty and staff, along with mentoring activities, contribute to students' academic progress and overall success (Museus & Neville, 2012; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). The results supported the idea that advisor mentorship is associated with student engagement, persistence, and academic success, even in the absence of statistically significant differences.

When viewed together with the study's methodology and the existing literature, the findings provided a picture of how mentoring operates within PTKHS. The use of a quantitative approach and the CSMS examining alumni perceptions across the four mentoring domains as described by Nora and Crisp (2007), offered insights into the experiences members had of mentorship support during their time at the community college. Even without statistically significant differences, the results highlighted the steady presence of advisor support and its influence on students' sense of connection and growth. This study offered a clearer understanding of how mentoring works within a community college, particularly in PTKHS, and highlighted the role of supportive relationships in promoting student success.

Recommendations for Future Research

The results of this study provided a foundation for understanding the role of advisor mentorship in PTKHS member success at the community college level. Although the findings did not reveal significant relationships between advisor mentorship and educational outcomes, they showed a need to continually explore the ways mentoring practices could influence persistence and achievement. The strong reliability of the College Student Mentoring Scale (CSMS) reinforced its applicability for future research focused on mentoring practices.

Several recommendations for future research are presented below and ideas to address the limitations in the study are included.

First, increase participant representation and survey reach. The present study was limited by its small number of respondents. Included in a research paper by Saleh & Bista (2017) examining a wide range of factors related to survey response rates in academic research, the author presented 11 recommendations to increase the response rates of online surveys. These recommendations were followed in the research design. While the small number of respondents were reported, this lack of the number of participants may have constrained statistical power and limited the ability to detect relationships among variables. Expanding the participants to include alumni not in alumni associations only or finding a more effective way to reach the alumni on the list could provide a more detailed understanding of mentorship's impact on student outcomes.

Second, integrate qualitative or mixed-method approaches with quantitative data collected through the College Student Mentoring Scale (CSMS). Capturing insight through interviews or focus groups with alumni, advisors and current members could provide additional insight into mentoring experiences and how they may affect student educational outcomes on persistence and achievement. A mixed-method design could strengthen the interpretation of

statistical findings and clarify how specific mentoring interactions contribute to completion and transfer decisions.

Third, examine the impact of advisor training through comparative analyses. Future studies could compare chapters led by advisors who have completed the Five Star Advisor Plan with those whose advisors have not completed formal training. The Advisor Plan offers structured training and includes mentorship guidance. The comparisons would allow for a researcher to examine whether structured mentorship training would improve academic or transfer outcomes and show relationships among the mentoring experiences.

Fourth, explore additional variables related to student success. A researcher may examine additional variables such as grade point average, leadership positions, or involvement with other academic organizations at the community college level. Considering these factors would expand the understanding of success beyond completion and transfer to gain a more complete picture of how PTKHS advisor mentorship support can strengthen students' academic achievement.

Finally, broaden the scope beyond Phi Theta Kappa. To strengthen generalizability, future researchers could examine advisor mentorship across other honor societies or academic support programs within the community college system. Comparing PTKHS members with non-member populations could help identify the role that mentorship plays in contributing to academic success.

In summary, future research should build upon these findings by expanding the scope of participants, integrating qualitative methods, and exploring how advisor training and engagement strategies translate into measurable student outcomes. Continued study in this area will enhance the understanding of mentorship's influence on persistence, transfer, and academic achievement

while supporting the mission of Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society to promote excellence and student success.

Conclusion

To quote Nora and Crisp (2007), mentoring involves providing students with “psychological and emotional support, degree and career support, academic support, and a role model,” which reflects the multiple forms of support of mentoring explored throughout this study. This study examined the effect of Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society (PTKHS) advisor mentorship on student success as measured through graduation and transfer outcomes among community college students. Guided by Nora and Crisp’s (2007) mentoring framework and utilizing the College Student Mentoring Scale (Crisp, 2009), the study sought to better understand how alumni perceived mentoring support across the domains of psychological and emotional support, degree and career support, academic subject knowledge support, and the existence of a role model. By focusing on alumni perspectives, this research provided insight into how mentoring relationships experienced during college may continue to shape reflections on student success and engagement.

Descriptive statistical results reflected strong alumni-reported perceptions of advisor mentorship and high levels of engagement in chapter meetings, events, and programming aligned with the organization’s hallmarks of scholarship, leadership, service, and fellowship. These results are consistent with the longstanding role of PTKHS as an organization that promotes academic achievement and involvement among high-achieving community college students and consistent with prior research highlighting the importance of structured opportunities for engagement in supporting student development. The high levels of participation observed are consistent with PTKHS engagement patterns that provide an environment that encourages

connection, involvement, and growth, all of which are supported by the mentoring literature emphasizing the importance of relationships in higher education.

Inferential analyses did not reveal statistically significant differences among alumni groups based on completion status, nor were significant relationships identified between mentoring constructs and educational outcomes. However, the consistently positive perceptions of mentoring across groups suggested that advisor support may function as a stabilizing influence that contributes to students' sense of belonging and persistence, even when differences are not detectable through statistical testing. These are consistent with prior literature describing mentoring as operating as a broad developmental support rather than as a direct predictor of specific outcomes and reinforces the perspective that mentoring contributes to the overall educational experience.

The methodological approach, including the use of a quantitative design and a validated instrument, provided a structured way to examine mentoring perceptions across a diverse alumni population. The strong internal consistency reliability observed in the constructs supported the appropriateness of the College Student Mentoring Scale for assessing mentoring experiences in this context. At the same time, the study acknowledged limitations related to response rate, self-reported data, and the inability to determine the exact number of alumni who received the survey link due to distribution through organizational channels. These considerations suggested that findings should be interpreted with appropriate caution while still recognizing the meaningful insights gained from alumni perspectives.

Taken together, the results extend existing literature examining mentoring within community college environments as an important, yet still underexplored, component of student success within community college environments. The research examined the gap identified in

prior research by examining mentoring specifically within the context of an honor society and by focusing on advisor roles that extend beyond administrative responsibilities to include guidance, encouragement, and developmental support. The results are consistent with prior research emphasizing the importance of faculty and staff interactions and mentoring activities in supporting students' academic progress and highlight the value of intentional mentoring practices within student organizations.

Importantly, the results demonstrated that mentoring relationships within PTKHS appear to be consistently experienced across alumni regardless of completion pathway, suggesting that advisor mentorship may contribute to a shared culture of support within chapters. This consistency reflected the multidimensional nature of mentoring described in the literature and supported the idea that mentoring experiences may influence students' academic journeys in ways that extend beyond measurable outcomes such as graduation or transfer.

In conclusion, the analysis contributed to a clearer understanding of how mentoring operates within Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society and offered evidence that advisor mentorship plays a meaningful role in shaping students' experiences in community college settings. By bringing together the theoretical framework, the findings, and the study's methodology, this study contributed to existing literature about how colleges and organizations can support student success through meaningful relationships and intentional engagement. Future research can build on these findings by examining mentoring practices in different settings, exploring outcomes over time, and continuing to investigate how mentoring shapes student development. Ultimately, the results supported the value of mentorship within PTKHS and highlighted the continued importance of fostering supportive environments that encourage students to persist, engage, and achieve their educational goals

References

- American Association of Community Colleges. (2018a). *Fast Facts, 2018*.
<https://www.aacc.nche.edu/research-trends/fast-facts/>
- American Association of Community Colleges. (2018b). *Research*.
<https://www.aacc.nche.edu/research-trends/>
- Baier, S. T. (2014). The role of academic factors, self-efficacy, mentoring relationships, and learning communities in persistence and academic success of freshman college students. *Wayne State University Dissertations*.
- Bailey, T., & Alfonso, M. (2005). *Paths to persistence: An analysis of research on program effectiveness at community colleges*. Lumina Foundation for Education New Agenda Series (Vol. 6, no. 1). Indianapolis, IN: Lumina Foundation for Education.
- Bailey, T., Jenkins, D., & Leinbach, T. (2007). The effect of student goals on community college performance measures. *Community College Research Center Brief, 33*, 1–4.
- Baker, V. L., & Griffin, K. A. (2010). Beyond mentoring and advising: Toward understanding the role of faculty “developers” in student success. *About Campus, 2–8*.
doi:10.1002/abc.20002
- Baldwin, C., Alfred, R. L., & Sydow, D. L. (2017). *The completion agenda in community colleges: What it is, why it matters, and where it's going*. Lanham, MA: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Chan, J. (2014). *Validating the college student mentoring scale (CSMS) for a peer mentoring program in higher education: An exploratory study in Hong Kong*. The University of Newcastle, 1 – 130.
- Cohen, A. M., Brawer, F. B., & Kisker, C. B. (2014). *The American community college* (6th ed.).

Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, N. H. (1995). The principles of adult mentoring scale. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 66, 15-32.

Collings, R., Swanson, V., & Watkins, R. (2014). The impact of peer mentoring on levels of student wellbeing, integration and retention: A controlled comparative evaluation of residential students in UK higher education. *Higher Education*, 68, 927–942.

doi:10.1007/s10734-014-9752-y

Community college. (n.d.). In *Cambridge Dictionary online*. Retrieved May 26, 2026, from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/community-college>

Crisp, G. (2009). Conceptualization and initial validation of the College Student Mentoring Scale (CSMS). *Journal of College Student Development*, 50(2), 177–194.

doi:10.1353/csd.0.0061

Crisp, G. (2010). The impact of mentoring on the success of community college students. *The Review of Higher Education*, 34(1), 39-60.

Crisp, G., & Cruz, I. (2009). Mentoring college students: A critical review of the literature between 1990 and 2007. *Research in Higher Education*, 50(6), 525–545.

doi:10.1007/s11162-009-9130-2

Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2014). *Internet, phone, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method* (4th ed.). Wiley.

Eells, J. L. (2017). *Transitioning from military to civilian: The impact of veteran mentoring programs on the transition of veteran students*. (Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses A&I; ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

<https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/transitioning-military-civilian-impact->

veteran/docview/1937874959/se-2?accountid=159967.

- Espinoza, P. P., & Espinoza, C. C. (2012). Supporting the 7th-year undergraduate: Responsive leadership at a Hispanic Serving Institution. *Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership*, 15(1), 32–50. doi:10.1177/1555458912440738
- Gross, D., Iverson, E., Willett, G., & Manduca, C. (2015). Research and teaching: Broadening access to science with support for the whole student in a residential liberal arts college environment. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 44(4), n4.
- Henry, J., Bruland, H. H., & Sano-Franchini, J. (2011). Course-embedded Mentoring for first-year students: Melding academic subject support with role modeling, psycho-social support, and goal setting. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 5(2), 1-22.
- Holt, L. J., & Fifer, J. E. (2018). Peer mentor characteristics that predict supportive relationships with first-year students: Implications for peer mentor programming and first-year student retention. *Journal of College Student Retention*, 20(1), 67-91.
- Homer. (1990). *The Odyssey* [R. Fagles, trans.]. New York: Viking/Penguin.
- Horton, R. (2015). *The impact of a mentoring relationship on college adjustment and college-related stress for first-year, first-generation college students* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global database.
<https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/impact-mentoring-relationship-on-college/docview/1762584420/se-2?accountid=159966>
- Irby, B. J., & Boswell, J. (2016). Historical print context of the term mentoring. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 24(1), 1-7, doi: 10.1080/13611267.2016.1170556.
- Jacobi, M. (1991). Mentoring and undergraduate academic success: A literature review. *Review*

- of Educational Research*, 61(4), 505–532.
- Jenkins, D., & Fink, J. (2016). *Tracking transfer new measures of institutional and state effectiveness in helping community college students attain bachelor's degrees*. New York, NY: Community College Research Center
- Kalbfleisch, P. J. (2002). Communicating in mentoring relationships: A theory for enactment. *Communication Theory*, 12, 63-69. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2885.2002.tb00259.x
- Khazanov, L. (2011). Mentoring at-risk students in a remedial mathematics course. *Mathematics and Computer Education*, 106–118.
- Kim, S. (2015). *Examining the relationship between mentoring experiences and intent to persist and complete for African American male students at Maryland community colleges* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global database. (UMI No. 3707667)
- Knapp, L. G., Kelly-Reid, J. E., & Ginder, S. A. (2012). *Enrollment in Postsecondary Institutions, Fall 2010; Financial Statistics, Fiscal Year 2010; and Graduation Rates, Selected Cohorts, 2002-07*. Washington DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Kram, K. E. (1985). *Mentoring at work*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Kram, K. E. (1988). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life*. Lanham, MD; University Press of America, Inc.
- Kruskal-Wallis H test using SPSS statistics. (2018). <https://statistics.laerd.com/spss-tutorials/kruskal-wallis-h-test-using-spss-statistics.php>
- Levinson, D. J., Carrow, C. N., Klein, E. B., Levinson, M. H., & McKee, B. (1978). *The seasons of a man's life*. New York: Ballentine.
- Lunsford, L. G. (2011). Psychology of mentoring: The case of talented college students. *Journal*

- of Advanced Academics*, 22(3), 474–498.
- Marlowe, M., Tincher-Ladner, L., King, S., & Boggs, G. (2016). *Completion and Transfer Success of High-Achieving Community College Students*.
https://www.insidehighered.com/sites/default/server_files/files/Completion_high_achieving_community_college_completion_transfer_outcomes_020216.pdf
- Marquardt, M. J., & Loan, P. (2006). *The manager as mentor*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- McKinsey, E. (2016). Faculty mentoring undergraduates: The nature, development, and benefits of mentoring relationships. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry*, 4(1),
<http://dx.doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.4.1.5>.
- Miller, A. (2002). *Mentoring students & young people: A handbook of effective practice*. London: Kogan Page.
- Museus, S. D., & Neville, K. M. (2012). Delineating the ways that key institutional agents provide racial minority students with access to social capital in college. *Journal of College Student Development*, 53(3), 436–452. doi:10.1353/csd.2012.0042
- Nora, A., & Crisp, G. (2007). Mentoring students: Conceptualizing and validating the multi-dimensions of a support system. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory and Practice*, 9(3), 337–356.
- Olwell, R. (2016). *Mentoring is a verb: Strategies for improving college and career readiness*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Phi Theta Kappa. (2018a). *About Us*. <https://www.ptk.org/AboutUs.aspx>
- Phi Theta Kappa. (2018b). *Alumni*.

- <https://www.ptk.org/About/AboutPhiThetaKappa/Alumni.aspx>
- Phi Theta Kappa. (2018c). *Constitution & Bylaws*.
- <https://www.ptk.org/About/AboutPhiThetaKappa/ConstitutionBylaws.aspx>
- Phi Theta Kappa. (2018d). *Eligibility*. <https://www.ptk.org/About/Membership/Eligibility.aspx>
- Phi Theta Kappa. (2018e). *Five Star Advisor*.
- <http://fivestaradvisor.ptk.org/moodle/course/view.php?id=2>.
- Phi Theta Kappa. (2018f). *Glossary*.
- <http://fivestaradvisor.ptk.org/moodle/mod/glossary/view.php?id=39>
- Phi Theta Kappa. (2018g). *PTK History*. <https://www.ptk.org/PTKHistory.aspx>
- Provasnik, S., & Planty, M. (2008). *Community Colleges: Special Supplement to the Condition of Education*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Roberts, A. (2000). Mentoring revisited: A phenomenological reading of the literature. *Mentoring and Tutoring*, 8(2), 145-170.
- Saleh, A., & Bista, K. (2017). Examining factors impacting online survey response rates in educational research: Perceptions of graduate students. *Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation*, 13(29), 63-74.
- Sanford, N. (1966). *Self and society: Social change and individual development*. New York: Atherton.
- Schockett, M. R., & Haring-Hidore, M. (1985). Factor analytic support for psychosocial and vocational mentoring functions. *Psychological Reports*, 57, 627-630.
- Seidman, A. (2012). *College student retention: Formula for student success* (2nd ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Shapiro, D., Dundar, A., Huie, F., Wakhungu, P., Yuan, X., Nathan, A., & Bhimdiwala, A. (2018,

- February). *Completing College: A State-Level View of Student Completion Rates* (Signature Report No. 14a). Herndon, VA: National Student Clearinghouse Research Center.
- Shapiro, D., Dundar, A., Huie, F., Wakhungu, P. K., Yuan, X., Nathan, A., & Hwang, Y. (2017, September). *Tracking Transfer: Measures of Effectiveness in Helping Community College Students to Complete Bachelor's Degrees* (Signature Report No. 13). Herndon, VA: National Student Clearinghouse Research Center.
- Thelin, J. R. (2011). *A history of American higher education* (2nd ed.). The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Townsend, B. K., Donaldson, J., & Wilson, T. (2004). *Marginal or monumental? Visibility of community colleges in selective higher education journals*. Paper presented at the Conference of the Council for the Study of Community Colleges, Minneapolis, MN.
- Witt, A. A., Wattenbarger, J. L., Gollattscheck, J. F., & Suppiger, J. E. (1994). *America's community colleges: The first century*. Washington, DC: Community College Press.

Appendix A:

Permission Letter from Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society



PHI THETA KAPPA
HONOR SOCIETY

January 12, 2022

Valdosta State University Institutional Review Board
Office of Sponsored Programs and Research Administration
1500 N. Patterson St.
Valdosta, GA 31698

Dear Members of the Valdosta State University IRB Committee:

On behalf of Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society, I am writing to grant permission for Amy Hancock, a doctoral graduate student at Valdosta State University, to conduct her research titled, "Effect of Phi Theta Kappa Advisor Mentorship on Student Success" with Phi Theta Kappa alumni who are members of recognized alumni association chapters. I understand that Ms. Hancock will elicit responses on an approved electronic survey, the College Student Mentoring Scale, to gain understanding of the mentoring experiences provided by Phi Theta Kappa advisors to Phi Theta Kappa members while they were still at the institution that holds their Phi Theta Kappa membership record. We will aid Ms. Hancock by providing the names and email addresses for Phi Theta Kappa alumni associations advisors. She will send the electronic survey link to the advisors for them to share with their respective alumni association members.

We are aware the research will be conducted over the course of the next six months. We are happy to participate in this study and contribute to this important research in order to gain an understanding of how Phi Theta Kappa advisors play a role in the success of their chapters' members through a variety of mentorship activities.

Sincerely,

Blake A. Ellis, Ph.D.

Chief Engagement Officer
Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society



PHI THETA KAPPA HONOR SOCIETY
1625 Eastover Drive, Jackson, MS 39211

p: 601.000.0000 inquires@ptk.org
f: 555.555.5555 www.ptk.org

Appendix B:
Survey Instrument

Demographic Information

Please answer the following questions to identify your current status as a Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society member.

| | | |
|--|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Are you a member of a Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society recognized alumni association? | Yes <input type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> |
| Are you a graduate with a degree or certificate from the community college where you became a Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society member? | Yes <input type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> |
| Did you transfer to a four-year college from the community college where you became a Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society member before you received a degree or certificate? | Yes <input type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> |
| Did you leave the community college where you became a Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society member before you received a degree or certificate and did not continue with your education? <i>For example, not completing your degree requirements due to health, family issues or employment, etc.</i> | Yes <input type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> |
| While at the community college where you became a Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society member, did you at least once participate in the following: | | |
| - Chapter meeting or fellowship activity? | Yes <input type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> |
| - Regional or international event, such as Regional Conferences, Catalyst Convention or Honors Institute? | Yes <input type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> |
| - A PTKHS Edge training program for chapter members? | Yes <input type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> |

| | | |
|--|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| - The chapter's College Project or Honors in Action project? | Yes <input type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> |
|--|---------------------------|--------------------------|

College Student Mentoring Scale (CSMS; Crisp, 2009)

Please answer the following questions to identify the degree to which, while you were in a Phi Theta chapter, the Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society advisor provided each of the mentoring experiences to you as a member.

My Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society advisor was someone who...

| | Strongly Agree 5 | Somewhat agree 4 | Neither agree or disagree 3 | Somewhat disagree 2 | Strongly disagree 1 |
|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Recognized my academic accomplishments | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| I could talk openly about social issues related to being in college | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Encouraged me to use him or her as a sounding board to explore what I wanted | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Gave me emotional support | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| I could talk openly about personal issues related to being in college | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Made me feel that I belonged in college | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Expressed confidence in my ability to succeed academically | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Encouraged me to talk about problems I was having in my social life | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Encouraged me to consider educational opportunities beyond my current plans | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Helped me realistically examine my degree or certificate options | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Questioned my assumptions by guiding me through a realistic appraisal of my skills | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Helped me carefully examine my degree or certificate options | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Discussed the implications of my degree choice | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Helped me consider the sacrifices associated with my chosen degree | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Provided ongoing support about the work I did in my classes | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Helped me perform to the best of my abilities in my classes | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Helped me work toward achieving my academic aspirations | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Provided practical suggestions for improving my academic performance | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Encouraged me to discuss problems I was having with my coursework | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Shared personal examples of difficulties he or she has had to overcome to accomplish academic goals | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Served as a model for how to be successful in college | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Set a good example about how to relate to other people | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| I wanted to copy their behaviors as they relate to college-going | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| I looked up to regarding college-related issues | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| I admired | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Note. The 25-item survey uses a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 equaling strongly agree to 5 equaling strongly disagree. Participants will be asked to identify the degree to which, while as a Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society member, the advisor provided each of the mentoring experiences.

1. Psychological and Emotional Support

Encompasses a sense of listening, providing moral and emotional support, identifying problems, and providing encouragement as well as the establishment of a supportive relationship in which there is mutual understanding and link between the student and the mentor. Items designed to measure psychological and emotional support:

When in college, I have had someone in my life who...

Recognizes my academic accomplishments

I can talk with openly about social issues related to being in college

Encourages me to use him or her as a sounding board to explore what I want

Gives me emotional support

I can talk with openly about personal issues related to being in college

Makes me feel that I belong in college

Expresses confidence in my ability to succeed academically

Encourages me to talk about problems I am having in my social life

2. Degree and Career Support

Includes an assessment of the student's strength, weaknesses, abilities, and includes assistance with setting academic/career goals and decision-making. Items designed to measure degree and career support:

When in college, I have had someone in my life who...

Encourages me to consider educational opportunities beyond my current plans

Helps me realistically examine my degree or certificate options

Questions my assumptions by guiding me through a realistic appraisal of my skills

Helps me carefully examine my degree or certificate options

Discusses the implications of my degree choice

Provides ongoing support about the work I did in my classes

3. Academic Subject Knowledge Support

Centered on the acquisition of necessary skills and knowledge; on educating, evaluating, and challenging the student academically; on employing tutoring skills and focusing on subject learning in contrast to mentoring that focuses on life learning; and on establishing a teaching-learning process. Items designed to measure academic subject knowledge support:

When in college, I have had someone in my life who...

Provides ongoing support about the work I do in my classes

Helps me perform to the best of my abilities in my classes

Helps me work toward achieving my academic aspirations

Provides practical suggestions for improving my academic performance

Encourages me to discuss problems I am having with my coursework

4. Existence of a Role Model

Concentrated on the presence of a role model in the student's life as well as the opportunity for the student to learn from the mentor's current and past actions, as well as achievements and failures. Items designed to measure the presence of a role model:

When in college, I have had someone in my life who...

Shares personal examples of difficulties he or she has had to overcome to accomplish academic goals

Serves as a model for how to be successful in college

Sets a good example about how to relate to other people

I want to copy their behaviors as they relate to college-going

I look up to regarding college-related issues

I admire

Appendix C:
Survey Permission

FW: gloriacrisp.com Mentoring Students: Form Submission

Crisp, Gloria E <gloria.crisp@oregonstate.edu>

Tue 10/15/2019 11:57 AM


To: Amy K Hancock <akhancock@valdosta.edu>

Delivered From External Sender


Amy,

You are welcome to use the items on the CSMS for your dissertation work. It sounds like an interesting study. Best of luck!

Gloria

From: "donotreply@godaddy.com" <donotreply@godaddy.com>**Date:** Saturday, October 12, 2019 at 10:59 AM**To:** "Crisp, Gloria E" <gloria.crisp@oregonstate.edu>**Subject:** gloriacrisp.com Mentoring Students: Form Submission
 [https://img.secureserver.net/bbimage.aspx?](https://img.secureserver.net/bbimage.aspx?pl=1&isc=wwbb2459&e=crisp%40oregonstate.edu&tid=2459&eid=2998062388&mid=a93cca14-c152-4256-bfa4-e95b8887f23d)

[pl=1&isc=wwbb2459&e=crisp%40oregonstate.edu&tid=2459&eid=2998062388&mid=a93cca14-c152-4256-bfa4-e95b8887f23d](https://img.secureserver.net/bbimage.aspx?pl=1&isc=wwbb2459&e=crisp%40oregonstate.edu&tid=2459&eid=2998062388&mid=a93cca14-c152-4256-bfa4-e95b8887f23d)

 <http://50analytics.secureserver.net/ea/C5HKnqoXEQ/?e=a93cca14-c152-4256-bfa4-e95b8887f23d@oregonstate.edu&c=wwbb2459&LocId=en-US>
Name

Amy Hancock

Email

akhancock@valdosta.edu

Subject

Use of CSMS for dissertation

Message

Greetings, I am currently working on my Ed.D in Adult and Career Education from Valdosta State University in Valdosta, Ga. I work at South Georgia State College in the Office of Advancement and also serve as Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society advisor. My plan for my dissertation is to focus on the impact/effect of a Phi Theta Kappa advisor serving as mentor on the success of graduation and transfer rates of PTK students. Through my research I have found the theoretical framework discussed in "The Impact of Mentoring on the Success of Community College Students" and the CSMS closely align with my efforts. I plan to survey alumni members of PTK through PTK regional alumni associations on the impact they feel advisors made on their completion efforts. Advisors of PTK are expected to identify eligible students at their institutions, invite them to join, and facilitate their membership acceptance process. Other than that, advisors are only encouraged, not required, to go beyond that, most of which would fall within the realm of mentorship definitions. I welcome your feedback as well as offering instructions for next steps of gaining permission to use the CSMS. I look forward to your response, Amy Hancock

Optin

False

This message was submitted from your website contact form:

<http://www.gloriacrisp.com/mentoring-scale.html>

Appendix D:
Institutional Review Board



**Institutional Review Board (IRB)
For the Protection of Human Research Participants**

PROTOCOL EXEMPTION REPORT

Protocol Number: 04281-2022

Responsible Researcher(s): Amy Hancock

Supervising Faculty: Dr. C. Keith Waugh

Project Title: *Effect of Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society Advisor Mentorship on Student Success.*

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD DETERMINATION:

This research protocol is **exempt** from Institutional Review Board (IRB) oversight under 45 CFR 46.101(b) of the federal regulations **category 2**. If the nature of the research changes such that exemption criteria no longer apply, please consult with the IRB Administrator (irb@valdosta.edu) before continuing your research study.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

- *Upon completion of the research study, collected data (e.g. transcript, name lists, email lists, etc.) must be securely maintained and accessible only by the researcher(s) for a minimum of 3 years. At the end of the required time, collected data must be permanently destroyed.*
- *Make certain that the settings in Qualtrics are set to:*
 - *not track IP addresses*
 - *allow participants to skip questions or not provide an answer.*

If this box is checked, please submit any documents you revise to the IRB Administrator at irb@valdosta.edu to ensure an updated record of your exemption.

Elizabeth Ann Olphie 03.10.2022

Elizabeth Ann Olphie, IRB Administrator

Thank you for submitting an IRB application.

Please direct questions to irb@valdosta.edu or 229-253-2947.

Revised: 06.02.16

Appendix E:
Histograms

