


Fall 2016

# The Impact of High School Dual Enrollment Participation on Bachelor's Degree Attainment and Time and Cost to Degree

Thomas Earl Hughes  
*Old Dominion University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/efl\\_etds](https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/efl_etds)

 Part of the [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Hughes, Thomas E.. "The Impact of High School Dual Enrollment Participation on Bachelor's Degree Attainment and Time and Cost to Degree" (2016). Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), dissertation, Educ Foundations & Leadership, Old Dominion University, DOI: 10.25777/1dxd-0m46  
[https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/efl\\_etds/27](https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/efl_etds/27)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Educational Foundations & Leadership at ODU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Educational Foundations & Leadership Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ODU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@odu.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@odu.edu).

**THE IMPACT OF HIGH SCHOOL DUAL ENROLLMENT  
PARTICIPATION ON BACHELOR'S DEGREE ATTAINMENT AND  
TIME AND COST TO DEGREE**

by

Thomas Earl Hughes  
B.S. December 1989, Arizona State University  
M.A. May 1993, Arizona State University

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of  
Old Dominion University in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEADERSHIP

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY  
December 2016

Approved by:

---

Alan M. Schwitzer (Chair)

---

Peter B. Baker (Member)

---

Mitchell R. Williams (Member)

**ABSTRACT****THE IMPACT OF HIGH SCHOOL DUAL ENROLLMENT  
PARTICIPATION ON BACHELOR'S DEGREE ATTAINMENT AND  
TIME AND COST TO DEGREE**

Thomas Earl Hughes  
Old Dominion University, 2016  
Director: Dr. Alan M. Schwitzer

Dual enrollment has become nearly ubiquitous in the U.S. with 82% of public high schools offering dual credit courses with student enrollment topping two million (Borden, Taylor, Park, & Seiler, 2013). Policymakers and proponents of dual enrollment have claimed that these programs better prepare students for college success and reduce the time and cost to a college degree. There is a growing body of empirical research showing that students who participated in dual enrollment programs completed bachelor's degrees at higher rates than non-dual enrollment participants do. However, most of this research has focused on single institutions or states, and not nationally representative samples.

This causal comparative study used *ex post facto* data from the Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study (BPS: 04/09) to address the benefits of bachelor's degree attainment, shortened time to degree, and reduced cost of a degree attributed to dual enrollment. This study was limited to students who began their postsecondary studies at public community colleges with the intent to complete a bachelor's degree. The researcher employed propensity score matching to improve comparability of study outcomes between dual enrollment and non-dual enrollment

participants.

Conclusively determining how or why dual enrollment programs impact students is challenging. This study drew from two socialization theories—anticipatory socialization and validation theory. In accordance with these theories, this study found statistical and practical significance linking dual enrollment participation to increased bachelor's degree attainment. Dual enrollment participants were also statistically significantly more likely to experience a shorter time to degree and lower costs as measured by student loans than non-participants were. The effect sizes, however, for the time to degree and cost of a degree models were modest at best and not overly persuasive.

©2016 Thomas Earl Hughes. All Rights Reserved.

**DEDICATION**

To my Wife, Marcee and my sons, William and Grayson.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

While much of the dissertation process is a solitary endeavor, the completion of this journey would not have been possible without the support of many people.

Many thanks go to my dissertation committee for their insightful feedback and encouragement throughout this process. Their comments and guidance significantly improved my writing and this dissertation. I am especially grateful to my chair, Dr. Schwitzer, for his kind support and direction in reaching this milestone.

I wish to acknowledge my fellow Cohort 11 members, now dear friends and thank them for their support and encouragement that made this dream of earning a Ph.D. a reality. Special thanks and tons of gratitude are due to Matt McGraw, Donna McCauley, and Christine Damrose-Mahlmann for their reassurance, encouragement, and friendship beyond any of my expectations.

I am also grateful to my friends and colleagues at Yavapai College for their unwavering support and encouragement. To my boss and mentor, Dr. Clint Ewell, thank you for encouraging me to begin this journey and supporting me to completion. To Dr. Penny Wills, it meant so much to have my President ask how is it going and reassuring me that all the sacrifices are worth it. Also, thank you to the Yavapai College Foundation for financial support through the Roger Runyon Employee Enhancement Award.

I wish to thank my family for their support and sacrifices that were necessary to achieve this goal. First, to my parents, Roger and Helen Hughes, thank you for modeling and instilling in me a work ethic that was essential to my success. I want to acknowledge my sons, William and Grayson, for their understanding and tolerance of their father's

need to pursue a Ph.D. May it inspire you to reach for and achieve your dreams. Lastly, to my wife, Marcee, I am forever grateful for your love, support, and faith in me throughout.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES .....	x
LIST OF FIGURES .....	xii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION .....	1
Background of the Study .....	2
Conceptual Framework .....	6
Purpose Statement .....	7
Research Questions .....	7
Professional Significance of the Study .....	8
Overview of the Methodology .....	9
Delimitations .....	10
Definition of Key Terms .....	10
Conclusion and Organization of the Work .....	12
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW .....	14
Public Community Colleges .....	14
The Nexus between Postsecondary Education and the Knowledge Economy .....	15
The Case for Increased College Readiness .....	19
History of Secondary and Postsecondary Integration .....	21
Benefits and Limitations of Dual Enrollment .....	25
Dual Enrollment from a Theoretical Perspective: A Remaining Need in the Literature .....	30

Anticipatory Socialization .....	31
Validation Theory .....	32
Current Study: Utilizing Anticipatory Socialization and Validation Theory Constructs to Examine Effects of Dual Learning .....	35
Conclusion .....	38
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY .....	39
Research Questions and Hypotheses .....	39
Research Design.....	40
Data Source .....	43
Participants.....	44
Data Analysis .....	44
Assumptions.....	45
Limitations .....	45
Conclusion .....	46
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS .....	48
Data Set and Sample .....	48
Descriptive Statistics.....	52
Research Questions .....	55
Conclusion .....	64
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION.....	67
Study Context.....	67
Purpose Statement and Research Questions .....	70
Review of Methodology .....	71

Limitations .....	72
Major Findings and Relationship to the Literature .....	73
Implications for Practice .....	79
Recommendations for Future Research .....	83
Conclusion .....	85
REFERENCES .....	87
APPENDICES	
A. Human Subjects Exempt Research Letter.....	100
VITA.....	101

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: <i>Overview of Study Design and Research Methods</i> .....	41
Table 2: <i>Characteristics of First-Time College Students in the Original and Matched Samples</i> .....	51
Table 3: <i>Bachelor's Degree Attainment Within Six Years by Dual Enrollment Status</i> .....	52
Table 4: <i>Student Loan Status by Dual Enrollment Status</i> .....	53
Table 5: <i>Mean Time to Degree (in Months) and Student Loans (in Dollars) by Dual Enrollment Status for Students completing a Bachelor's Degree</i> .....	54
Table 6: <i>College Attendance Intensity by Dual Enrollment Status</i> .....	54
Table 7: <i>Credits to Enter College as a Sophomore by Dual Enrollment Status</i> .....	55
Table 8: <i>Summary Binary Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting Likelihood of Bachelor's Degree Attainment</i> .....	57
Table 9: <i>Classification Table for Full Model: Dual Enrollment Participation, College Attendance Intensity, and Pre-College Credit Dosage</i> .....	58
Table 10: <i>Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for Time to Bachelor's Degree (in Months) and Predictor Variables</i> .....	60
Table 11: <i>Multiple Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Time to a Bachelor's Degree (in Months)</i> .....	60
Table 12: <i>Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for Student Loans Incurred (in Dollars Squared) and Predictor Variables</i> .....	63
Table 13: <i>Multiple Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Student Loan Amount Incurred (in Dollars Squared)</i> .....	63

Table 14: *Multiple Regression Equation Transformation Example for Predicted Student Loan Amount Incurred (in Dollars)*.....64

**LIST OF FIGURES**

Figure 1: *Standardized Differences Before and After PS Matching* .....50

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

Speaking at Macomb Community College in 2009, President Obama announced the American Graduation Initiative (AGI) and challenged community colleges to assist the nation in strengthening its educational attainment levels (Brandon, 2009). Addressing the President's challenge the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) launched the *21st-Century Initiative* with the overall goal to educate an additional five million students with associate's degrees, certificates, or other credentials by 2020.

Through most of the twentieth century, the United States experienced steady educational attainment progress and unprecedented economic growth and had a workforce that was significantly more educated than most of Europe (Goldin & Katz, 2008). In 1970, America ranked number one in the world in the percentage of its workforce holding a postsecondary degree; however, educational attainment stagnated between then and 1990 (American Association of Community Colleges [AACC], 2012; HigherEdSolutions, 2008). Today the United States ranks number 12 in the share of adults ages 25 to 34 holding postsecondary degrees or certificates according to the latest Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development report (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD], 2014).

If community colleges are to play a key role in increasing the share of the U.S. population with a postsecondary degree, improvements are necessary (AACC, 2012; Brandon, 2009). The majority of students who begin postsecondary studies at a community college and express the goal of earning a bachelor's degree do not complete their goal (Cohen, Brawer, & Kisker, 2014). In reality, only 14% of students with the

intent of obtaining a bachelor's degree did so within six years of starting at a public community college (Radford, Berkner, Wheelless, & Shepherd, 2010). Additionally, even for students completing a bachelor's (regardless of institution type the student started at), the time to complete and cost of earning a degree have increased substantially over the past decade (Complete College America, 2014). Secondary student preparedness is a key indicator of postsecondary completion (Adelman, 2006). Hence, the intent of this study is to examine the effect of dual enrollment (earning college credits while the student is still enrolled in high school) on bachelor's degree attainment as well as time to degree and cost of the degree.

### **Background of the Study**

Dual enrollment has grown substantially in recent years. Borden, Taylor, Park, and Seiler (2013) reported a 75% increase in dual enrollment between the 2002-2003 academic year and the 2010-2011 academic year with enrollment now exceeding two million students. Dual enrollment programs take many different forms (Karp & Hughes, 2008). Some programs occur on college campuses while others operate at the high schools. Dual enrollment faculty may be full-time college professors or high school teachers credentialed as adjuncts. What remains common in all dual enrollment programs is that students receive credit from both the high school and college.

The idea of integrating secondary and postsecondary institutions is not new. Most integration efforts have focused on the last years of secondary schooling and the first two years of postsecondary education. The advent of community colleges, first known as junior colleges, began in the late nineteenth century. Often located in high schools, most junior colleges operated as extensions of secondary schools until the early 1960s (Cohen



& Brawer, 2008). Leonard Koos, an influential professor of secondary education at the Universities of Minnesota and Chicago, and his 6-4-4 plan of public school organization represent one of the earliest attempts to integrate secondary schooling and the first two years of postsecondary education (Koos, 1946). The 6-4-4 plan advocated by Koos pushed for a realignment of the nation's public education system. Elementary school would make up years one through six, junior high school years seven through 10, and junior college 11 through 14. The 6-4-4 plan never gained wide appeal, and only ten public school systems were operating under this model by 1941 (Kisker, 2006).

With post-World War II economic growth and increased demand for four-year degrees, pre-college activities evolved to prepare secondary students for baccalaureate-granting colleges and universities. In 1955, the College Board introduced the Advanced Placement (AP) program that allows secondary students to take AP courses as part of the high school curriculum and potentially earn credit by taking an end-of-course exam (Bailey & Karp, 2003). Colleges may or may not award college credit for courses based on the student's AP exam score. Likewise, the International Baccalaureate (IB) program, introduced in the 1960s, is a comprehensive curriculum designed to prepare students for a liberal arts education. Like the AP program, students in IB programs must pass end-of-course exams and then petition colleges to award college credits based on test cutoff scores (Bailey & Karp, 2003). Both the AP and IB programs target high-achieving students with postsecondary aspirations. In 2012, more than one million United States public high school graduates completed AP exams with 61% receiving scores that signify college readiness in a subject and may be accepted for college credit (College Board, 2014).

It would not be until the 1970s that another significant effort would be put forth to integrate the community college and high school—the Middle College High School. Created to assist at-risk students, Middle College High Schools were a response to the nation's increasing secondary dropout rate (Jordan, Cavalluzzo, & Corallo, 2006; Kisker, 2006). Middle College High Schools offer both secondary and postsecondary curricula in a flexible manner that allows students to progress at their own pace (Wechsler, 2001). The first Middle College High School opened in 1974 at LaGuardia Community College. Middle College High Schools numbered 30 in 2000 and enjoy exceptionally high graduation rates (90%) and college going rates (75%) (Kisker, 2006; Wechsler, 2001). Middle College High Schools, like the 6-4-4- model, struggled to grow because of disparate regulations such as state policies establishing independent and unconnected funding and governance models for secondary and postsecondary institutions (Wechsler, 2001).

Unlike the previous more complex models, basic dual enrollment uses intergovernmental agreements between high schools and colleges to set up and guide programs. In 1976, California was the first to create policy establishing dual enrollment programs (Mokher & McLendon, 2009). Dual enrollment expanded considerably in the 1990s and today 47 states have enacted policies directing some aspect of these programs (Borden et al., 2013; Karp, Calcagno, Hughes, Jeong, & Bailey, 2008). Dual enrollment is differentiated from AP and IB programs in that the former earn college-level credit while the latter are college-type courses. Once restricted to high achieving students, dual enrollment programs are now enrolling middle achieving students to increase academic rigor and instill postsecondary aspirations in students who may not have seen themselves

as college bound (Karp et al., 2008). Another impetus behind dual enrollment growth is the belief that these programs improve college readiness.

Secondary student preparedness is a key indicator of postsecondary completion. American College Testing (2014) reported that almost three-quarters of college-bound students do not pass all four college-readiness benchmarks (English, mathematics, reading, and science). As many as two-thirds of students entering community colleges today require some level of remediation (Bailey, Jaggars, & Jenkins, 2015; Cohen et al., 2014). Dual enrollment is one practice that educators and state policymakers can implement to improve college readiness by enhancing curriculum and clarifying the alignment between secondary and postsecondary standards (Venezia, 2006). Reducing the time and cost of obtaining a college degree is another benefit attributed to dual enrollment (Borden et al., 2013; Karp, Calcagno, Hughes, Jeong, & Bailey, 2007).

There is little debate that college affordability is a concern for students and their families (Abel, 2014; Complete College America, 2014). The College Board reported that public two-year and four-year institutions had increased tuition and fees over the last 30 years by 150% and 225% respectively (College Board, 2014). With rising college prices and stagnant wages, many Americans are wondering if college is worth the cost. Related to college costs is the time it takes a student to obtain a degree. Beyond tuition and fees, the expense of transportation, housing, and foregone wages are related to the time it takes a student to complete a degree (Complete College America, 2014). Although bachelor's degrees are referred to as four-year degrees, the four-year graduation rates for bachelor's degree-granting institutions range from 19% to 36% (Complete College America, 2014).

Absent from most research on dual enrollment is an explicit theoretical framework. Although some research focusing on dual enrollment outcomes has occurred, there remains a need to understand how these programs affect students. Roberts (2010) stated a conceptual model or theoretical framework explaining the relationship between relevant variables and constructs is necessary.

### **Conceptual Framework: Anticipatory Socialization Theory and Validation Theory**

Conclusively determining how or why dual enrollment programs impact students is challenging. This study draws from two socialization theories. The first is Merton's (1968) anticipatory socialization theory. Anticipatory socialization is "the process or set of experiences through which individuals come to anticipate correctly the values, norms, and behaviors they will encounter in a new social setting" (Pascarella, Terenzini, & Wolfe, 1986, p. 156). The researchers build off Merton's theory and conceptualize that precollege programs can prepare transitioning students to be better integrated and successful when they enter college (Pascarella et al., 1986).

The second is Rendon's validation theory. Rendon's theory describes validation as "an enabling, confirming and supportive process initiated by in- and out-of-class agents that foster academic and interpersonal development" (Rendon, 1994, p. 44). Rendon maintains that the earlier validation from college agents such as advisers, testing staff and enrollment services staff begins the better, especially for minority and at-risk students (Rendon, 2002). Students must feel a sense of academic and interpersonal validation before they can become involved in the social and academic fabric of college life (Rendon, 2002). Students who feel validated by their institutions of higher learning have increased odds of academic success according to validation theory (Rendon, 1994,

2002).

Lastly, Adelman (1999) found that momentum points such as earning 20 credits in the first year of college significantly enhance a student's chance of completing a bachelor's degree. Adelman argued that the "academic resources"—a term that includes earning college credits while in high school—is one of the largest and most significant explanatory factors for successful bachelor's degree completion. Adelman (1999, 2006) builds the case for dual enrollment-type programs as a method of increasing rigor and college credit accumulation for high school students and preparing students for postsecondary studies.

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this study was to compare dual enrollment participants and non-participants who begin college at a public community college in the areas of (1) bachelor's degree attainment, (2) time to a bachelor's degree as measured by months, and (3) loans incurred in obtaining a bachelor's degree as measured by total student loan amount taken.

### **Research Questions**

The study addressed the following research questions:

1. How do dual enrollment participants compare to non-participants in terms of bachelor's degree attainment for students who begin their postsecondary studies at a community college?
2. How do dual enrollment participants compare to non-participants in terms of time to bachelor's degree attainment for students who begin their postsecondary studies at a community college?

3. How do dual enrollment participants compare to non-participants in terms of loan debt incurred in obtaining a bachelor's degree, as measured by the total amount of Stafford, Perkins, and PLUS undergraduate loans, for students who begin their postsecondary studies at a community college?

### **Professional Significance of Study**

Proponents of dual enrollment frequently cite shortened time to degree and reduced college costs as primary benefits of such programs. However, the case for such time and cost saving statements has not been convincingly established (Borden et al., 2013). There has been very limited empirical research on the effect of dual enrollment on the cost of a bachelor's degree. Prior research on the relationship between dual enrollment and time to degree has almost exclusively focused on single institutions or individual state systems (Karp et al., 2007; Westcott, 2009). Swanson (2008) is the only researcher to use a national dataset to examine the relationship between dual enrollment and time to degree. Swanson's research used the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS: 88). This study utilized national data from the Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study (BPS: 04/09) to evaluate the effect of dual enrollment on bachelor's degree attainment, time to degree, and cost of a degree for dual enrollment participants and non-participants beginning at a public community college.

Additionally, one of the chief criticisms in the dual enrollment literature is the failure of researchers to account for factors outside the dual enrollment programs like student motivation, prior academic work, economic status, and student characteristics (Bailey & Karp, 2003; Karp et al., 2008). This study controlled for preexisting academic, socioeconomic, and demographic student characteristics.

Given the demand for increased educational attainment, rising college costs, and the ubiquity of dual enrollment programs, a study of the effects of dual enrollment with a national scope is merited. The study's findings will provide insights to policymakers and practitioners who operate or are considering dual enrollment activities to improve students' college readiness.

### **Overview of Methodology**

This causal comparative study used *ex post facto* data from the Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study (BPS: 04/09) to address the research questions. Authorized by the U.S. Department of Education, the National Center for Education Statistics conducted the BPS: 04/09. The BPS: 04/09 is a nationally representative cohort of students who first enrolled in postsecondary education in 2003-2004 and who were followed for six years. This study was limited to students who began their postsecondary studies at a public community college with the intent to complete a bachelor's degree.

A combination of binary logistic and multiple linear regression was used to answer the research questions. In addition to dual enrollment participation (the main independent variable of interest), the analysis controls for preexisting differences between participants and non-participants. Including race, gender, socio-economic status (SES), first generation status, high school GPA, highest high school mathematics, pre-college credit dosage, ACT/SAT scores, and Advanced Placement (AP) coursework.

The Old Dominion University Darden College of Education's Human Subject Research Committee approved and granted permission for this study. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) authorized use of the BPS: 04/09 dataset.

**Delimitations**

The study was limited to first-time college students who began their postsecondary studies at a community college with the intent of earning a bachelor's degree. In addition, study participants were traditionally aged (age 24 or younger) when entering in the 2003-2004 academic year.

For students earning multiple bachelor's degrees, only the first degree was considered for the time to degree and cost of degree outcomes.

**Definitions of Key Terms**

The following listing serves as a reference for key terms used during this study.

*Advanced Placement (AP)*: College-type courses accredited by the College Board that are taught as part of the high school curriculum. Students may potentially earn college credit by taking an end-of-course exam. It is at the discretion of the postsecondary institution to award college credit or not.

*Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study (BPS: 04/09)*: A survey project of the National Center for Education Statistics, the BPS: 04/09 is a nationally representative cohort of students who first enrolled in postsecondary education in 2003-2004. Beginning students are surveyed at three points in time: at the end of their first year, and then three and six years after beginning their postsecondary education. The survey collected a wide range of data on high school experiences, student demographics, work, student loans, persistence, transfer, and degree attainment.

*Degree Attainment*: Indicates bachelor's degree attained by a student beginning their postsecondary studies in 2003-2004 and followed through 2009.



*Degree Cost:* Indicates the total amount of Stafford, Perkins, and PLUS undergraduate loan amounts incurred as of 2009.

*Dual Enrollment:* Indicates whether the student took courses at a college or university for which he/she earned college credit while in high school.

*Dual Enrollment Participant:* Indicates a student who earned college credits while in high school, excluding AP credits.

*Dual Enrollment Program:* Partnership agreements between secondary and postsecondary institutions that allow high school students to enroll in college courses prior to high school graduation.

*First Generation Student:* Indicates that neither parent of the student had completed a bachelor's degree at the time the student entered college.

*Highest Degree Attained:* Indicates the highest postsecondary degree attained at any institution June 2003 through June 2009.

*Highest High School Math:* Indicates the highest level of math the student completed or planned to take. Math courses include algebra II, trigonometry/algebra II, pre-calculus, calculus, and none of these.

*International Baccalaureate (IB):* A high school curriculum that includes college-type courses approved by the International Baccalaureate organization. Students may potentially earn college credit by taking an end-of-course exam. It is at the discretion of the postsecondary institution to award college credit or not.

*Non-Dual Enrollment Participant:* Indicates a student who did not earn any college credits while in high school.

*Pre-College Credit Dosage:* Indicates if a student earned enough early college credits to enter college as a sophomore.

*Pre-College Programs:* Coursework that leads to or may lead to college credit awarded upon successful course completion or an end-of-course exam taken by students prior to high school graduation. Examples include dual enrollment, AP, IB, and CLEP.

*Time to Degree:* Number of months elapsed from the first month enrolled to month attained highest degree as of June 2009.

*Socioeconomic Status (SES):* SES was determined by Pell Grant eligibility. Students receiving a Pell award in any semester were classified as economically disadvantaged.

### **Conclusion and Organization of the Work**

History has documented that a highly educated populace is not just fundamental, but critical to economic growth. The connection between an educated workforce and America's economic and social wellbeing has received prominent and needed attention (AACC, 2012; Brandon, 2009; Goldin & Katz, 2008). Community colleges have been at the center of recent debates on how to improve educational attainment and bolster the U.S. workforce (AACC, 2012; Brandon, 2009). Today, almost half of all undergraduates begin their studies at community colleges (American Association of Community Colleges [AACC], 2015; Cohen et al., 2014). The focus on community colleges highlights the importance of this postsecondary sector and its vital role in assisting the U.S. to meet its goal of increased educational attainment. While more high school graduates are going on to college, their success rates, as measured by obtaining a college degree, have stagnated. A lack of college readiness has been identified as a significant barrier to postsecondary

success (ACT, 2010; Adelman, 2006). Insights from this study provide an opportunity to improve our understanding of the relationship between college preparedness and dual enrollment, a ubiquitous but under evaluated pre-college program.

The remaining chapters of this dissertation are organized as follows: Chapter 2 contains an exhaustive review of the pertinent literature. The review begins with a description of public community colleges in higher education today. Presented next is research literature on the nexus between the new knowledge economy and postsecondary education. It continues with the case for increased college readiness – student preparedness, alignment of secondary and postsecondary standards, and dual enrollment and pre-college programs’ effects on postsecondary readiness. In addition, research on the relevancy of time to and cost of a college degree are reviewed. This chapter concludes with a more detailed explanation of the conceptual framework and its relevance to understanding the effects of dual enrollment on postsecondary success. Chapter 3 addresses in detail the BPS: 04/09 data source and quantitative methods used in this study. Chapter 4 reports the study’s findings. Presented last in Chapter 5 is a discussion that considers the results through the lens of anticipatory socialization and validation theories. The study concludes with recommendations for future practice and implications for policymakers, educators, and students.

## CHAPTER 2

### LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter examines the literature on dual enrollment and its role in creating a pathway for secondary students to access and succeed in postsecondary studies. This section first examines the context of public community colleges in higher education today. Subsequently, the necessity of postsecondary skills in today's knowledge economy is explored. Next, current literature documenting the need for improving college readiness among the United States' secondary student population is reviewed. The ensuing section presents historic and current secondary and postsecondary integration efforts. The chapter concludes with a description of anticipatory socialization theory and validation theory and how each possibly influences the outcomes of this study.

#### **Public Community Colleges**

The first public two-year higher education institution was Joliet Junior College, founded in 1901 (Cohen et al., 2014). The purpose of early two-year colleges, known as junior colleges, was to offer lower cost and accessible lower-division coursework. Early proponents of junior colleges even suggested abdicating lower-division and general education to junior colleges, so that universities could focus on higher-order scholarship and research (Cohen et al., 2014). Events such as the depression in the 1930s, World War II, and the 1948 Truman Commission recommendations would serve to expand the scope of two-year schools to include vocational training and evolve to be recognized as community colleges (American Association of Community Colleges [AACC], 2000). The footprint of public community colleges has grown significantly from just 19 institutions in 1916 to 992 in 2015. Today, community colleges educate almost half of

all undergraduate students (Cohen et al., 2014), and 47 percent of all bachelor's degree recipients have completed one or more classes at a two-year institution (National Center on Education and the Economy [NCEE], 2013).

With rising higher education costs, especially at four-year colleges and universities, community colleges will increasingly serve as the starting point for students' intent on earning a bachelor's degree. This is particularly true for economically disadvantaged students. Adelman (2005) found that characteristics like gender, race, and first-generation status were not statistically significant predictors of who begins at a community college, but SES does play such a role. Students who began their studies at community colleges, unfortunately, are statistically less likely to complete a bachelor's degree compared to students starting at a four-year institution (Long & Kurlaender, 2009). Wang (2009) studied persistence and baccalaureate attainment of community college transfer students and found rigor in high school was one of the strongest predictors of degree completion. Degree completion is integral to success in today's economy.

### **The Nexus between Postsecondary Education and the Knowledge Economy**

The twenty-first-century workplace landscape has experienced significant changes driven by rapid technological innovations and globalization (Goldin & Katz, 2008; Kirsch, Braun, Yamamoto, & Sum, 2007). Technology has shrunk the world, and jobs can be located anywhere on the globe where an educated workforce exists (Goldin & Katz, 2008). The continuing transition from a manufacturing economy to a knowledge economy necessitates that the skill sets required for all levels of jobs will increase, as will need for continuing education (American Association of Community Colleges [AACC],

2012; Goldin & Katz, 2008; Kirsch et al., 2007). Researchers estimate that 65% of American jobs by 2020 will require postsecondary education or training (Carnevale, Smith, & Strohl, 2013). Increased postsecondary certificate and degree production is critical to America staying competitive in the global workplace, and growing technological innovation will require twenty-first-century workers to access continuing education throughout their work life.

Our Nation's history indicates that a highly educated populace is not just fundamental, but critical to economic growth (Goldin & Katz, 2008; Stanley, 2003). Through most of the twentieth century, the United States experienced steady educational attainment progress and unprecedented economic growth and had a workforce that was significantly more educated than most of Europe (Goldin & Katz, 2008). In 1970, America ranked number one in the world with 28% of its workforce holding a postsecondary degree; however, educational attainment stagnated between then and 1990 (AACC, 2012; Brooks, 2008; HigherEdSolutions, 2008). De Vise (2011) reported that current leaders South Korea, Canada, and Japan now outpace the United States on postsecondary attainment for adults age 25 to 34.

Recognition of the connection between an educated workforce and America's economic and social wellbeing have received prominent and needed attention. Speaking at Macomb Community College in 2009, President Obama announced the American Graduation Initiative (AGI) and challenged community colleges to assist the nation in strengthening its educational attainment levels (Brandon, 2009). The President stated:

Time and again, when we have placed our bet for the future on education, we have prospered as a result - by tapping the incredible innovative and generative

potential of a skilled American workforce. That is what happened when President Lincoln signed into law legislation creating the land grant colleges which not only transformed higher education, but also our economy. That is what took place when President Roosevelt signed the GI Bill which helped educate a generation - and usher in an era of unprecedented prosperity

That is why, at the start of my administration I set a goal for America: by 2020, this nation will once again have the highest proportion of college graduates in the world. (Obama Macomb, 2009, para. 12-13)

Addressing the President's challenge the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) launched the *21st-Century Initiative* with the overall goal to educate an additional five million students with associate's degrees, certificates, or other credentials by 2020 (AACC, 2012). Correspondingly, the American Council on Education, along with other higher educational associations, has embraced the President's goal by introducing publications and programs to assist member institutions in increasing postsecondary bachelor's degrees (<http://www.acenet.edu>). New research indicates that the United States is making modest improvement based on current data showing 42% of the population attaining some postsecondary credential (U.S. Census Bureau, 2014). This improvement, while positive, may be happening too slowly as evidenced by the United States ranking of 12 out of 36 OECD nations in the share of adults ages 25 to 34 holding degrees according to the latest Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development report (OECD, 2014). Similarly, South Korea has already passed the United States' 2020 goal of 60% of the population attaining a postsecondary award, and Japan and Canada are at 56% (American Council on Education [ACE], 2012).

International comparisons are not without problems. There is evidence suggesting that the data for these comparisons are questionable. Adelman (2009) in “*The Spaces Between Numbers: Getting International Data on Higher Education Straight*” suggested the United States and other countries are not able to benefit from educational attainment comparisons because the flaws are so significant. Criticisms raised include flawed degree completion data, counts of countries bachelor’s degrees regardless of time to earn the degree, and various ratios in the data do not reflect significant changes in population trends or growth of educational opportunities making the ratios meaningless (Adelman, 2009). Particularly compelling is the criticism regarding degree completion comparing United States community colleges (where many students are not degree-seeking) with students in other countries that have institutions offering sub-baccalaureate awards, but that enroll only degree-seeking students (Adelman, 2009). Additional criticisms fault the United States Education Department for its collection methodology which is limited to first-time, full-time students that enroll in the fall semester and complete a degree at the same institution (Cohen et al., 2014). The National Student Clearinghouse and the American Council on Education collaborated on a study that followed not the institution, but the student to track degree completion and persistence (Cook, 2012). Cook (2012) presented data showing that first-time, full-time students at two-year public institutions have a 22% graduation rate leading students, parents, and policymakers to assume that 78% of students dropped out. When one looks at graduation from any institution and/or students still enrolled, however, the 22% jumps to 63%.

While international comparisons may be flawed, the need for America to produce more postsecondary award recipients is clear. Human capital (learned education and skill



sets that add economic value) is integral to the United States economic and social wellbeing (Goldin & Katz, 2008). Goldin and Katz (2008) cited the lack of college readiness as one of the key factors holding educational attainment back and threatening America's human capital supply.

### **The Case for Increased College Readiness**

At a time when the United States needs increased postsecondary credential production the country struggles with an aging workforce and high school graduates who are underprepared for the workforce or college (Crook, 2008; Sasser, 2010). While unimaginable a generation ago, the quality of the United States workforce shows signs of decline. As baby boomers exit the workforce, their replacements are no better educated as witnessed by recent data showing Americans age 55 to 59 hold more advanced postsecondary degrees than their 30 to 34 counterparts (Crook, 2008). The United States high school graduation rates have rebounded to 80%, matching the peak experienced in the late 1960s (Yettick & Lloyd, 2015). The disparity in graduation rates by state, however, is large. For example, Iowa boasts a 90% graduation rate, while only 62% of District of Columbia students graduated on time; three states—Arizona, Illinois, and Wyoming—have experienced declines in their graduation rates from 2011 to 2013 (Yettick & Lloyd, 2015).

Improved high school completion is a must, but equally significant is the need for high school graduates to be academically challenged and college-ready. ACT (2014) reported that almost three quarters of college-bound students do not pass all four college-readiness benchmarks (English, mathematics, reading, and science). As many as two thirds of students entering community colleges today require some level of remediation

(Bailey, Jaggars, & Jenkins, 2015; Cohen et al., 2014). Similarly, Rose (2012) stated 35% to 40% of students attending state colleges and universities require at least one remedial course.

Secondary student preparedness is a key indicator of postsecondary completion. In a longitudinal research study focusing on high school and college curricula and academic performance culled from transcripts, Adelman (2006) found that students taking any remedial courses had degree completion rates at 48% compared to 70% for students with no remedial coursework. Adelman's findings point to serious issues in the secondary education system. The literature suggests that high school students are graduating with one set of criteria, only to enter college and encounter a different set of standards required to succeed (Conley, 2003; Venezia, 2006). Attempts to measure student learning in the U.S. public schools has been underway for two decades now with the focus on meeting specified content standards; however, only recently have states begun to adopt standards or policy with the goal of increasing college enrollment and success (Glancy et al., 2014). Secondary students are lulled into a sense of college readiness based on passing state testing standards and receipt of a high school diploma, but the evidence for most students is contrary. Educators and state policymakers can improve college readiness if they better align secondary and postsecondary standards. Venezia (2006, p. 16) wrote, "State policies send important signals to students about what they need to know and be able to do, to educators about what is important to teach and to researchers and policymakers about what students need."

Current college readiness levels indicate a systemic failure in the United States education system. Secondary and postsecondary standards must be aligned. Dual

enrollment is one solution that prepares high school students for college-level work by extending a bridge between secondary and postsecondary institutions.

### **College-Type or College-Level Courses in High School and College**

**Readiness.** High school curriculum, more than academic standing and admission test scores, is the greatest predictor of postsecondary success (Adelman, 1999). Exposure to college-type or college-level courses is one way to increase the rigor for secondary students and prepare them for postsecondary work (Bailey & Karp, 2003; Hoffman, Vargas, & Santos, 2009). Programs designed to expose secondary students to college-type courses include Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), and college-level courses in Middle College High School, and basic dual enrollment partnerships. Community colleges have historically led this effort, and today 98% of public two-year schools have secondary students enrolled in college courses (Hoffman et al., 2009). Dual enrollment programs consisting of partnerships between colleges and high schools that award dual credit have become increasingly popular due to cost effectiveness and flexibility in administration of the programs (Borden et al., 2013; Kisker, 2006).

### **History of Secondary and Postsecondary Integration**

The idea of integrating secondary and postsecondary institutions is not new. Most efforts in this vein have focused on integration between the last years of secondary schooling and the first two years of postsecondary education. The advent of community colleges, first known as junior colleges, began in the late nineteenth century. Often located in high schools, most junior colleges operated as extensions of secondary schools until the early 1960s (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). Leonard Koos, an influential professor of

secondary education at the Universities of Minnesota and Chicago, developed the 6-4-4 plan of public school organization which was one of the earliest attempts to integrate secondary schooling and the first two years of postsecondary education (Koos, 1946).

Early proponents of the junior college, President William Rainey Harper of the University of Chicago, and organizations like the American Association of School Administrators saw the last two years of high school and first two years of college as similar in purpose (Kisker, 2006). Many scholars, including Koos, supported and expected that the first two years of college would be folded into the high school experience. The 6-4-4 plan advocated by Koos pushed for a realignment of the nation's public education system. Elementary school would make up years one through six, junior high school years seven through 10, and junior college 11 through 14. Koos (1946) argued that the 6-4-4 model would reduce the overlap in curricula and cut administrative and facilities cost in half by having dual-level assignment of administrative functions and dual-level use of instruction facilities such as classrooms and libraries. The 6-4-4 plan never gained acceptance, and only ten public school systems were operating under this model by 1941 (Kisker, 2006).

Three primary factors contributed to the failure of the 6-4-4 model. First, America was experiencing changing societal attitudes toward college. Walter Eells, an influential professor of education at Stanford noted that the thought of attending college had moved from an ambition to an expectation for many Americans (Wechsler, 2001). Educational leaders may have seen the first two years of high school and college as similar, but the American public did not. Eells (1931, p. 728) said the idea of a four-year junior college goes against the "psychology of the American people." Second, the

passing of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (P.L. 78-346) following World War II opened access for vast numbers of Americans, many wanting to earn a four-year degree (Altschuler & Blumin, 2009; Goldin & Katz, 2008). Finally, state policies legislating separate governance and funding arrangements for secondary and postsecondary education deterred integration of high school and the first two years of college as proposed in the 6-4-4 plan (Kisker, 2006; Mokher & McLendon, 2009).

With the post-World War II economic growth and increased demand for four-year degrees, college preparatory efforts evolved to prepare secondary students for baccalaureate-granting colleges and universities. In 1955, the College Board introduced the Advanced Placement (AP) program that allows secondary students to take AP courses as part of the high school curriculum and potentially earn credit by taking end-of-course exams (Bailey & Karp, 2003). Colleges may or may not award college credit for courses based on the student's AP exam score. Likewise, the International Baccalaureate (IB) program introduced in the 1960s is a comprehensive curriculum designed to prepare students for a liberal arts education. Like the AP program, students in IB programs must pass end-of-course exams and then petition colleges to award college credits based on test cutoff scores (Bailey & Karp, 2003). Both the AP and IB programs target high-achieving students with postsecondary aspirations. In 2012, more than one million United States public high school graduates completed AP exams with 61% receiving scores that signal college readiness in a subject and may be accepted for college credit (College Board, 2014).

It would not be until the 1970s that another significant effort would be put forth to integrate the community college and high school—the Middle College High School.

Created to assist at-risk students, Middle College High Schools were a response to the nation's increasing secondary dropout rate (Kisker, 2006; Jordan, Cavalluzzo, & Corallo, 2006). Middle College High Schools offer both secondary and postsecondary curricula in a flexible manner that allows students to progress at their pace (Wechsler, 2001). The first Middle College High School opened in 1974 at LaGuardia Community College. Middle College High Schools numbered 30 in 2000 and enjoy exceptionally high graduation rates (90%) and college-going rates (75%) (Kisker, 2006; Wechsler, 2001). Middle College High Schools, like the 6-4-4- model, struggled to grow because of disparate regulations for secondary and postsecondary institutions (Wechsler, 2001).

Unlike the previous more complex models, basic dual enrollment uses intergovernmental agreements between high schools and colleges to setup and guide programs (Kisker, 2006). In 1976, California was the first to create policy establishing dual enrollment programs (Mokher & McLendon, 2009). Dual enrollment expanded considerably since the 1990s and today 47 states have enacted policies directing these programs (Borden et al., 2013). Dual enrollment programs take many different forms. Some programs occur on college campuses while others operate at the high schools. Dual enrollment faculty may be full-time college professors or high school teachers credentialed as adjuncts. What remains common in all dual enrollment programs is that students receive credit from both the high school and college. Dual enrollment is differentiated from AP and IB programs in that the former earn college-level credit while the latter are college-type courses. Once restricted to high achieving students, dual enrollment programs are now enrolling middle achieving students to increase academic

rigor and instill postsecondary aspirations in students who may not have seen themselves as college bound (Karp, Calcagno, Hughes, Jeong, & Bailey, 2008).

### **Benefits and Limitations of Dual Enrollment**

**Benefits.** Borden, Taylor, Park, and Seiler (2013) completed an extensive review of dual enrollment state policy and best practices. From their descriptive analysis, Borden et al. (2013) identified four “promises” attributed to dual enrollment programs: Enhance and Diversify High School Curricula, Increase Access to Higher Education, Improve High School and College Relationships, and Shorten Time to Degree and Lower the Cost of College.

Dual enrollment is credited for improving course options for students, especially in rural areas. As public schools struggle with state divestment, dual enrollment is one pathway for high schools to access expanded and rigorous curricula for prepared students. State policy can play an important and active role in enhancing high school curricula. Today, 16 states require dual enrollment be offered to high school students, while another 14 states have a policy that highly encourage dual enrollment opportunities (Borden et al., 2013).

Still predominantly focused on academically well-prepared students, dual enrollment is slowly integrating moderately-prepared students, and results have been positive (Karp et al., 2008). Recent studies have shown that so-called middle-achieving students can benefit from these programs and that participation can improve the students’ college aspirations (Borden et al., 2013; Karp et al., 2008; Kim, 2012). State policy often determines whether students can access dual enrollment programs. According to Borden

et al. (2013), state policy often sets the access standards in terms of high school grade level, GPA requirements, standardized test scores, and course prerequisites.

High school students are not the only beneficiary of dual enrollment benefits. There is growing literature that suggests that dual enrollment facilitates collaboration between secondary and postsecondary institutions (Borden et al., 2013; Kisker, 2006). Borden et al. (2013) cited state policies in Kansas and Arizona that require high schools and college faculty to establish advisory councils, establish evaluative processes, and provide professional development opportunities to credentialed high school instructors teaching as dual enrollment adjuncts.

The literature on dual enrollment suggested that program participation reduced both the time and cost to a college degree; however, most of the evidence is anecdotal (Allen & Dadgar, 2012). Borden et al. (2013) suggested that the critical factor between dual enrollment and time and cost to degree has to do with how well the programs prepare high schools students to be ready for subsequent college courses once they matriculate from high school to college.

Ultimately, taking fewer college courses to reduce the cost may be less important financially than shortening the time to degree: student loan debt burden is more substantially impacted by taking longer to complete (and borrowing to cover living expenses) than by tuition costs. (Borden et. al., 2013, p. 39)

A number of factors contribute to rising costs and time to a college degree.

Complete College America (2014) reported that unnecessary degree requirements, poorly designed degree paths, and remedial courses are key factors driving up the time and cost of obtaining a college degree. At public two-year colleges, it is estimated each



extra year costs students nearly \$15,000 more in tuition, fees, and room and board; almost \$23,000 for each additional year at public four-year schools (Complete College America, 2014). In addition to college-related costs for each extra year, students have opportunity costs in the form of lost wages. Zeidenberg (2012) researched excess credits earned by associate's degree completers in one state's community college system and found that 12% of earned credits did not contribute to degree requirements at an estimated cost of \$6 million per year. It is important to note that Zeidenberg's analysis excluded failed or dropped courses and remedial coursework. Similarly, a recent Education Department study found that the average bachelor's degree recipient earned 18.4 excess credits and paid for 20.3 credits for failed, repeated, or withdrawn coursework (Douglas-Gabriel, 2014). There is a growing body of evidence that dual enrollment improves postsecondary academic outcomes that align with the Nation's call for college accountability and increased degree production.

Recent studies have found positive outcomes for students participating in dual enrollment including increased high school graduation rates, increased postsecondary aspirations, reduced need for remediation, and improved college persistence and completion rates (Allen & Dadgar, 2012; An, 2015; Hoffman et al., 2009; Karp et al., 2008; Swanson, 2008). Adelman (1999, 2006) argued for dual enrollment type programs as a method of increasing rigor for high school students and preparing students for postsecondary studies. Research shows that momentum points such as earning 20 credits in the first year of college significantly enhance a student's chance of completing a postsecondary degree (Adelman, 1999; Swanson, 2008). Dual enrollment offers students a head start on these 20 credit hours by allowing students to earn college credits while

still enrolled in high school. Recent research by Allen and Dadgar highlighted the results from one of the country's largest dual enrollment programs.

Allen's and Dadgar's (2012) research on New York City's College Now program has been cited as one of the most robust and rigorous studies of dual enrollment. The study employed a quantitative, non-randomized pretest and posttest group design. The sample included 22,962 first-time freshmen who within 15 months of graduating from a New York City public high school enrolled in a City University of New York (CUNY) college in fall 2009. Two groups were evaluated: group one consisted of CUNY first-time freshmen who completed at least one dual enrollment course; group two, the control group, consisted of CUNY first-time freshmen who never enrolled in a dual enrollment course. The authors utilized an extensive set of demographic and prior achievement control variables in conducting a series of regression analyses. Additionally, a difference in differences analysis was conducted to account for unobserved differences among College Now participants and nonparticipants that were not captured by the study's demographic and prior academic achievement variables.

The initial regression results indicated that completing one or more dual enrollment courses is associated with significant gains in college credit attainment, higher college GPA, and increased retention rates. A subsequent regression analysis employing the difference in differences (DID) framework resulted in similar findings to the initial regression results. Credit attainment and GPA outcomes were significantly higher for College Now participants; however, no effect for improved retention was detected. Results suggested that College Now program impacts were not driven by prior academic achievement or differences in eligibility and high school attended. While the College

Now program results are encouraging, the lack of uniformity across the country in dual enrollment programs leaves room for concern.

Proponents have suggested that dual enrollment can benefit non-traditional students. Current research has indicated that low-income students benefit from dual enrollment, and first-generation students see an increase in degree attainment compared to non-participants (An, 2013).

**Limitations.** As well as identifying promising aspects of dual enrollment programs, Borden et al. (2013) cited potential pitfalls. Potential limitations to dual enrollment included inadequate rigor to prepare students for college, dual enrollment instructor qualifications, lack of an authentic college experience, and transferability of dual enrollment coursework (Borden et al., 2013).

One of the most common concerns surrounding dual enrollment is the question of rigor and whether dual enrollment courses truly represent college coursework. Borden et al. (2013) in their review of state policies on dual enrollment, said it was common to find references to course quality. However, there is a lack of research indicating that dual enrollment courses are equivalent to traditional college courses. Closely related is the issue of dual enrollment course instructor qualifications—the majority of these instructors are high school teachers credentialed as adjunct community college faculty. Most state policies rely on the postsecondary institutions regional accreditation requirements for faculty qualifications (Borden et al., 2013).

Additionally, there is the concern that offering college courses at the high school does not provide an authentic college experience (Karp, 2012; Smith, 2007). What is the holistic impact on learning when dual enrollment students do not have access to on-

campus experiences and services, or interaction with a diversity of college-level students? Again, little to no research has addressed this facet of dual enrollment.

The last potential pitfall centers on course transferability. Critics and even some supporters of dual enrollment worry rapid growth and the admittance of students who may not be ready (middle-achieving) diminish the rigor and legitimacy of dual credit courses, and that postsecondary institutions will refuse transfer credits from these courses (Mangan, 2016). Only a handful of states including Arkansas, Indiana, and Kentucky include explicit language in state statute that ensures transferability of dual enrollment courses among the state's higher education institutions (Borden et al., 2013). The researcher's review of the dual enrollment literature did not uncover any examples where transfer institutions rejected courses because they were earned through dual enrollment.

Research on the effectiveness of dual enrollment is at an early stage. Given the rapid growth and variability in dual enrollment offerings from state to state, it is difficult to make any conclusive statements at this time. The chief criticism in the literature is the failure to account for factors outside the dual enrollment programs like student motivation, prior academic work, economic status, and student characteristics (Bailey & Karp, 2003; Karp et al., 2008). Despite the noted shortcomings, there is a preponderance of evidence warranting further investigation into dual enrollment programs and their roles in postsecondary readiness.

### **Dual Enrollment from a Theoretical Perspective: A Remaining Need in the Literature**

Absent from most research on dual enrollment is an explicit theoretical framework. Conclusively determining how or why dual enrollment programs affect

students is challenging. Although some research has occurred in dual enrollment outcomes, there remains a need to understand how these programs affect learners. To do that, a conceptual model or theoretical framework that explains the relationship between important variables and constructs is needed (Roberts, 2010).

The literature indicates there are two theoretical models that may be relevant to elucidating how dual enrollment programs support students in making a successful transition from high school to college. Anticipatory socialization and validation theory are two socialization/change theories that hold promise. Descriptions of both anticipatory socialization and validation theory are presented along with an explanation of how each theory is hypothesized to affect the outcomes of this study.

### **Anticipatory Socialization**

Merton (1968) in his work on reference group behavior developed the conceptual framework of anticipatory socialization. Anticipatory socialization is “the process or set of experiences through which individuals come to anticipate correctly the values, norms, and behaviors they will encounter in a new social setting” (Pascarella, Terenzini, & Wolfe, 1986, p. 156). Merton examined data from *The American Soldier* study to explain how enlisted soldiers desiring to become officers would adopt the values and attitudes of the reference group (officers) to which they aspired to join. Merton found that privates who embraced and modeled the values and behaviors of the Army as enlisted men were more likely to be promoted than those who did not (Merton, 1968). Furthermore, Merton hypothesized that anticipatory socialization would ease the soldiers’ adjustment to their new officer status. It is important to note that for anticipatory socialization to serve a positive function there must exist an accepting environment in the desired group (Merton,

1968). Karp (2012) and Pascarella et al. (1986) applied the theory of anticipatory socialization to the transition of students from high school to college.

**Anticipatory Socialization and Dual Enrollment Outcomes.** Pascarella et al. (1986) studied precollege orientation as a form of anticipatory socialization. An intensive two-day orientation was designed to familiarize students with the expected behaviors of the college and increase the student's knowledge of the institution's social and academic programs (Pascarella et al., 1986). It was hypothesized that students participating in the precollege orientation would be positively integrated into the campus and function successfully in the new environment. The researchers found the orientation had a considerable and significant positive effect on social integration and persistence (Pascarella et al., 1986).

More recently, Karp (2006) and Swanson (2008) adapted the theory of anticipatory socialization to dual enrollment. Karp (2006) argued dual enrollment provides students with information about their ability to succeed in college by letting them experience college expectations and take on the role of a college student while still in high school. Swanson (2008) discussed anticipatory socialization as a conceptual framework to explain dual enrollment's role in successfully transitioning students from high school to college. Swanson found that dual enrollment participants were less likely to delay entry into college and persisted at greater rates through the second year of college than non-participating students (Swanson, 2008).

### **Validation Theory**

Rendon's theory describes validation as "an enabling, confirming and supportive process initiated by in- and out-of-class agents that foster academic and interpersonal

development” (Rendon, 1994, p. 44). Rendon maintains that the earlier validation from college agents begins, the better, especially for non-traditional, at-risk students (Rendon, 2002). Students must feel a sense of academic and interpersonal validation before they can become involved in the social and academic fabric of college life (Rendon, 2002). Rendon (2002) contends that postsecondary institutions were originally designed to serve the privileged; traditional students came to college with the social capital necessary to succeed. In validation theory, faculty and staff are expected to initiate and take an active role in assisting students with integration and affirming students as capable and valued members of the institution (Rendon, 2002). Students who feel validated by their institutions of higher learning have increased odds of academic success according to validation theory (Rendon, 1994, 2002).

Validation theory is particularly relevant given the historic and rapidly changing demographics in the United States. United States Census Bureau statistics showed that 85% of the U.S. population was White in 1960, while 11% were Black, 4% Hispanic, and 1% Asian (Wade, 2012). In 2013, Whites have declined to 63% while minority groups (17% Hispanic, 12% Black, and 5% Asian) have increased as a proportion of the U.S. population (United States Census Bureau, 2015). Taylor and Cohn (2012) reported by 2050 the Hispanic share of the population will nearly double, and the White population will slide to 47% representing for the first time in U.S. history a minority majority. For minorities and other non-traditional groups (first-generation, low-income, and disabled), community colleges continue to be the primary choice to begin one's undergraduate education (AACC, 2015; Cohen et al., 2014; Wood, 2012).

The United States has made great strides in racial and ethnic equality over the last half-century (Montalvo, 2013). Nonetheless, many non-traditional groups including Hispanics and Blacks continue to lag in educational attainment and socioeconomic status compared to their White peers (Gerald & Haycock, 2006).

What is needed to transform these students is for faculty, administrators, and counselors to fully engage in the validation of students and to recognize that not all students can be expected to learn or to get involved in institutional life in the same way. (Rendon, 1994, pg. 51)

Students who feel validated by their institutions of higher learning have increased odds of academic success according to validation theory (Rendon, 1994, 2002). Once reserved for high-achieving students, dual enrollment programs are being expanded to encompass middle-achieving students. Kim (2012) found that midrange academic students allowed to participate in dual enrollment perform better than similar non-participants do when they matriculate to college.

**Validation Theory and Dual Enrollment Outcomes.** Rendon contends that nontraditional students are often less sure of their academic abilities, hence, requiring validation of their presence in higher education and academic competencies (Rendon, 2002). Community college students, the subjects of this research study, are more prone to be nontraditional students (Cohen et al., 2014). American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) data indicated community college students are likely to be first-generation, minorities, low-income, employed, and/or attend part-time compared to their peers beginning at four-year institutions (AACC, 2015 Fact Sheet; Cohen et al., 2014). Dual enrollment programs afford students early contact with college staff through



admissions, advising, and other student services and in class interaction with college faculty. Dual enrollment provides an environment for students to experience postsecondary validation that they may not receive from parents or peers.

### **Current Study: Utilizing Anticipatory Socialization and Validation Theory**

#### **Constructs to Examine Effects of Dual Learning**

Postsecondary institutions in general and community colleges specifically have advocated for open access as a means to increase educational attainment and produce a skilled workforce (Cohen et al., 2014). With over 70% of recent high school graduates attending postsecondary institutions, it is clear that the message of access has been received by colleges and students alike (Kirst & Bracco, 2004). However, high rates of remediation and low rates of degree completion suggest that access to higher education alone is not the answer. Researchers argued that high schools need to do more to emphasize preparation for college-level work (Adelman, 2006; Kirst & Bracco, 2004). Dual enrollment is one method by which high schools and colleges can both emphasize preparation and allow students to experience college while still in high school. Dual enrollment programs move beyond access by communicating the values and performance expectations of postsecondary education to participants, a level of preparation that non-participants likely did not receive. Using a nationally representative dataset with robust demographic and academic variables, this current study used the lens of anticipatory socialization and validation theory to address the research questions and test the study hypotheses.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses.** The study addressed the following research questions:

1. How do dual enrollment participants compare to non-participants in terms of bachelor's degree attainment for students who begin their postsecondary studies at a community college?

2. How do dual enrollment participants compare to non-participants in terms of time to bachelor's degree attainment for students who begin their postsecondary studies at a community college?

3. How do dual enrollment participants compare to non-participants in terms of loan debt incurred in obtaining a bachelor's degree, as measured by the total amount of Stafford, Perkins, and PLUS undergraduate loans, for students who begin their postsecondary studies at a community college?

This study tested the following hypotheses:

*Hypothesis 1:* Degree attainment will be significantly higher for students who were dual enrollment participants compared to non-dual enrollment participants.

*Hypothesis 2:* Time to bachelor's degree will be significantly shorter for students who were dual enrollment participants compared to non-dual enrollment participants.

*Hypothesis 3:* The loans incurred in obtaining a bachelor's degree will be significantly less for students who were dual enrollment participants compared to non-dual enrollment participants.

In relation to the study's research questions and hypotheses, if dual enrollment and the anticipatory socialization experience it provides affect students' expectations and skills required to be successful in college, then one would expect that dual enrollment

participants are significantly more likely to attain a bachelor's degree than non-dual enrollment participants. In addition to degree attainment, dual enrollment gives students experience in navigating college and a head start on college credit completions. Hence, it is hypothesized that dual enrollment participants will earn their bachelor's degree in less time than non-participants. Moreover, it is hypothesized that this decreased time to degree will allow graduates to enter the workforce earlier and avoid lost opportunity costs that result with college attendance. As a result, dual enrollment students should have significantly lower loan amounts incurred in obtaining a bachelor's degree compared to non-dual enrollment participants.

Likewise, given this study's population of students beginning their postsecondary studies at a public community college, Rendon's validation theory is another explanation of how dual enrollment programs could positively influence students' postsecondary success. Relative to the three research questions put forth in this study, one would expect dual enrollment participants who experienced early postsecondary validation to be better socially integrated and significantly more likely to attain a bachelor's degree when compared to non-participants. Similarly, being validated as college-capable, dual enrollment students should experience decreased time to a bachelor's degree as measured in months and consequently have significantly reduced loans incurred in obtaining a bachelor's degree compared to non-participants.

Anticipatory socialization and validation theories represent two potential explanations of how dual enrollment programs prepare high school students to be successful in college. Dual enrollment programs not only provide students with college-level work experience, but also provide socialization practice and insights into

postsecondary mores, values, and norms. Students also experience early and direct contact with college staff and faculty that validation theory postulates will enable nontraditional students to effectively transition from high school to college. Linking each of these theories to the study's population and research questions will assist in assessing the mechanisms that dual enrollment programs contribute to students' college readiness and will be revisited in Chapter 5.

### **Conclusion**

Technology and globalization have reshaped the American workplace. The skill sets required in the new knowledge economy will increasingly require postsecondary training. To remain economically competitive, the U.S. must raise the educational attainment level of its workforce. One impediment to increasing educational attainment levels is the lack of college readiness for many recent high school graduates. A review of the extant literature on dual enrollment documents how these programs can prepare students both socially and academically to be successful in college. However, gaps remain in the literature. Policymakers and dual enrollment proponents advocate that dual enrollment programs reduce the time to and cost of a college degree for students and taxpayers alike. This study proposes to advance secondary and postsecondary educators knowledge of dual enrollment programs by addressing these specific gaps in the literature. Chapter 3 provides an explanation of the data source, methodology, research design, and analysis used for this study.

### CHAPTER 3

#### METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effect of dual enrollment on students' bachelor's degree attainment, and the impact on students' time and cost of attaining their degree. This quantitative study used a national sample of recent high school graduates to compare dual enrollment participants and non-dual enrollment participants in their efforts to attain a bachelor's degree. Additional independent variables included students' race, gender, socio-economic status (SES), first generation status, high school GPA, highest high school mathematics, pre-college credit dosage, Advanced Placement (AP), ACT/SAT scores, and college academic intensity.

#### **Research Questions and Hypotheses**

The study addressed the following research questions:

1. How do dual enrollment participants compare to non-participants in terms of bachelor's degree attainment for students who begin their postsecondary studies at a community college?

2. How do dual enrollment participants compare to non-participants in terms of time to bachelor's degree attainment for students who begin their postsecondary studies at a community college?

3. How do dual enrollment participants compare to non-participants in terms of loan debt incurred in obtaining a bachelor's degree, as measured by the total amount of Stafford, Perkins, and PLUS undergraduate loans, for students who begin their postsecondary studies at a community college?

The study tested the following hypotheses:

*Hypothesis 1:* Degree attainment will be significantly higher for students who were dual enrollment participants compared to non-dual enrollment participants.

*Hypothesis 2:* Time to bachelor's degree will be significantly shorter for students who were dual enrollment participants compared to non-dual enrollment participants.

*Hypothesis 3:* The loans incurred in obtaining a bachelor's degree will be significantly less for students who were dual enrollment participants compared to non-dual enrollment participants.

### **Research Design**

Using an *ex post facto* data source, this study employed a causal comparative research design. While the causal comparative design lacks the random assignment component that makes true experimental designs the highest standard for causal explanations (Rossi, Lipsey, & Freeman, 2004) it is still more rigorous than correlation or pre-experimental designs (Nachmias & Nachmias, 1987). To adjust for selection bias and improve causal inference, the statistical method of propensity score matching (PSM) was utilized. Propensity score matching uses observable covariates to match the treatment (dual enrollment participant) and control (non-dual enrollment participant) groups and make them comparable (Rosenbaum & Rubin, 1983). Estimation of the propensity score and sample balance diagnostics are discussed in Chapter 4. Table 1 summarizes the study design and methods.

Table 1

*Overview of Study Design and Research Methods*

Research Questions	Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	Covariates	Analysis
R1	Bachelor's degree attainment (Yes/No)	Dual enrollment participation (Yes/No)	PS	Binary Logistic Regression
R2	Time to degree (in Months)		Pre-college credit dosage (enough credits to enter as a sophomore)	OLS Multiple Regression
R3	Loans incurred (Stafford, Perkins, PLUS loans taken in Dollars)		College attendance intensity (full- vs. part-time)	OLS Multiple Regression

*Note.* Propensity Score (PS) = race, gender, socioeconomic status, first generation status, h.s. GPA, AP participation, ACT/SAT scores, and highest h.s. mathematics course completed.

*Dependent variables.* Much of the research on dual enrollment and its relationship to postsecondary academic success has focused on short-term outcomes such as first-year persistence, first-year GPA, and credit accumulation (Allen & Dadgar, 2012; Karp, Calcagno, Hughes, Jeong, & Bailey, 2007). The goal for participants in the current study, however, is ultimately bachelor's degree attainment. Given the paucity of research on dual enrollment and bachelor's degree attainment (An, 2013), the dependent variable for research question 1 is bachelor's degree attainment. Similarly, both popular and scholarly literature on dual enrollment frequently cited reduced time to and cost of a degree as benefits or reasons for supporting dual enrollment programs (Cowan & Goldhaber, 2015; Jones, 2014; Karp et al., 2007). Nevertheless, there is an absence of

empirical research to support these claims (Borden et al., 2013). Thus, the dependent variable for research question 2 is time to degree measured in months. For research question 3, the dependent variable is loan amount incurred in obtaining a degree as measured by Stafford, Perkins, and PLUS undergraduate loan amounts acquired.

*Independent variable.* The dichotomous independent or treatment variable for this causal observation study was participation status in dual enrollment (earned college credits while in high school or not).

*Covariates.* The rationale of selected covariates are separated into pre- and post-treatment explanatory variables. The pre-treatment variables included race, gender, socioeconomic status, first generation status, high school GPA, AP participation, highest high school mathematics course completed, and ACT/SAT college readiness scores. Dual enrollment participant status was regressed on the pre-treatment covariates to create the propensity scores. Previous research has recommended or identified the background variables of race, gender, socioeconomic status, and first generation status as important covariates to control for when modeling the effects of dual enrollment on academic success (An, 2015; Bailey, 2003; Karp et al., 2007; Karp, 2015). Adelman (2006) found that highest high school mathematics course was one of the strongest predictors of postsecondary degree attainment. Pretlow and Wathington (2013) included high school setting as a control because research has indicated unequal access to dual enrollment courses depending on the schools geographic location (city, suburb, town, rural). Jones (2014) recommended using high school GPA when matching dual enrollment participants to non-dual enrollment participants to reduce selection bias. Additionally, An (2015) identified ACT scores as a valid pre-college control variable when studying the effects of



dual enrollment programs. Long and Kurlaender (2009) added that ACT or SAT scores are strong indicators of baccalaureate degree intent and are particularly appropriate when matching community college students. The study's post-treatment control covariates follow.

Post-treatment covariates included pre-college credit dosage and college attendance intensity. Ganzert (2010) found a positive correlation between the number of dual enrollment courses completed and postsecondary graduation rates. Likewise, Giani, Alexander, and Reyes (2014) reported that dual enrollment dosage was significantly related to postsecondary outcomes. Researchers have reported that the subject of the dual enrollment course is important when determining the impact on postsecondary success (Speroni, 2011). Giani et al. (2014) found that vocational dual enrollment courses had little impact on postsecondary degree completion, while academic courses such as English, mathematics, and science significantly improved students' chances of degree completion. Lastly, An (2006) reported that college attendance intensity was significantly related to bachelor's degree attainment with full-time students outperforming part-time students.

### **Data Source**

Data for this study were provided by the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics. Specifically, this study used the restricted version of the BPS: 04/09. The target population for the BPS: 04/09 study was students who began their postsecondary studies for the first time during the academic year 2003-2004 at any institution in the United States or Puerto Rico (Wine, Janson, & Wheelless, 2011). According to Wine et al. (2011), 16,684 students had adequate data to be classified as the

BPS: 04/09 study respondents. BPS: 04/09 comprises data files containing student-level data collected from student interviews and transcripts, and supplemented by information from government and administrative databases (Wine et al., 2011).

### **Participants**

Participants for this study are recent high school graduates who are first-time college students beginning at a public community college during the 2003-2004 academic year. In addition, students entering college with the intent to earn a bachelor's degree were included in the study sample. Study participants and their academic outcomes were tracked for six years (2003-2004 to 2008-2009) across all institutions attended in the United States or Puerto Rico.

### **Data Analysis**

All data were analyzed using the statistical software, SPSS version 21. To reduce selection bias, Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983) suggested the statistical method of Propensity Score Matching (PSM). A logistic regression model regressing dual enrollment participation status on the eight pre-treatment covariates was used to create the predicted probability score (PS) to match the control group (non-dual enrollment participants) to dual enrollment participants. Next, as recommended by Austin, (2009) balance diagnostics were examined to ensure that the propensity score model was adequately specified. The PSM sample was used for all the descriptive and causal analyses. A detailed description of the matching methods and statistical assumptions are presented in Chapter 4.

**Assumptions**

The principal assumption underlying this study is that bachelor's degree attainment—and the time to and cost of a degree—differ according to dual enrollment status (dual enrollment participant or not).

Data from the BPS: 04/09 are assumed accurate and complete with the exceptions noted in the limitations section. Inferential statistical tests met required distributional and independent observation assumptions to ensure valid analyses results.

**Limitations**

The BPS: 04/09 lacks specificity in its measurement of dual enrollment. Dual enrollment programs take many different forms. Some programs occur on college campuses, while others operate at the high schools. Others incorporate distance delivery through interactive television. Dual enrollment faculty may be full-time college professors or high school teachers credentialed as adjuncts. The BPS: 04/09 data do not distinguish between the different types of dual enrollment.

Although the BPS: 04/09 allows for differentiation between other types of pre-college transition programs such as Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB), it does not negate the fact that students may participate in multiple pre-college programs. Untangling the direct and indirect effects of these pre-college programs from dual enrollment is another limitation. For students participating in multiple pre-college programs, discerning the effect between the different program types is a limitation. In these cases, the findings may only be able to detect that pre-college programs have an effect or no effect on bachelor's degree attainment and time and cost to a degree.

Missing variables are another limitation. The literature suggested that high school setting (city, suburb, town, rural) was an important pre-treatment covariate. While high school setting was included in the initial study design, the variable was not available in BPS: 04/09. Likewise, two recommended predictor variables (dual enrolled credits and dual course type) that were to be derived from transcript data were not available. Pre-college credit dosage (enough early college credits to enter college as a sophomore-yes/no) was available as a proxy for the missing continuous variable, dual enrolled credits.

Another limitation of using BPS: 04/09 is that some of the data are self-reported through student interviews, and thus respondent bias is a potential concern. While not a unique limitation to this study, there may be unobserved covariates such as student motivation or family support that could influence the study outcomes.

### **Conclusion**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of dual enrollment on students' bachelor's degree attainment, time to a degree, and cost of a degree applying the conceptual framework of anticipatory socialization and validation theory. Using an *ex post facto* data source, the researcher employed the statistical method of propensity score matching to reduce selection bias and improve the validity of resulting causal inferences. The statistical analysis used logistic regression to address the research question of bachelor's degree attainment while ordinary least squares regression was used answer the questions of time to and cost of a degree. A strength of this study was its use of a nationally representative sample of college students. Nonetheless, there are limitations regarding the specificity of dual enrollment information collected and the

potential respondent bias that exists with survey data. Chapter 4 reports the study's findings.

## CHAPTER 4

### FINDINGS

Given the rapid growth of dual enrollment programs across the United States, coupled with a shortage of empirical research to effectively inform the debate between proponents and critics of such programs, the purpose of this study was to address the influence of dual enrollment participation on bachelor's degree attainment, and time to and cost of a degree. The study examined a national sample of traditionally aged, first-time college students who began their postsecondary studies at a public community college in the academic year 2003-2004. The study tested the following hypotheses:

*Hypothesis 1:* Degree attainment will be significantly higher for students who were dual enrollment participants compared to non-dual enrollment participants.

*Hypothesis 2:* Time to bachelor's degree will be significantly shorter for students who were dual enrollment participants compared to non-dual enrollment participants.

*Hypothesis 3:* The loans incurred in obtaining a bachelor's degree will be significantly less for students who were dual enrollment participants compared to non-dual enrollment participants.

#### **Data Set and Sample**


For this analysis, the researcher used the Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study (BPS: 04/09) from the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). The BPS: 04/09 had an unweighted study population of 16,684 first-time college students. Due to the complex sampling design and longitudinal nature of the BPS: 04/09, all analysis for this study used weighted data (WTB000) as recommended by NCES. The researcher employed propensity score

matching to improve comparability of study outcomes between dual enrollment and non-dual enrollment participants.

Propensity score matching (PSM) was conducted using Thoemme's (2012) PSM guidelines for the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21. First, the researcher filtered the data to include only participants of interest for the study—first-time, traditionally aged (24 years or less) college students beginning their postsecondary studies at a public community college with the intent of earning a bachelor's degree. Using weighted data as recommended by Ridgeway et al. (2015), the propensity score estimate was produced using a 1:1 nearest neighbor matching logistic regression algorithm using the pre-treatment covariates of gender, race, socioeconomic status, first-generation status, high school GPA, AP participation, highest high school mathematics course completed, and ACT/SAT scores. To improve matching, a caliper of .15 was imposed (tolerance allowable between two participants based on their estimated propensity score).

Before the PSM procedure, the control group (non-dual enrollment) had 834,945 students, and the treatment (dual enrolled) had 180,585. After the PSM, the non-dual enrollment group had 131,316, while the dual enrollment group had 153,267. Balance diagnostic tests including standardized differences before and after matching (Figure 1) and a visual dot plot of standardized mean differences showed nearly no imbalance based on observed covariates and interactions among all covariates. The overall balance test indicated that the non-dual enrollment and dual enrollment groups were not statistically different,  $\chi^2(38) = 20.107, p = .992$ . Similarly, the multivariate imbalance test showed that the matched sample (.967) was smaller than the unmatched sample (.979) which

indicated that PSM improved the overall balance (Austin, 2009; Thoemmes, 2012).



*Figure 1.* Improvement in standardized differences after propensity score matching procedure indicating balanced groups.

Morgan and Winship (2007) suggested that adjusting on the propensity score amounts to statistical randomization. Hence, the researcher can estimate the treatment effect (dual enrollment) by matching dual enrollment participants with observationally equivalent non-dual enrollment participants (based on propensity scores). Table 2 displays the pre-treatment covariate differences between the original and matched



samples. Across most pre-treatment characteristics, differences decreased in the matched sample. Study participants on average were more likely to be female, White, first-generation, and have a high school GPA between 3.0 and 3.4.

Table 2

*Characteristics of First-Time College Students in the Original and Matched Samples*

Characteristic	Original Sample			Matched Sample		
	Non-Dual	Dual	Diff	Non-Dual	Dual	Diff
<i>n/%</i>	834,945	180,585	654,360	131,316	153,267	-21,951
Female	52.3	53.1	-0.8	60.2	52.1	8.1
White	59.1	61.7	-2.6	62.9	60.7	2.2
Black or African American	14.0	10.3	3.7	10.7	11.9	-1.2
Hispanic or Latino	15.9	17.6	-1.7	18.0	17.9	0.1
Asian	5.2	6.2	-1.0	4.5	5.6	-1.1
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.7	0.5	0.2	0.0	0.4	-0.4
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.2
Other	1.7	0.9	0.8	0.7	1.1	-0.4
More than one race	3.2	2.5	0.7	2.8	2.4	0.4
Economically Disadvantaged	42.9	41.6	1.3	46.4	39.4	7.0
First Generation	67.1	59.6	7.5	65.8	60.7	5.1
Pre-Calculus or higher while in high school	18.1	31.9	-13.8	21.6	31.2	-9.6
Median High School GPA Category	3.0-3.4	3.0-3.4	0.0	3.0-3.4	3.0-3.4	0.0
Avg. ACT/SAT Score	894.1	929.7	-35.6	917.2	923.7	-6.5
AP Credits accepted	0.8	14.9	-14.1	3.7	14.9	-11.2

### Descriptive Statistics

The first level of analysis used descriptive statistics to portray the essential features of the data and observe measures of central tendency, dispersion, and frequency. Tables 3-5 summarize the study's dependent variables.

As shown in Table 3, dual enrollment participants (28.1%) earned a bachelor's degree at close to double the percentage earned by non-dual enrollment students (15.9%). A two-sample t-test between percentages showed that the difference in earning a bachelor's degree between dual enrollment and non-dual enrollment students was statistically significant ( $p < .001$ ).

Table 4 shows that the majority of study participants did not receive student loans to pay for their education. The use of student loans to pay for college was similar for both non-dual enrollment (45.8%) and dual enrolled students (45.1%).

Table 3

#### *Bachelor's Degree Attainment Within Six Years by Dual Enrollment Status*

Bachelor's Degree	Non-Dual Enrollment ( $n = 131,316$ )	Dual Enrollment ( $n = 153,267$ )
	%	%
Yes	15.9	28.1
No	84.1	71.9

Table 4

*Student Loan Status by Dual Enrollment Status*

Student Loans	Non-Dual Enrollment ( <i>n</i> = 131,316)	Dual Enrollment ( <i>n</i> = 153,267)
	%	%
Yes	45.8	45.1
No	54.2	54.9

For study participants completing a bachelor's within six years, Table 5 displays the mean and standard deviation by dual enrollment status for time to a bachelor's degree and total student loans incurred. On average, dual students ( $M=58.42$ ,  $SD=8.22$ ) completed their degree faster than non-dual enrollment students ( $M=60.37$ ,  $SD=8.35$ ). An independent-samples t-test showed that the difference in months to bachelor's degree between the groups was statistically significant,  $M = 1.94$ , 95% CI [1.81, 2.08],  $t(40604) = 27.71$ ,  $p < .001$ . Skewness measures showed no violation for either dual enrollment status group. Regarding student loan amounts incurred, dual students ( $M=12,301.91$ ,  $SD=13,740.31$ ) had slightly lower average loan amounts than non-dual enrollment students ( $M=12,820.86$ ,  $SD=15,157.62$ ). An independent-samples t-test showed that the difference in student loans incurred between the groups was statistically significant,  $M = 518.95$ , 95% CI [275.56, 762.34],  $t(37784) = 4.18$ ,  $p < .001$ . The standard deviations for both the dual enrollment and non-dual enrollment groups show a high amount of loan variability. Total student loans are markedly skewed to the right for both the dual enrollment group (1.13) and non-dual enrollment group (1.45).

Table 5

*Mean Time to Degree (in Months) and Student Loans (in Dollars) by Dual Enrollment Status for Students completing a Bachelor's Degree*

Characteristic	Non-Dual Enrollment ( <i>n</i> = 20,824)		Dual Enrollment ( <i>n</i> = 43,035)	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Months to Bachelor's Degree	60.37	8.35	58.42	8.22
Total Student Loans in Dollars	12,820.86	15,157.62	12,301.91	13,740.31

Table 6 presents study participant's college attendance patterns. The majority of students had mixed enrollment patterns where they sometimes attended school full-time and other terms part-time. Approximately one-third of both non-dual enrollment and dual enrollment students attended exclusively full-time. Attending college exclusively as a part-time student was the least common attendance pattern.

Table 6

*College Attendance Intensity by Dual Enrollment Status*

Characteristic	Non-Dual Enrollment ( <i>n</i> = 131,316)	Dual Enrollment ( <i>n</i> = 153,267)
Attendance Intensity	%	%
Exclusively Full-Time	34.3	32.6
Exclusively Part-Time	11.8	10.6
Mixed Full- and Part-Time	53.9	56.8

The measure, pre-college credit dosage (combination of dual enrollment credits and AP credits) are presented in Table 7. The vast majority of students in both groups did not attain enough credits in high school to enter college as a sophomore. For those students entering college as a sophomore, dual enrolled students did so at more than three

times the rate of non-dual enrollment students.

Table 7

*Credits to Enter College as a Sophomore by Dual Enrollment Status*

Characteristic	Non-Dual Enrollment ( <i>n</i> = 131,316)	Dual Enrollment ( <i>n</i> = 153,267)
Pre-College Credit Dosage	%	%
Sophomore Standing	3.7	14.9
Less than Sophomore	96.3	85.1

To summarize the preliminary analysis, balance diagnostics based on observed pre-treatment covariates and descriptive statistics confirmed that the groups of interest, non-dual enrollment and dual enrolled students are statistically similar. Independent-samples t-tests showed the dual enrolled group having statistically significantly better results on the study's outcome variables completing a bachelor's degree, time to degree in months, and cost of degree as measured by student loans incurred. These descriptive analyses, however, do not indicate causality or take into account confounding covariates. The next section presents the binary logistic regression and ordinary least squares (OLS) multiple regression analyses used to address the study's research questions.

### **Research Questions**

**Research Question 1: How do dual enrollment participants compare to non-participants in terms of bachelor's degree attainment for students who begin their postsecondary studies at a community college?**

*Hypothesis 1:* Degree attainment will be significantly higher for students who were dual enrollment participants compared to non-dual enrollment participants.

For research question 1, binary logistic regression was implemented. Leech,

Barrett, and Morgan (2015) recommended logistic regression when the dependent variable is dichotomous. Before proceeding with the analysis, logistic regression assumptions were verified. Unlike multiple regression, logistic regression has no distributional assumptions (Leech et al., 2015). “However, observations must be independent and independent variables must be linearly related to the logit of the dependent variable” (Leech et al., 2015, p. 167). Observations are independent. The linearity of the continuous variable, propensity score, was assessed using the Box-Tidwell test. The propensity score variable violated the assumption that it be linearly related to the logit of the dependent variable. A Bonferroni correction was applied using all six terms in the model, but the propensity score was still found to violate the linearity assumption. As a result, the propensity score variable was removed from the model. There were three studentized residuals with values exceeding three standard deviations, which were included in the analysis.

With assumptions met, a binary logistic regression was performed to ascertain whether the predictor variables: dual enrollment participation, college attendance intensity, and pre-college credit dosage, significantly predicted whether a student earned a bachelor’s degree. The logistic regression model was statistically significant,  $\chi^2 = 13791.750$   $p < .001$ ,  $df = 3$ , indicating that when all three predictor variables were considered together, they significantly predicted whether a student earned a bachelor’s degree or not.

All three predictor variables were statistically significant: dual enrollment status, college attendance intensity, and pre-college credit dosage (Table 8). Dual enrollment participants had a 2.07 increased likelihood of earning a bachelor’s degree compared to

non-dual enrollment participants. Attending college exclusively full-time was associated with a 2.28 increased likelihood of earning a bachelor's degree. Earning enough college credits in high school to enter college as a sophomore also increased the odds of earning a bachelor's degree. Unlike  $R^2$  in OLS regression, there is no widely agreed upon variance explained measure for logistic regression (Garson, 2011). Garson (2011) stated that pseudo-measures like Nagelkerke's  $R^2$  are not true goodness of fit tests and recommended classification rate as the preferable measure of effect size. The model correctly classified 71.6% of cases in bachelor's degree attainment. As shown in Table 9, prediction success had a sensitivity (events correctly predicted) of 42.2% and specificity (non-events correctly predicted) of 80.1%. The  $c$  statistic was .80. The  $c$  statistic and classification results indicated a moderate to medium effect size for the prediction model. The logistic model statistically confirmed hypothesis 1, and more importantly, it suggested a causal link between the dual enrollment predictors and bachelor's degree attainment.

Table 8

*Summary Binary Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting Likelihood of Bachelor's Degree Attainment*

Variable	$B$	$SE$	Wald	$p$	$\text{Exp}(B)$
Dual Enrollment Participation	0.73	0.01	5595.69	.001	2.07
College Attendance Intensity	0.82	0.01	7537.13	.001	2.28
Pre-College Credit Dosage	0.33	0.02	497.83	.001	1.39

Table 9

*Classification Table for Full Model: Dual Enrollment Participation, College Attendance Intensity, and Pre-College Credit Dosage*

Observed	Predicted			
	Bachelor's Degree		Percentage Correct	
	No	Yes		
Bachelor's Degree	No	176,770	43,954	80.1
	Yes	36,917	26,943	42.2
Overall Percentage				71.6

*Note.* The cut value is .270

**Research Question 2: How do dual enrollment participants compare to non-participants in terms of time to bachelor's degree attainment for students who begin their postsecondary studies at a community college?**

*Hypothesis 2:* Time to bachelor's degree will be significantly shorter for students who were dual enrollment participants compared to non-dual enrollment participants.

For research question 2, ordinary least squares (OLS) multiple regression was chosen. Leech et al. (2015) stated that OLS multiple regression is appropriate for models with continuous dependent variables. Preceding the analysis, assumptions for multiple regression were checked. As assessed by a Durbin-Watson statistic of 1.816, there was independence of observations (uncorrelated errors). No outliers were found as evidenced by no standardized residuals greater than three standard deviations, no leverage values greater than 2.0, and no values for Cook's distance above 1.0. A visual inspection of the plot of studentized residuals by the unstandardized predicted values showed homoscedasticity (linear relationship exists between the dependent variable and independent variables collectively). The assumption of normality was confirmed by



visual inspection of the standardized residual histogram and Normal P-P Plot. High tolerance values indicated no evidence of multicollinearity.

An OLS multiple regression was run to predict time to bachelor's degree based on the best linear combination of dual enrollment participation, college attendance intensity, pre-college credit dosage, and propensity score. The multiple regression model was statistically significant,  $F(4, 63855) = 1141.145, p < .001$ , indicating that when all four predictor variables were considered together as a whole, they significantly predicted time to bachelor's degree.

All four predictor variables were statistically significant: dual enrollment status, college attendance intensity, pre-college credit dosage, and propensity score. The means, standard deviations and intercorrelations are presented in Table 10. The beta weights presented in Table 11 indicated that propensity score and dual enrollment participation contributed the most to predicting time to a bachelor's degree. Participating in dual enrollment reduced the time to degree by 1.86 months when holding constant the other predictors. Counterintuitively, attending college exclusively as a full-time student increased the time to degree by .39 months when holding constant the other covariates. The model explained 6.7% (adjusted  $R^2$ ) of the variance in time to a bachelor's degree. According to Cohen (1988), this is a small effect. Hill, Bloom, Black and Lipsey (2007), however, argued that standardized guidelines for measuring effect sizes such as Cohen's  $d$  overlook context and potentially risk dismissing interventions that have substantive significance, especially in the area of student academic achievement. Hill et al. (2007) recommended determining effect size based on empirical benchmarks of comparison such as policy-relevant gaps, and effect size results from similar research. The model

statistically confirmed hypothesis 2. The effect size is modest and represents practical significance.

Table 10

*Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for Time to Bachelor's Degree (in Months) and Predictor Variables*

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4
Time to Degree	59.60	8.31	-			
Predictor Variable						
1. Dual Enrollment Participation	0.67	0.47	—	.04**	.21**	.00
2. College Attendance Intensity	0.47	0.50		—	.14**	.01
3. Pre-College Credit Dosage	0.12	0.33			—	.15**
4. Propensity Score	0.30	0.23				—

*Note.* \*\* $p < .01$ .

Table 11

*Multiple Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Time to a Bachelor's Degree (in Months)*

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE<sub>B</sub></i>	$\beta$	<i>p</i>
Dual Enrollment Participation	-1.86	0.07	-.11	.001
College Attendance Intensity	0.39	0.06	.02	.001
Pre-College Credit Dosage	-0.63	0.10	-.03	.001
Propensity Score	-8.41	0.14	-.24	.001

*Note.* *B* = unstandardized regression coefficient; *SE<sub>B</sub>* = standard error of the coefficient;  $\beta$  = standardized coefficient.

**Research Question 3: How do dual enrollment participants compare to non-participants in terms of loan debt incurred in obtaining a bachelor's degree, as measured by the total amount of Stafford, Perkins, and PLUS undergraduate loans, for students who begin their postsecondary studies at a community college?**

Hypothesis 3: The loans incurred in obtaining a bachelor's degree will be significantly less for students who were dual enrollment participants compared to non-dual enrollment participants.

Given the continuous dependent variable and its assumed linear relationship with the independent variables, OLS multiple regression was selected. The following assumptions for multiple regression were checked and met before beginning the analysis. Due to positive skewness and resulting heteroscedasticity, the dependent variable, student loans, was transformed (quadratic or  $\sqrt{Y}$ ) and used in the analysis. There was independence of observations (uncorrelated errors) as assessed by a Durbin-Watson statistic of 2.016. Review of case diagnostics, leverage values, and Cook's distance indicated no significant outliers. A visual inspection of the plot of studentized residual by the unstandardized predicted values showed homoscedasticity (linear relationship exists between the squared dependent variable and independent variables collectively). The assumption of normality was checked by visual inspection of the standardized residual histogram and Normal P-P Plot. There was no evidence of multicollinearity as assessed by tolerance values.

Multiple regression was conducted to predict student loans incurred from dual enrollment participation, college attendance intensity, pre-college credit dosage, and propensity score. The multiple regression model statistically significantly predicted

student loan amount incurred,  $F(4, 63855) = 727.501, p < .001$ , suggesting that the combination of predictor variables significantly predicted student loans incurred.

All four predictor variables were statistically significant: dual enrollment status, college attendance intensity, pre-college credit dosage, and propensity score. The means, standard deviations and intercorrelations are presented in Table 12. The beta weights presented in Table 13 indicated that college attendance intensity and pre-college credit dosage contributed the most to predicting student loan amounts. Not surprisingly, attending college exclusively full-time reduced the student loan amount when controlling for the other predictors. Having a large number of early college credits (enough to enter college as a sophomore) increased the student loan amount when controlling for the other predictors. Due to the squaring of the dependent variable (student loans), meaningful interpretation of the regression results required transforming the unstandardized beta coefficients. Table 14 depicts the transformation process, and resultant predicted student loan amount by way of example. The model explained 4.4% (adjusted  $R^2$ ) of the variance in student loans incurred. Similar to hypotheses 2, the regression model statistically confirmed hypothesis 3, but the low effect size indicated caution should be used when interpreting the practical significance of the relationship between the dual enrollment predictors and student loans incurred.

Table 12

*Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for Student Loans Incurred (in Dollars Squared) and Predictor Variables*

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4
Student Loans Incurred <sup>a</sup>	84.58	72.92	-.01	-.16**	.14**	.02**
Predictor Variable						
1. Dual Enrollment Participation	0.67	0.47	—	.04**	.21**	.00
2. College Attendance Intensity	0.47	0.50		—	-.14**	.01**
3. Pre-College Credit Dosage	0.12	0.33			—	-.15**
4. Propensity Score	0.30	0.23				—

*Note.* \*\* $p < .01$ .

<sup>a</sup> Mean of square root of student loans incurred.

Table 13

*Multiple Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Student Loan Amount Incurred (in Dollars Squared)*

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE<sub>B</sub></i>	$\beta$	<i>p</i>
Dual Enrollment Participation	-4.21	0.62	-.03	.001
College Attendance Intensity	-20.99	0.57	-.14	.001
Pre-College Credit Dosage	30.13	0.90	.14	.001
Propensity Score	11.64	1.23	.04	.001

*Note.* *B* = unstandardized regression coefficient; *SE<sub>B</sub>* = standard error of the coefficient;  $\beta$  = standardized coefficient.

Table 14

*Multiple Regression Equation Transformation Example for Predicted Student Loan Amount Incurred (in Dollars)*

	Student Loans in Dollars	Constant	DE	ACI	ECD	PS
Model with Dual	7996.29	= (90.14	+ -4.21 * (1)	+ -20.99 * (0)	+ 30.13 * (0)	+ 11.64 (.30))^2
Model without Dual	8766.95	= (90.14	+ -4.21 * (0)	+ -20.99 * (0)	+ 30.13 * (0)	+ 11.64 (.30))^2

*Note.* Model compares predicted loan amount between dual enrollment and non-dual enrollment participants when controlling for the other predictors. DE (1 = dual, 0 = non-dual enrollment), ACI (1 = exclusively full-time, 0 = mixed or part-time), ECD (1 = early college credits to enter as a sophomore, 0 = not enough credits to enter as sophomore), PS (propensity score).

**Conclusion**

The purpose of this study was to compare dual enrollment participants and non-participants who begin college at a public community college in the areas of (1) bachelor’s degree attainment, (2) time to a bachelor’s degree as measured by months, and (3) loans incurred in obtaining a bachelor’s degree as measured by total student loan amount taken. The data source was the Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study (BPS: 04/09). The analysis was conducted using the data subset of first-time, traditionally aged (24 years or less) college students beginning their postsecondary studies at a public community college with the intent of earning a bachelor’s degree. To reduce selection bias, and create equal treatment (dual enrolled) and control (non-dual enrolled) groups, the statistical method of propensity score matching was used.

Examining demographics, study participants were more likely to be female, White, first-generation, and have a high school GPA between 3.0 and 3.4. Frequencies

and independent-samples t-tests showed statistically significant differences between the groups with dual enrollment participants attaining bachelor's degrees at a higher rate, a reduced time to degree, and lower student loan amounts compared to non-dual enrollment students. Although statistically significant differences were found between dual enrollment and non-dual enrollment participants, the tests do not infer a causal relationship.

The study addressed three research questions using binary logistic regression (question 1) and multiple regression (questions 2 and 3) analyses.

1. How do dual enrollment participants compare to non-participants in terms of bachelor's degree attainment for students who begin their postsecondary studies at a community college?

2. How do dual enrollment participants compare to non-participants in terms of time to bachelor's degree attainment for students who begin their postsecondary studies at a community college?

3. How do dual enrollment participants compare to non-participants in terms of loan debt incurred in obtaining a bachelor's degree, as measured by the total amount of Stafford, Perkins, and PLUS undergraduate loans, for students who begin their postsecondary studies at a community college?

The regression models for each of the three research questions were statistically significant. Moreover, in each model all the independent predictors were significant,  $p < .001$ . Question 1 examined the likelihood of earning a bachelor's degree, and the classification table correctly classified 71.6% of cases with a sensitivity (events correctly predicted) of 42.2% and specificity (non-events correctly predicted) of 80.1%. Questions

2 and 3 were modest to low predictor models with adjusted  $R^2$ s of 6.7% and 4.4% respectively.



## CHAPTER 5

### DISCUSSION

This chapter abridges the study's various components, findings, and recommendations. Discussed first is the educational context that encouraged this research. The next section restates the research purpose and questions. Following is a summary of the methodological approach, study limitations, and discussion of the study's major findings. The ensuing section presents implications for practice for policymakers, secondary and postsecondary educators, and students and their families grounded on the study's findings. Addressed next are recommendations for future research. The chapter ends with the researcher's concluding remarks.

#### **Context**

Dual enrollment programs have grown significantly in recent years. Borden et al. (2013) reported a 75% increase in dual enrollment between the 2002-2003 academic year and the 2010-2011 academic year with enrollment now exceeding two million students. Dual enrollment programs take many different forms (Karp & Hughes, 2008). Some programs occur on college campuses while others operate at the high school. Dual enrollment faculty may be full-time college professors or high school teachers credentialed as adjuncts. What remains common in all dual enrollment programs is that students receive credit from both the high school and college.

Basic dual enrollment uses intergovernmental agreements between high schools and colleges to set up and guide programs. In 1976, California was the first to create policy establishing dual enrollment programs (Mokher & McLendon, 2009). Dual enrollment expanded considerably in the 1990s, and today 47 states have enacted policies

directing some aspect of these programs (Borden et al., 2013; Karp et al., 2008). Dual enrollment is differentiated from AP and IB programs in that the former earn college-level credit while the latter are college-type courses. Once restricted to high achieving students, dual enrollment programs are now enrolling middle-achieving students to increase academic rigor and instill postsecondary aspirations in students who may not have seen themselves as college bound (Karp et al., 2008). Another impetus behind dual enrollment growth is the belief that these programs improve college readiness.

Secondary student preparedness is a key indicator of postsecondary completion. ACT (2014) reported that almost three quarters of college-bound students do not pass all four college-readiness benchmarks (English, mathematics, reading, and science). As many as two thirds of students entering community colleges today require some level of remediation (Bailey et al., 2015; Cohen et al., 2014). Dual enrollment is one practice that educators and state policymakers can implement to improve college readiness by enhancing curriculum and clarifying the alignment of secondary and postsecondary standards (Venezia, 2006). Reducing the time and cost of obtaining a college degree is another benefit attributed to dual enrollment (Borden et al., 2013; Karp et al., 2007).

There is little debate that college affordability is a concern for students and their families (Abel, 2014; Complete College America, 2014). With state disinvestment in higher education, public two-year and four-year institutions have responded by increasing tuition and fees over the last 30 years by 150% and 225% respectively (College Board, 2014). With rising college prices and stagnant wages, many Americans are wondering if college is worth the cost. Related to college costs is the time it takes a student to obtain a degree. Beyond tuition and fees, the expense of transportation, housing, and foregone

wages are related to the time it takes a student to complete a degree (Complete College America, 2014). Although bachelor's degrees are referred to as four-year degrees, the four-year graduation rates for bachelor's degree-granting institutions range from 19% to 36% (Complete College America, 2014).

Proponents of dual enrollment frequently cite shortened time to degree and reduced college costs as primary benefits of such programs. However, the case for such time and cost saving statements has not been convincingly established (Borden et al., 2013). There has been very limited empirical research on the effect of dual enrollment on the cost of a bachelor's degree. Prior research on the relationship between dual enrollment and time to degree has almost exclusively focused on single institutions or individual state systems (Karp et al., 2007; Westcott, 2009). Swanson (2008) is the only researcher to use a national dataset to examine the relationship between dual enrollment and time to degree. Swanson's research used the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS: 88). The current study utilized national data from the Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study (BPS: 04/09) to evaluate the effect of dual enrollment on bachelor's degree attainment, time to degree, and cost of a degree for dual enrollment participants and non-participants beginning at a public community college.

Additionally, one of the chief criticisms in the dual enrollment literature is the failure of researchers to account for factors outside the dual enrollment programs like student motivation, prior academic work, economic status, and student characteristics (Bailey & Karp, 2003; Karp et al., 2008). The current study controlled for preexisting academic, socioeconomic, and demographic student characteristics.

Given the demand for increased educational attainment, rising college costs, and

the ubiquity of dual enrollment programs a study of the effects of dual enrollment with a national scope is merited. The study's findings provide insights to policymakers and practitioners who operate or are considering dual enrollment activities to improve students' college readiness. Furthermore, this study examined the outcomes through the theoretical lens of anticipatory socialization and validation theory. Interpreting the findings through these theories provides insights into how and why dual enrollment programs influence students and allows greater generalizability of the results.

### **Purpose Statement and Research Questions**

The purpose of this study was to compare dual enrollment participants and non-participants who begin college at a public community college in the areas of (1) bachelor's degree attainment, (2) time to a bachelor's degree as measured by months, and (3) loans incurred in obtaining a bachelor's degree as measured by total student loan amount taken.

The study addressed the following research questions:

1. How do dual enrollment participants compare to non-participants in terms of bachelor's degree attainment for students who begin their postsecondary studies at a community college?

2. How do dual enrollment participants compare to non-participants in terms of time to bachelor's degree attainment for students who begin their postsecondary studies at a community college?

3. How do dual enrollment participants compare to non-participants in terms of loan debt incurred in obtaining a bachelor's degree, as measured by the total amount of Stafford, Perkins, and PLUS undergraduate loans, for students who begin their

postsecondary studies at a community college?

### **Review of Methodology**

This causal comparative study used *ex post facto* data from the Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study (BPS: 04/09) to address the research questions. The BPS: 04/09 is a nationally representative cohort of students who first enrolled in postsecondary education in 2003-2004 and who were followed for six years. This study was limited to traditionally aged (24 years or less) students who began their postsecondary studies at a public community college with the intent to complete a bachelor's degree. To adjust for selection bias and improve causal inference, the statistical method of propensity score matching (PSM) was utilized. Propensity score matching uses observable covariates to match the treatment (dual enrollment participant) and control (non-dual enrollment participant) groups and make them comparable (Rosenbaum & Rubin, 1983).

Much of the research on dual enrollment and its relationship to postsecondary academic success has focused on short-term outcomes such as first-year persistence, first-year GPA, and credit accumulation (Allen & Dadgar, 2012; Karp et al., 2007). The goal for participants in the current study, however, is ultimately bachelor's degree attainment. Given the paucity of research on dual enrollment and bachelor's degree attainment (An, 2013), the dependent variable for research question 1 is bachelor's degree attainment. Similarly, both popular and scholarly literature on dual enrollment frequently cited reduced time to and cost of a degree as benefits or reasons for supporting dual enrollment programs (Cowan & Goldhaber, 2015; Jones, 2014; Karp et al., 2007). Nevertheless, there is an absence of empirical research to support these claims (Borden et al., 2013).

Thus, the dependent variable for research question 2 is time to a degree measured in months. For research question 3, the dependent variable is loan amount incurred in obtaining a degree as measured by Stafford, Perkins, and PLUS undergraduate loan amounts acquired.

The dichotomous independent or treatment variable for this causal observation study was participation status in dual enrollment (student earned college credit in dual enrollment program while in high school or not).

The pre-treatment variables included race, gender, socioeconomic status, first-generation status, high school GPA, AP participation, highest high school mathematics course completed, and ACT/SAT college readiness scores. Dual enrollment participant status was regressed on the pre-treatment covariates to create the propensity scores.

Post-treatment covariates included pre-college credit dosage, college attendance intensity, and propensity score.

A combination of binary logistic and multiple linear regression was used to answer the research questions. All analyses used weighted data due to the BPS's complex study design.

### **Limitations**

The BPS: 04/09 is the most current national data source for researchers interested in studying dual enrollment; nonetheless, there remain limitations. The data lacks specificity in its measurement of dual enrollment. Dual enrollment programs take many different forms. Some programs occur on college campuses while others operate at the high school. Others incorporate distance delivery through interactive television. Some focus on vocational coursework and others on academic. Not being able to distinguish

between the different types of dual enrollment potentially affects the findings for this study's outcomes.

The exclusion of student motivation variables like teacher or counselor's college aspirations for students, parent/child academic discussions, and peers' influence on postsecondary plans are limitations. The failure to collect students' high school transcripts is another shortcoming. The inclusion of these excluded variables in future national data collection efforts would facilitate and enhance future research.

Another limitation of using BPS: 04/09 is that some of the data are self-reported through student interviews, and thus respondent bias is a potential concern. Lastly, there may be unobserved or unknown covariates that could influence the study outcomes.

### **Major Findings and Relationship to the Literature**

#### **Research Question 1: How do dual enrollment participants compare to non-participants in terms of bachelor's degree attainment for students who begin their postsecondary studies at a community college?**

The current study found dual enrollment participants were 2.07 times more likely to earn a bachelor's degree than the control group of non-dual enrollment participants. Likewise, attending college exclusively full-time was associated with an increased likelihood (2.28) of earning a bachelor's degree. While not as strong a predictor as dual enrollment participation and college attendance intensity, high pre-college credit dosage (enough hours to enter college as a sophomore) increased the odds of degree attainment by 1.39. The logistic regression model and all three individual predictors were statistically significant,  $p < .001$ . The effect size was moderate with the model correctly classifying 71.6% of cases in bachelor's degree attainment. Prediction success had a

sensitivity of 42.4% and specificity of 80.1%, which suggested that dual enrollment participation and college attendance intensity add to our understanding of the factors that explain bachelor's degree attainment, but also indicated that other components influence degree completion. The findings are consistent with anticipatory socialization and validation theories.

Anticipatory socialization developed by Merton (1968) and applied by Karp (2006) and Swanson (2008), argued dual enrollment programs provide participants with information and experiences essential for college success while students are still in high school. These researchers assert dual enrollment improves students' college readiness. The current study findings are aligned with previous research crediting dual enrollment for facilitating collaboration between secondary and postsecondary institutions (Borden et al., 2013; Kisker, 2006), and improving college persistence and completion rates (Allen & Dadgar, 2012; An, 2015; Hoffman et al., 2009; Karp et al., 2008; Swanson, 2008). Regarding the modest positive benefits attributed to the intensity of dual enrollment participation, the current study findings are similar to outcomes found by Karp et al. (2007) for Florida dual enrollment students. The mix of dual enrollment course offerings available to students could be one explanation of why attaining high pre-college credit dosage had only a modest effect on degree attainment. High pre-college credits are most effective when they align with the student's college major. Hence, some dual credit classes such as vocational coursework may not apply to four-year college degree requirements.

Similarly, the current study's population of students beginning their studies at a public community college, are disproportionately at-risk (first-generation and low SES)



compared to their four-year college peers. Rendon's validation theory suggested early college validation, such as that provided by dual enrollment programs, enhances students' social integration and validates students as college-capable. Previous research has suggested middle achieving students' participation in dual enrollment programs improves students' college aspirations (Borden et al., 2013; Karp et al., 2008; Kim, 2012).

The results of this study align with the reported outcomes from other pertinent studies that focused on bachelor's degree attainment. Westcott (2009) whose research population of community college students was most similar to this study found that dual enrolled students earned a larger number of bachelor's and advanced degrees than non-dual enrollment students. Swanson (2008) found positive and statistically significant outcomes for bachelor's degree attainment for dual enrolled students who do not delay entry to college and who stop out no more than one semester in their first two years of college. An (2013) examined low-SES students and found that dual enrollment had a positive impact on increasing college degree attainment rates.

While a majority of dual enrolled students in the current study did not complete a bachelor's degree, this should not be construed as a refutation of anticipatory socialization and validation theories. Time to bachelor's degree completion was limited to a six-year follow-up. Most community college students take more than six years to complete any degree (Cohen et al., 2014; Complete College America, 2014). Also, the current study does not control for the fact that dual enrollment programs take many forms (some programs occur on college campuses while others operate at the high school, some use full-time faculty, and others use high school teachers credentialed as adjunct instructors). Given that both groups were statistically matched on eight observable pre-

treatment covariates and the significant findings that dual enrollment participants were two times more likely to earn a bachelor's degree than non-participants aligns with the conceptual framework of anticipatory socialization and validation theories.

**Research Question 2: How do dual enrollment participants compare to non-participants in terms of time to bachelor's degree attainment for students who begin their postsecondary studies at a community college?**

Proponents cite shorter time to degree as one of the primary benefits of dual enrollment programs. The regression model for research question 2 was statistically significant,  $p < .001$ . This study found that dual enrollment participation reduced the time to degree by almost two months (-1.86) when controlling for the other predictors. The findings also show lower time to degree for students at the higher end of the propensity scale (-8.41) and for those with enough credits to enter college as a sophomore (-.63). Counterintuitively, attending college exclusively as a full-time student increased the time to degree by .39 months. Within the scope of education research and the relevance of producing more baccalaureate recipients, the explained variance of 6.7% represents a practical but modest effect size. With the exception of the statistically significant full-time student negative finding, the results are consistent with anticipatory socialization and validation theories. Anticipatory socialization gives students experiences in navigating college and a jump-start on college credit accumulation. Similarly, if dual enrollment validates students as college proficient, one would expect these students to be better socially integrated, possibly leading to a shorter time to a bachelor's degree.

Reduced college and living expenses and the opportunity to enter the workforce

sooner are some of the benefits of completing a bachelor's degree in a shorter time. Earlier research on the relationship between dual enrollment and time to a bachelor's degree is both sparse and mixed. Swanson (2008) using a national sample found no statistical difference in time to bachelor's degree between dual enrollment and non-dual enrollment participants. Likewise, Menzel (2006) examined dual enrollment students' perception of time saved in earning a bachelor's degree and found that students did not perceive a shorter time to degree. A plausible explanation for why Menzel and Swanson found no difference may be that dual students are well socialized and integrated to succeed in college but make decisions to change majors or experience institutional factors such as canceled courses that impact time to degree. Examining students beginning at Virginia community colleges, Westcott (2009) found that dual enrollment participants had statistically shorter time to bachelor's degree than non-participants did. The modest effect size for the current study and the findings from previous research suggest that dual enrollment participation on its own may not be sufficient for understanding the mechanisms driving shorter time to degree attainment.

**Research Question 3: How do dual enrollment participants compare to non-participants in terms of loan debt incurred in obtaining a bachelor's degree, as measured by the total amount of Stafford, Perkins, and PLUS undergraduate loans, for students who begin their postsecondary studies at a community college?**

This final research question utilized student loan debt as a proxy for measuring the cost of a bachelor's degree. Again, the regression model was statistically significant,  $p < .001$ . Dual enrollment participation and attending college exclusively full-time were found to reduce student loan debt. Having high early college credits (enough to enter

college as a sophomore), however, increased the student loan amount when controlling for the other predictors. This finding was not consistent with the literature or the two theories offered. The model explained 4.4% (adjusted  $R^2$ ) of the variance in student loans incurred. Hence, despite statistical significance, the low effect size makes for a tenuous causal link between the dual enrollment predictors and the study outcome of the cost of a degree as measured by student loans.

While the literature is rich with anecdotal evidence suggesting that dual enrollment programs reduce the cost of a college degree, this is the first study to test this hypothesis. These findings present the first empirical evidence that dual enrollment may reduce the cost of earning a bachelor's degree, even though the explained variance was low. There are many possible reasons why dual enrollment did not have a strong explanatory effect on the cost of a degree as measured by student loan debt. Although student loans incurred was the best proxy for college costs in this study, the findings may have been different if actual college costs were used. Borden et al. (2013) suggested that reducing the cost of a degree is less a function of tuition costs and more closely tied to time to a degree where increased time is influenced by students borrowing to cover living expenses. Previous research suggested that dual enrollment programs are often offered at a reduced or no cost to high school students (Borden et al., 2013; Menzel, 2006; Swanson, 2008). Anticipatory socialization theory would suggest that familiarizing students with college costs and financial aid literacy, rather than just academic matters, might have the effect of reducing student loan debt.

**Implications for Practice**

A highly educated populace is not just fundamental, but critical to economic growth (Goldin & Katz, 2008; Stanley, 2003). Recognition of the connection between an educated workforce and America's economic and social wellbeing have received prominent and needed attention in the last decade. Findings from this study can provide direction to policymakers, practitioners at both the secondary and postsecondary level, and students and their families.

**Implications and Recommendations for Policymakers.** Researchers argue that state policies have a significant impact on educators as to what is essential to teach and what students need to learn (Venezia, 2006). Policymakers at both the state and national levels have acknowledged the need to improve the alignment between secondary and postsecondary standards as a means to increase the number of college graduates (Hoffman, Vargas, Venezia & Miller, 2007). An implication from this study for policymakers is that dual enrollment participants graduate from college at significantly higher rates and in less time than non-dual enrollment participants. These findings are consistent with previous dual enrollment studies on bachelor's degree attainment; policymakers should consider dual enrollment programs as one strategy to align secondary standards with postsecondary expectations.

Furthermore, it is recommended that states, not individual schools or districts, fund dual enrollment programs to ensure equitable access for all qualified students. Although dual enrollment benefits all participants, research has shown that low-SES students receive an even greater boost regarding degree attainment (An, 2014). Society and taxpayers benefit from the outcomes of dual enrollment programs. Dual enrollment

has been shown increase the number of students who choose to graduate from high school and persist on to college (Allen & Dadgar, 2012; An, 2015). Researchers also suggest that dual enrollment programs increase rigor for participants and reduce the need for costly remediation at the postsecondary level (Adelman, 2006). While the social and economic returns on investment created by dual enrollment programs are not immediate, long-term the more college credits students earn results in a reduced demand for government social services, reduced health care costs, lower incarceration rates, and higher tax contributions (Economic Modeling Specialists International, 2015). Dual enrollment programs also represent a cost savings opportunity for states as most programs are affiliated with community colleges (Borden et al., 2013) that receive lower state funding (FTE reimbursement) than their four-year counterparts for the same coursework. States should also consider legislating guaranteed transfer articulation of dual coursework between state public institutions. Guaranteed articulation saves states and students money by reducing repeated coursework and supporting the goal of shorter time to degree. Presently 18 states mandate transfer articulation of dual enrollment coursework (Borden et al., 2013).

Another implication from this study is the need for improved data collection and tracking of students across the K-20 education spectrum. Implementation of comprehensive statewide data systems gives states and education researchers the ability to accurately evaluate the effectiveness of school programs and interventions.

**Implications and Recommendations for Secondary and Postsecondary Institutions.** Too often high school students are graduating with one set of criteria, only to enter college and encounter a different set of standards required to succeed (Conley,

2003; Venezia, 2006). Dual enrollment is one way to address this misalignment. Dual enrollment programs by their nature require secondary and postsecondary institutions to collaborate. Such collaboration opens a dialog to identify gaps and develop solutions for improving student preparedness for college and the workforce. For prepared students, dual enrollment offers expanded and rigorous curriculum. For underprepared students, these partnerships can encourage high school and college faculty collaboration in developing a curriculum that prepares students to be college-ready upon graduation. In Denver, for example, high school juniors who fail a college-readiness exam can take remedial courses in their senior year using community college curriculum so they will be ready for college coursework after they graduate (Zalaznick, 2013).

Secondary and postsecondary institutions should collaborate to build intentional dual enrollment programs that align dual credit offerings with the student's college intent. The offering of random college courses may contribute to socializing high school students and preparing them for college, but will do little to reduce the time and cost of earning a bachelor's degree.

The quality of dual enrollment offerings remains a lingering concern. It is recommended that institutions involved in dual enrollment agreements follow the lead of Kansas and Arizona that require high schools and college faculty to establish advisory councils, establish evaluative processes, and provide professional development opportunities for adjunct instructors. Furthermore, to strengthen program effectiveness, dual enrollment programs should consider accreditation through the National Association of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP). NACEP is the sole accrediting body for dual enrollment programs and has established guidelines and best practices that assure

that programs adhere to high-quality standards.

**Implications and Recommendations for Students and their Families.** A growing body of research (Allen & Dadgar, 2012; An, 2015; Hoffman et al., 2009; Karp et al., 2008; Swanson, 2008), including this study, find that students and their families benefit from participation in dual enrollment programs. Adelman (2006) proffered that academic rigor in high school is one of the best predictors of bachelor's degree attainment and that dual enrollment programs are an effective way to provide such rigor. Benefits resulting from dual enrollment participation include increased high school graduation rates, increased postsecondary aspirations, reduced need for remediation, improved postsecondary persistence, and increased college completion.

Traditionally, dual enrollment programs have been limited to high-achieving students. Some states, such as Florida require students taking dual enrollment to have a cumulative GPA of 3.00 or higher (Karp et al., 2007). New evidence is emerging, however, indicating that middle-achieving students and traditionally at-risk students can benefit from dual enrollment programs (An, 2013; Karp et al., 2008). Dual enrollment has shown promise to increase college aspirations in students who may not have seen themselves as college bound and represents an opportunity to narrow the achievement gap. Non-dominant groups continue to lag in educational attainment and socioeconomic status compared to their White peers, and they are the fastest growing populations in the United States. Increased educational attainment of non-dominant group members is essential to addressing replacement needs for the nation's aging workforce. For society to fully benefit from the impact of dual enrollment programs, educators and policymakers must ensure that at-risk, low-income, and middle-achieving high school students have



opportunities to participate in these programs. Open access to dual enrollment programs is imperative. It is recommended that program access not solely rest on high school grades, but consider other measures like teacher recommendations, college placement tests, or SAT/ACT scores. Dual enrollment programs should remain as free as possible for students and their families with scholarships for low-income students to guarantee equitable access.

### **Recommendations for Future Research**

This study was able to empirically and rigorously address some of the chief criticisms cited in previous research on dual enrollment. As detailed throughout the study, the findings contribute to narrowing the gaps in the literature about the relationship between dual enrollment and postsecondary outcomes. Nevertheless, many gaps and areas for improvement remain. Following are recommendations and direction for future research that may enhance our understanding of dual enrollment programs.

Dual enrollment programs take many different forms. Few studies have included the location of dual enrollment offerings. This exclusion has resulted in a situation where there is little evidence to demonstrate if one type of program is superior to others. Hence, the need for further research examining dual enrollment delivery (on college campus, interactive television between college and high school, online, or on the high school campus) is warranted. This focus could clarify if the location is one of the underlying mechanisms explaining how dual enrollment programs benefit students.

In addition to course delivery location, the research on dual enrollment programs would be furthered by including variables that are not typically available. These important variables include measures of student motivation, faculty and counselor

aspirations for students, dual enrollment course type (academic vs. vocational), and prior academic history (high school and middle school transcripts).

A further investigation comparing dual enrollment outcomes to AP outcomes for students is warranted. Included in this research should be a focus on instructor credentials to determine if the higher credential requirement for dual enrollment instructors has an impact on student outcomes at the postsecondary level.

A national K-20 data warehouse is the ideal system to collect common and comprehensive information on America's educational institutions and programs. However, the improbability of a national data system highlights the importance of expanding the list of explanatory variables in surveys like the BPS: 04/09. Creating a multi-state database from existing K-20 data systems is another option for future research.

The cost of and time to a college degree continues to be of high importance to students and their families (Complete College America, 2014). Following students for four or even six years is not sufficient. Following students for longer periods may provide researchers with clues such as degree intent or major changes that explain why the majority of students fail to complete a bachelor's degree in the prescribed four years. Regarding college costs, data instruments need to include robust elements like tuition, fees, room and board, books and supplies, scholarships, parental contributions, financial aid (grants and loans), institution type (public vs. private), and student major. While difficult to capture, this financial information is fundamental to understanding students' higher education costs.

In addition, future research on the cost of and time to degree should examine

student's dual enrollment coursework and its alignment to participant's college major. Studying the alignment of dual enrollment course offerings with students' postsecondary intent is vital to understanding related cost and time concerns. If students are accumulating high pre-college credits but the credits do not contribute to the student's degree plan, then high pre-college intensity will not have the desired effect of reducing time and cost of a bachelor's degree.

Results of this study suggested that dual enrollment provided benefits to students beginning at a public community college with the intent to earn a bachelor's degree. Future studies could be replicated for students with different degree goals (associates degree or certificate). Similarly, future research could examine degree attainment for dual enrolled students beginning their college studies at a four-year institution. While the literature has called for a more rigorous quantitative evaluation of dual enrollment programs, a mixed method approach incorporating qualitative investigation would broaden and deepen the education community's understanding of such programs.

### **Conclusion**

Economic changes driven by technological innovations and globalization necessitate that the skill sets for all level of jobs will increase (AACC, 2012; Goldin & Katz, 2008; Kirsch et al., 2007). At a time when the U.S. needs increased postsecondary educational attainment, the country struggles with an aging workforce and high school graduates who are underprepared for the workforce or college (Crook, 2008; Sasser, 2010). Proponents of the rapidly growing dual enrollment movement claim that these programs are effective in improving college readiness and increasing postsecondary degree production. Much of the rhetoric surrounding dual enrollment benefits is

anecdotal or research based on single institutions or individual state systems. The goal of this study was to use a national dataset to examine the effects of dual enrollment participation on bachelor's degree attainment and time and cost of a degree. Since most dual enrollment programs are affiliated with community colleges and almost half of all undergraduates begin at two-year institutions, this research looked at students beginning their studies at a public community college with the intent to earn a bachelor's degree.

Although the results regarding shorter time to degree and lower costs were modest, the study suggests compelling evidence that dual enrollment significantly increases the likelihood of bachelor's degree attainment for participants. While reducing the time to and cost of a college degree is important, the ultimate goal is that students persist to degree completion. The results of this study support the continuation and expansion of dual enrollment programs as a strategy for increasing bachelor's degree recipients.

### References

- ACT. (2010). *The condition of college and career readiness: 2010*. Retrieved from <http://www.act.org/research/policymakers/cccr10/about.html>
- Abel, J. R. (2014). Do the benefits of college still outweigh the cost? *Current Issues in Economics and Finance*, 20(3), 1-11. Retrieved from [http://www.newyorkfed.org/research/current\\_issues/](http://www.newyorkfed.org/research/current_issues/)
- Adelman, C. (1999). *Answers in the tool box: Academic intensity, attendance patterns, and bachelor's degree attainment* [Monograph]. Retrieved from U.S. Department of Education website: <http://www2.ed.gov>
- Adelman, C. (2005). *Moving into town and moving on: The community college in the lives of traditional age students*. Retrieved from U.S. Department of Education: <https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/research/pubs/comcollege/movingintotown.pdf>
- Adelman, C. (2006). *The toolbox revisited: Paths to degree completion from high school through college*. Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/research/pubs/toolboxrevisit/idex.html>
- Adelman, C. (2009). *The spaces between numbers: Getting international data on higher education straight*. Retrieved from Institute for Higher Education Policy website: <http://www.ihep.org>
- Allen, D., & Dadgar, M. (2012, Summer). Does dual enrollment increase students' success in college? Evidence from a quasi-experimental analysis of dual enrollment in New York City. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 158, 11-19. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/he.20010>

Altschuler, G. C., & Blumin, S. M. (2009). *The GI Bill: A new deal for veterans*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

American Association of Community Colleges. (2000). Community colleges past to present. Retrieved from

<http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/history/Pages/pasttopresent.aspx>

American Association of Community Colleges. (2012). *Reclaiming the American dream community colleges and the nation's future*. Retrieved from

<http://www.aacc.nche.edu/21stCenturyReport>

American Association of Community Colleges. (2015). *2015 fact sheet*. Retrieved from

<http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Documents/FactSheet2015.pdf>

American College Testing. (2014). *The condition of college and career readiness 2014*.

Retrieved from <http://www.act.org/research/policymakers/cccr14/pdf/CCCR14-NationalReadinessRpt.pdf>

American Council on Education. (2012, July 30). *Educational attainment of population ages 25-35 in OECD countries in 2009 (percent of population)* [Fact Sheet].

Retrieved from American Council on Education website: <http://www.acenet.edu>

An, B. P. (2013, March). The impact of dual enrollment on college degree attainment: Do low-SES students benefit. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 35(1), 57-75. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0162373712461933>

An, B. P. (2015, January/February). The role of academic motivation and engagement on the relationship between dual enrollment and academic performance. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 86(1), 98-126. Retrieved from

<http://www.ashe.ws/?page=186>

- Austin, P. C. (2009, September). Balance diagnostics for comparing the distribution of baseline covariates between treatment groups in propensity-score matched samples. *Statistics in Medicine*, 28, 3083-3107.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/sim.3697>
- Bailey, T., & Karp, M. M. (2003). *Promoting college access and success: A review of credit-based transition programs*. Retrieved from Community College Research Center website: <http://www.ccrcc.tc.columbia.edu/Publication.asp?uid=9>
- Bailey, T. R., Jaggars, S. S., & Jenkins, D. (2015). *Redesigning America's community colleges*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Belfield, C. (2014, September). Can community colleges afford to improve completion measuring the cost and efficiency consequences of reform? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 36(3), 327-345.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0162373713517293>
- Borden, V. M., Taylor, J. L., Park, E., & Seiler, D. J. (2013). *Dual credit in U.S. higher education: A study of state policy and quality assurance practices*. Retrieved from Higher Learning Commission website: <http://www.ncahlc.org/>
- Brandon, K. (2009, July 14). Investing in education: The American Graduation Initiative [Blog post]. Retrieved from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/Investing-in-Education-The-American-Graduation-Initiative/>
- Brooks, D. (2008, July 29). The biggest issue. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com>

- Carnevale, A. P., Smith, N., & Strohl, J. (2013). *Recovery: Job growth and educational requirements through 2020*. Retrieved from Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce website: [https://cew.georgetown.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/Recovery2020.FR\\_.Web\\_.pdf](https://cew.georgetown.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/Recovery2020.FR_.Web_.pdf)
- Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (2008). *The American community college* (5th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cohen, A. M., Brawer, F. B., & Kisker, C. B. (2014). *The American community college* (6th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- College Board. (2014). *The SAT college and career readiness benchmark*. Retrieved from <https://www.collegeboard.org/program-results/2014/sat>
- College Board. (2014). *Trends in college pricing*. Retrieved from <https://secure-media.collegeboard.org/digitalServices/misc/trends/2014-trends-college-pricing-report-final.pdf>
- Complete College America. (2014). *Four-year myth: Make college more affordable. Restore the promise of graduating on time*. Retrieved from <http://completecollege.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/4-Year-Myth.pdf>
- Conley, D. T. (2003). Connecting the dots: Linking high schools and postsecondary education to increase student success. *Peer Review*, 5(2), 9-12.
- Cook, B. J. (2012, November 8). *Incomplete completers: Analysis of a comprehensive graduation rate* [Policy Analysis]. Retrieved from American Council on Education website: <http://www.acenet.edu>



- Cowan, J., & Goldhaber, D. (2015, Spring). How much of a “running start” do dual enrollment programs provide students? *The Review of Higher Education*, 38(3), 425-460. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2015.0018>
- Crook, C. (2008, July 7). America’s human capital is tested. *Financial Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.ft.com>
- De Vise, D. (2011, September 13). U.S. falls in global ranking of young adults who finish college. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com>
- Douglas-Gabriel, D. (2014, December 2). Why so many students are spending six years getting a college degree. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <https://www.washingtonpost.com/>
- Eells, W. C. (1931). *The junior college*. [Hathi Trust Digital Library]. Retrieved from <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015002978503;view=1up;seq=1>
- Economic Modeling Specialists International. (2015, February). *Demonstrating the value of Arizona community colleges* [Economic Analysis]. Retrieved from Arizona’s Community Colleges website:  
[http://www.arizonacommunitycolleges.org/EIS/ACC\\_MainReport\\_1314\\_Final.pdf](http://www.arizonacommunitycolleges.org/EIS/ACC_MainReport_1314_Final.pdf)
- Ganzert, B. Y. (2010). *The effects of dual enrollment credit and Huskins program credit on college readiness* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://www.proquest.com/products-services/pqdtglobal.html>
- Garson, D. G. (2011). *Logistic regression*. Retrieved from <http://faculty.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/PA765/logistic.html>

- Gerald, D., & Haycock, K. (2006). *Engines of inequality: Diminishing equity in the nation's premier public universities*. Retrieved from Education Trust:  
<http://edtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/EnginesofInequality.pdf>
- Giani, M., Alexander, C., & Reyes, P. (2014, Summer). Exploring variation in the impact of dual-credit coursework on postsecondary outcomes: A quasi-experimental analysis of Texas students. *The High School Journal*, 97(4), 200-218.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/hsj.2014.0007>
- Glancy, E., Fulton, M., Anderson, L., Dounay Zinth, J., Milliard, M., & Delander, B. (2014). *Blueprint for college readiness*. Retrieved from Education Commission of the States: <http://www.ecs.org/docs/ECSblueprint.pdf>
- Goldin, C., & Katz, L. F. (2008). *The race between education and technology*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- HigherEdSolutions. (2008, March 13). *Solutions through higher education* [Video file]. Retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NSAxEn2I--o>
- Hill, C. J., Bloom, H. S., Black, A. R., & Lipsey, M. W. (2007). *Empirical benchmarks for interpreting effect sizes in research*. Retrieved from MDRC Building Knowledge to Improve Social Policy:  
[http://mdrc.org/sites/default/files/full\\_84.pdf](http://mdrc.org/sites/default/files/full_84.pdf)
- Hoffman, N., Vargas, J., & Santos, J. (2009, Spring). New directions for dual enrollment: Creating stronger pathways from high school through college. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 145(Spring), 43-58.

- Hoffman, N., Vargas, J., Venezia, A., & Miller, M. S. (2007). *Minding the gap: Why integrating high school with college makes sense and how to do it*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Jones, S. J. (2013, November). Student participation in dual enrollment and college success. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 38(1), 24-37. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2010.532449>
- Jordan, W. J., Cavalluzzo, L., & Corallo, C. (2006, September 22). Community college and high school reform: Lessons from five case studies. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 30, 729-749.
- Karp, M. (2006). *It's the thought that counts: Cognition and the development of role-related identities*. Paper presented at the American Sociological Association, San Antonio, TX. Retrieved from Ebsco Discovery Service
- Karp, M. M. (2012, Summer). "I don't know, I've never been to college!" Dual enrollment as a college readiness strategy. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 158, 21-28. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/he>
- Karp, M. M. (2015, Spring). Dual enrollment, structural reform, and the completion agenda. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 169, 103-111. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/cc>
- Karp, M. M., Calcagno, J. C., Hughes, K. L., Jeong, D. W., & Bailey, T. (2008, February). *Dual enrollment students in Florida and New York City: Postsecondary outcomes* [Research Brief Number 37]. Retrieved from Community College Research Center website: <http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/>

- Karp, M. M., Calcagno, J. C., Hughes, K. L., Jeong, D. W., & Bailey, T. R. (2007). *The postsecondary achievement of participants in dual enrollment: An analysis of student outcomes in two states*. Retrieved from Community College Research Center website: <http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/publications/dual-enrollment-student-outcomes.html>
- Kim, J. (2012, Summer). Data-informed practices in an urban dual enrollment program. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 158, 49-57. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/he>
- Kirsch, I., Braun, H., Yamamoto, K., & Sum, A. (2007). *America's perfect storm: Three forces changing our nation's future* [Policy Information Report]. Retrieved from Educational Testing Service website: <http://www.ets.org>
- Kirst, M. W., & Bracco, K. R. (2004). Bridging the great divide: How the K-12 and postsecondary split hurts students, and what can be done about it. Retrieved from [http://media.johnwiley.com.au/product\\_data/excerpt/2X/07879706/078797062X-2.pdf](http://media.johnwiley.com.au/product_data/excerpt/2X/07879706/078797062X-2.pdf) (Reprinted from *high school to college: Improving opportunities for success in postsecondary education*, by M. W. Kirst, & K. R. Bracco, 2004, San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass)
- Kisker, C. B. (2006, July). Integrating high school and community college: Previous efforts and current possibilities. *Community College Review*, 34, 68-86.
- Koos, L. V. (1946). *Integrating high school and college: The six-four-four plan at work*. [Open Library]. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/stream/integratinghighs00koos#page/n3/mode/2up>
- Leech, N. L., Barrett, K. C., & Morgan, G. A. (2015). *IBM SPSS for intermediate statistics*. Hoboken, NJ: Taylor and Francis.

- Long, B. T., & Kurlaender, M. (2009, March). Do community colleges provide a viable pathway to a baccalaureate degree? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 31(1), 30-53. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0162373708327756>
- Mangan, K. (2016, July 22). As dual enrollments swell, so do worries about academic rigor. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com>
- Menzel, M. J. (2006). *Type III concurrent enrollment program participation effect on time and cost to baccalaureate degree completion* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://www.proquest.com/>
- Merton, R. (1968). *Social theory and social structure*. New York: Free Press.
- Mokher, C. G., & McLendon, M. K. (2009, February). Uniting secondary and postsecondary education: An event history analysis of state adoption of dual enrollment policies. *American Journal of Education*, 115, 249-277.
- Montalvo, E. J. (2013, January). The recruitment and retention of Hispanic undergraduate students in public universities in the United States, 2000-2006. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 12(3), 237-255. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1538192712470692>
- Morgan, S. L., & Winship, C. (2007). *Counterfactuals and causal inference: Methods and principles for social research*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nachmias, D., & Nachmias, C. (1987). *Research methods in the social sciences* (3rd ed.). New York City, NY: Saint Martin's Press.
- National Center on Education and the Economy. (2013). *Background information on community colleges*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncee.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/Community-College-Background-Reportjcc1.pdf>

- Obama, B. (Producer). (2009, July 14). *American graduation initiative* [Speech transcript]. Retrieved from [http://www.mlive.com/news/detroit/index.ssf/2009/07/full\\_text\\_of\\_president\\_barack.html](http://www.mlive.com/news/detroit/index.ssf/2009/07/full_text_of_president_barack.html)
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2014). *Education at a glance*. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/edu/Education-at-a-Glance-2014.pdf>
- Pascarella, E. T. (1986, March/April). Orientation to college and freshman year persistence/Withdrawal decisions. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 57(2), 155-175. Retrieved from <http://www.ashe.ws/?page=186>
- Pretlow, J., & Wathington, H. (2013). Access to dual enrollment courses and school-level characteristics. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 37, 196-204. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2013.739513>
- Radford, A. W. (2010). *Persistence and attainment of 2003-04 beginning postsecondary students: After 6 years*. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2011/2011151.pdf>
- Rendon, L. I. (1994, Fall). Validating culturally diverse students: Toward a new model of learning and student development. *Innovative Higher Education*, 19(1), 33-51. Retrieved from <http://link.springer.com/journal/10755>
- Rendon, L. I. (2002, September). Community college puente: A validating model of education. *Educational Policy*, 16(4), 642-667. Retrieved from <http://epx.sagepub.com/>
- Ridgeway, G., Kovalchik, S. A., Griffin, B. A., & Kabeto, M. U. (2015). Propensity score analysis with survey weighted data. *Journal of Causal Inference*, 3(2), 237-249. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/jci-2014-0039>

- Roberts, C. M. (2010). *The dissertation journey* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Rose, M. (2012, Fall). Second-chance collegians: Inside the remedial classroom. *Dissent*, 41-45. Retrieved from <http://www.dissentmagazine.org>
- Rosenbaum, P. R., & Rubin, D. B. (1983, April). The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects. *Biometrika*, 70(1), 41-55. Retrieved from <http://biomet.oxfordjournals.org/>
- Rossi, P. H., Lipsey, M. W., & Freeman, H. E. (2004). *Evaluation: A systematic approach* (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sasser, S. L. (2010, November 1). Older workers and labor force participation rates. *Franklin Business and Law Journal*, 1-14. Retrieved from <http://www.franklinpublishing.net/businesslaw.html>
- Smith, D. (2007, May 4). Why expand dual-credit programs? *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 31, 371-387.
- Speroni, C. (2011). *Determinants of students' success: The role of advanced placement and dual enrollment programs*. Retrieved from National Center for Postsecondary Research:  
[http://www.postsecondaryresearch.org/i/a/document/19811\\_Speroni\\_AP\\_DE\\_paper\\_110311\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.postsecondaryresearch.org/i/a/document/19811_Speroni_AP_DE_paper_110311_FINAL.pdf)
- Stanley, M. (2003). College education and the midcentury GI Bills. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 118, 671-708.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/003355303321675482>

Swanson, J. L. (2008). *An analysis of the impact of high school dual enrollment course participation on post-secondary academic success, persistence and degree completion* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://www.proquest.com/>

Taylor, P., & Cohn, D. (2012). *A milestone en route to a majority minority nation*.

Retrieved from Pew Research Center:

[http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2012/11/07/a-milestone-en-route-to-a-majority-minority-nation/?src=rss\\_main](http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2012/11/07/a-milestone-en-route-to-a-majority-minority-nation/?src=rss_main)

Thoemmes, F. (2012). Propensity score matching in SPSS. Retrieved from

<https://arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/1201/1201.6385.pdf>

United States Census Bureau. (2014). *Educational attainment in the United States*.

Retrieved from

<http://www.census.gov/hhes/socdemo/education/data/cps/2014/tables.html>

United States Census Bureau. (2015). *Quick facts: USA* [Fact sheet]. Retrieved from

<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/00000.html>

Venezia, A. (2006, Winter). Levers for change: Steps states can take to improve college readiness. *New England Board of Higher Education*, 16-18. Retrieved from

<http://www.nebhe.org/>

Wade, L. (2012). U.S. racial/ethnic demographics: 1960, today, and 2050. Retrieved from

<http://thesocietypages.org/socimages/2012/11/14/u-s-raciaethnic-demographics-1960-today-and-2050/>

Wang, X. (2009, March 31). Baccalaureate attainment and college persistence of

community college transfer students at four-year institutions. *Research in Higher Education*, 50, 570-588. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11162-009-9133-z>



- Wechsler, H. S. (2001). *Access to success in the urban high school: The middle college movement*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Westcott, P. A. (2009). *The impact of dual enrollment participation on degree attainment* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://www.proquest.com/>
- Wine, J., Janson, N., & Wheelless, S. (2011). *2004/09 beginning postsecondary students longitudinal study: Full-scale methodology report* (NCES 2012-246). Retrieved from National Center for Educational Statistics:  
<http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2012/2012246.pdf>
- Wood, J. L. (2012). Leaving the 2-year college: Predictors of Black male collegian departure. In E. M. Zamani-Gallaher, J. Lester, D. D. Bragg, & L. S. Hagedorn (Eds.), *ASHE reader series on community colleges* (4th ed., pp. 358-372). Boston, MA: Pearson Learning Solutions.
- Yettick, H., & Lloyd, S. C. (2015, May 29). Graduation rate hits high, but some groups lag. *Education Week*. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org>
- Zalaznick, M. (2013, October). Remedial reform moves to high schools: School districts try to increase chances that graduates will finish college [Magazine]. *District Administration*. Retrieved from <http://www.districtadministration.com>
- Zeidenberg, M. (2012). *Valuable learning or “spinning their wheels”?: Understanding excess credits earned by community college associate degree completers*. Retrieved from Community College Research Center:  
<http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/publications/understanding-excess-credits.html>

## APPENDIX A

## Human Subjects Exempt Research Letter



Thomas Hughes &lt;thugh019@odu.edu&gt;

---

**Re: IRBNet Board Document Published**

1 message

---

**Schwitzer, Alan** <aschwitz@odu.edu>  
To: "HUGHES, THOMAS E." <thugh019@odu.edu>  
Cc: "Baker, Peter B." <PBaker@odu.edu>

Tue, Mar 22, 2016 at 8:12 AM

Tom: Please see below and save for your records this letter of EXEMPT status for your dissertation research!

---

From: Petros Katsioloudis <[no-reply@irbnet.org](mailto:no-reply@irbnet.org)>  
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2016 11:04 AM  
To: Schwitzer, Alan  
Subject: IRBNet Board Document Published

Please note that Old Dominion University Education Human Subjects Review Committee has published the following Board Document on IRBNet:

Project Title: [877256-1] The impact of high school dual enrollment participation on bachelor's degree attainment and time and cost to degree  
Principal Investigator: Alan Schwitzer, Ph.D.

Submission Type: New Project  
Date Submitted: February 29, 2016

Document Type: Exempt Letter  
Document Description: Exempt Letter  
Publish Date: March 22, 2016

Should you have any questions you may contact Petros Katsioloudis at [pkatsiol@odu.edu](mailto:pkatsiol@odu.edu).

Thank you,  
The IRBNet Support Team

[www.irbnet.org](http://www.irbnet.org)

**VITA**

THOMAS EARL HUGHES

**EDUCATION**

Ph.D., Community College Leadership, Old Dominion University, December 2016

M.A., Sociology, Arizona State University, May 1993

B.S., Sociology, Arizona State University, December 1989

**PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE**

Director, Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research

Yavapai College, Arizona. May 2003-Current

Adjunct Faculty, Sociology

Yavapai College, Arizona. May 2003-Current

Senior Research Analyst, Office of Institutional Research

Yavapai College, Arizona. January 1999-May 2003

Epidemiologist/Health Statistician, Office of Epidemiology and Statistics

Arizona Department of Health Services. January 1997-January 1999

Epidemiologist Specialist II, Office of HIV/STD Services

Arizona Department of Health Services, December 1994-August 1998

Human Capital Research Analyst

Options and Choices, Inc., Wyoming. September 1995-January 1996

**RECENT PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS AND PUBLICATIONS**

2016 Hughes, Tom. "Strategic Planning, Budgeting, and Accountability—Collecting and Connecting the Dots" Rural Community College Alliance Conference. Orange Beach, Alabama. September 30, 2016

- McGraw, Matt and Hughes, Tom. "Rural Community College Faculty Perceptions of Teacher Evaluations" Rural Community College Alliance Conference. Orange Beach, Alabama. September 29, 2016
- 2015
- Ewell, C., & Hughes, T. (2015). Dashboard distillation: Yavapai College's award-winning web-based reporting tool extracts finance, student, and human resources data that make it easier for stakeholders to connect costs with productivity. *Business Officer*, January 2015, 31-34.
- Lou Guthrie; Tom Hughes; and Kristy Bishop. "Best Practices for Using Community College Benchmarking Data." Higher Learning Commission's Annual Conference. Chicago, Illinois. March 30, 2015
- Hughes, Tom and Moody, Carl. "Building an Instructional Cost Dashboard" National Higher Education Benchmarking Institute Annual Conference. Overland Park, Kansas, May 14, 2015 (Invited Workshop)
- 2014
- Hughes, Tom and Moody, Carl. "Instructional Cost Dashboard for Informed Decision-Making and Institutional Effectiveness." Higher Learning Commission's Annual Conference. Chicago, Illinois. April 12, 2014
- Hughes, Tom; Grieshaber, Larry; Merrifield, Mary and Long, Paul. "Sculpting Accreditation Clay: Designing and Articulating a Quality Initiative." Higher Learning Commission's Annual Conference. Chicago, Illinois. April 11, 2014