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Abstract

Using the National Postsecondary Study Aid Study Risk Factor Index, students were placed into four traditional/non-traditional status categories. For each category, persistence was compared between students who completed a First-Year Experience (FYE) course and a control group of students that did not. Of particular interest in this study was the possible positive relationship between FYE and persistence of the most highly non-traditional students. Attrition, analyzed over three semesters, determined that persistence was not related FYE completion.
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A substantial portion of enrollment growth in American higher education has been the result of increased accessibility to ever widening segments of citizens. Post-secondary institutions are increasingly viewed as gatekeepers to career and economic advancement (Leslie & Brinkman, 1988). Economic, technological, political and geopolitical factors related to perceived career opportunities may be the impetus to burgeoning enrollments as much as social, status, or parental influences of past generations. Technology in the 21st Century continues to impact the character of greater numbers of careers and necessitate the acquisition of advanced education and specialized abilities. Clearly, the abilities and skills of our citizens will play and integral role economically in the country’s future. As deregulation and privatization in Europe, Asia, and Latin America fuel globalization, expand capital markets, and intensify international competition (Yergin & Stanislaw, 2002); American higher education must provide effective pedagogy that engages an ever wider range of student interests and learning styles.

The majority of students prior to World War II, often described as traditional, were young White males, financially supported by college educated families who attended full-time and resided on campus as their parents had. Concerns that students entering college following World War II did not represent the traditional demographic would alter, if not dilute, higher education proved to be mistaken as increased numbers of college educated veterans ushered in the unmatched post-war era of scientific and economic expansion (Summers, 2004). The flood of World War II veterans forecast the coming transformation of college student populations. In 2005, the typical college student can no longer be described as traditional (Levine & Cureton, 1998a). “The era of the traditional college student is gone, especially at urban and metropolitan colleges and universities” (Belcheir, 1998, pg. 1).
Although concerns that affordability limits access still remain (Callan, 2004), the growth in today’s college going population consists of students whose odds to attend college before 1950 were slim (Digest of Educational Statistics, 2000). In fact, “the lion’s share of college enrollment growth came from students who might be described as non-traditional” (Levine & Cureton, 1998b, p. 5). Unfortunately, increased access by a broader segment of Americans has not resulted in persistence and timely completion outcomes comparable with traditional students (Astin, Tsui, & Avalos, 1996; Bean & Metzner, 1985; Horn, 1996, 1998; NCES, 1997, 1998; Peltier, Laden, & Matranga, 1999).

Certain retention programs target specific students. The federally supported TRIO project (Federal TRIO Programs, 2004) for first generation students and the Meyerhoff program (Fries-Britt, 1998) for gifted African-Americans are examples of programs that target non-traditional students. Many campuses recognize the value in retaining home grown students and acknowledge the importance of integrating these students into their campus community. Most campuses have also broadly adopted new student orientation as the standard approach to foster college adjustment and many offer a range of academic and transition interventions. As institutions invest in such interventions, there is an expectation for improved students’ learning, persistence, and ultimately, completion to obviate the accountability undercurrent that may focus upon persistence and graduation rates as performance indicators.

First-Year Experience Courses

Another approach to student orientation, known as the First Year Experience (FYE) course, has become common (Barefoot, 2003). The First-Year Experience course typically extends basic orientation content and student development beyond their first days on campus. The FYE model developed at the University of South Carolina in the 1970s ushered in the current orientation course renewal (Barefoot & Fidler, 1996). Various FYE formats are now
prevailent on 90% of college campuses (Barefoot, 2003). FYE courses vary considerably as to
target group, content, or implementation. Topics range from academic skills development and
test taking to wellness and stress issues, while some are thematic or academically oriented
(Barefoot, 2002). Although courses are generally designed to help new students succeed, course
focus is locally determined, and therefore, varies across institutions.

The South Carolina’s FYE course model has been examined (Fidler, 1991; Fidler &
Hunter, 1989; Fidler & Moore, 1996; Gordon & Grites, 1992) and these studies suggest
academic and persistence outcomes are appropriate measures of program effectiveness.
However, not all FYE courses achieve their anticipated result. For example, Swing (2002a)
found that academically oriented courses produced lower learning outcomes than other forms of
FYE and Cavote and Kopera-Frye (2004) determined that FYE content provided via academic
introductory courses was not positively associated with persistence.

Traditional and Non-Traditional Students

Non-traditional college students have received some attention; however, the dearth of
investigations of college students possessing non-traditional traits has made a synthesis of
available studies problematic as the “research literature is dominated by studies of White,
traditional-aged, full-time students attending residential colleges” (Graham, 1998, p. 239).
Students who may be described more as non-traditional than traditional often find they have
entered an environment in which they have no familial history, limited social or academic
support, and commitments, such as employment, that demand time and energy off campus. Bean
and Metzner (1985) established the basis to examine non-traditional factors in their studies of
early student departure factors. They identified factors that distinguish non-traditional students
and how institution’s policies may influence student persistence.
The National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NCES, 1999) used seven traits to define non-traditional students: first generation status, delayed entry, part-time attendance, off-campus employment, financial independence, dependents/single parenthood, and absence of a high school diploma. This National Center of Educational Statistics (NCES) sponsored study used these traits to compute a Risk Factor Index (RFI) for non-traditionality. Based on the absence or presence of these factors, the occurrences were summed and students were categorized as: Traditional (0 risk factors), Minimally non-traditional (1 risk factor), Moderately non-traditional (2-3 risk factors), and Highly non-traditional (4 or more risk factors). The NCES study found that increased non-traditionality was “negatively associated with students’ persistence and attainment” (NCES, 1999, p. 14).

Additional traits negatively associated with student persistence have been examined: commuting (Jacoby, 2000), lower socio-economic status (Hellman, 1996), minority status (Cabrera, Nora, Terenzini, Pascarella, & Hagedorn, 1999), age at enrollment (Graham & Donaldson, 1996), and small high school size (Monk & Haller, 1993). Given that researchers know little about how non-traditionality relates to persistence upon completion of an FYE courses, this study was undertaken to examine persistence utilizing NCES’s RFI construct. It was hypothesized that non-traditional FYE students within each RFI category would exhibit higher persistence rates than students who did not complete an FYE course. Of particular interest for this study was the potential impact FYE courses had for those students with four or more non-traditional traits relative to traditional students. It was expected that FYE would ameliorate attrition; highly or even moderately non-traditional students who completed an FYE course would exhibit greater persistence than their non-FYE counterparts.

Background
XXXXXX is one of the faster growing states in the country, yet only 27% of XXXXX’s high school graduates enrolled in postsecondary programs in 2002 compared to 40% nationally. Compared to other states, XXXXX ranked 39th in the proportion of high school students who graduate (Oden, 2004). Enrollment growth at the University of XXXXX, XXXX (XXX) was also less than satisfactory between 1989 and 1999 as growth averaged less than 1% annually. This situation has dramatically changed since the state initiated its first financial aid program in 2000. Still, XXX shares characteristics with other urban, commuter institutions and student success and persistence concerns continue. Only 10% of the XXX students (50% of new freshman) lived in residence halls. In addition, the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE, 2003) of XXX students found commuting freshman reported less participation in co-curricular activities, \( U(1, 290) = 3.253, p < .001, \eta^2 = .01 \) while reporting significantly more hours of off-campus employment, \( U(1, 289) = 7.206, p < .001, \eta^2 = .03 \).

In 1997, concerns about enrollment growth, persistence, graduation, and student learning led university administrators to focus on student transition. Faculty and university leaders discussed strategies and participated at First-Year Experience Conferences. Grant funds were acquired to pilot FYE courses in 1998. The following year, the Provost’s Office conducted a FYE course development workshop and authorized funding ($500 per course) for FYE courses through academic departments. Workshop content included introduction to an FYE text, course design strategies such as appropriate use of student affairs specialist and peer mentors, and course objective development. In 1999, 17 two and three credit graded First-Year Experience sections were identified.

METHOD

Sample
Students in this sample completed one of 17 FYE courses (n=381) or one of 23 English composition sections (n=332) agreed to participate in the study by also completing survey instruments during the first and last weeks of the fall 1999 semester. Demographic data were obtained from the university’s Student Information System (SIS). The total sample of 385 females and 328 males in the study were representative of the 55 to 45% female to male XXX student body proportions. Ethnicity for the entire sample, as well as within FYE groups, reflected the University’s general ethnic distribution. No significant difference was found in age between FYE and non-FYE students; the majority of the total sample falling into the “traditional 18-19 college age” range. Compared with XXX general student body, males represented 51% in FYE courses while females represented 60% in non-FYE courses. Gender differences between FYE and non-FYE were not found within Minimally or Moderately non-traditional students, however, 63% of Traditional students (60% in FYE and 65% in non-FYE) were females, while within the Highly non-traditional students, 59% were male (75% in FYE and 42% in non-FYE).

The survey administered at the beginning of fall 1999 asked students to report on these factors used in RFI group calculation:

**First Generation Status:** First-generation students are those whose parents’ highest level of education attainment is a high school diploma or less.

**Off-Campus Employment:** Students who are employed 20 hours or more off-campus.

**Commuter Status:** Students who do not reside in residence halls.

**Dependent Care:** Students with at least one child or parent dependent.

The university’s SIS contained the following student traits used in RFI group calculation:

**Delayed Entry:** Students less than 24 years of age who delayed entering at a post secondary institution for one or more years following high school graduation.

**Part-time Attendance:** Students who are enrolled less than full-time (12 units).
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Age: Students who were 24 or more years of age.

Race and Ethnicity (Minorities): Students who are non-White or Asian.

High School of Origin: Student who graduated from high schools in which resources and teacher expertise may affect course offerings associated with preparation for higher education.

After SIS and survey data were combined, students received a score of one (1) for each non-traditional trait and a zero (0) if the trait was not present. Each student’s non-traditional status was then computed by summing non-traditional traits. Based upon the sum of traits, students were then categorized using NCES’s RFI construct (i.e., Traditional = 0, Minimally non-traditional = 1, Moderately non-traditional = 2 or 3, and Highly non-traditional = 4 or more). Table 1 illustrates the distribution of students in each category across FYE/non-FYE groups.

[Table 1]

Procedure

All students in the study were enrolled at XXX for the first time during fall 1999. During the first week of classes, FYE students and an independent group of students enrolled in English composition were invited to complete an in-class survey, which included parent education, employment, dependent obligations, and living arrangements items, to obtain data not available through SIS. Enrollment status to determine persistence was available for all 713 students in the sample. Chi-square analysis determined that significantly more commuters, employed off-campus, and graduates from small high schools completed the non-FYE course, while more FYE students resided on campus (Table 2).

[Table 2]

Measures

FYE status. FYE students were those who self-selected a FYE course identified as such in the course catalog, while non-FYE students were those who did not enroll in an FYE course.
during the fall 1999 semester. Students who enrolled in an English composition section and a FYE course were assigned to the FYE group.

**Non-traditional status.** Nine non-traditional traits were determined to be present or not present for the 713 students that completed the fall 1999 semester. Students were assigned to one of four RFI categories based upon the presence of none to four or more traits.

**Persistence rates.** Persistence was determined by a student’s continued enrollment in a subsequent semester. Based upon spring and fall 2000 enrollment data available for all students, students were categorized as returning, while those who did not enroll in the subsequent semester were identified as non-returning. Persistence rates for all fall 1999 to spring 2000 and fall 1999 to fall 2000 were determined independently.

**Results**

**FYE Group Differences**

ACT scores and high school GPAs, often used as predictors of college success, were examined and found to be covariates of persistence for both FYE and non-FYE students in this sample. ACT composite scores were available for 345 FYE and 316 non-FYE students. Indeed, ACT scores \( (r = -.12, p < .001) \) and high school GPAs \( (r = -.12, p < .001) \) were significantly related to FYE completers and this group had significantly higher ACT scores (23.77 to 22.86), \( t (659) = 3.01, p < .01 \). Subsequent analysis of covariance (ANCOVA), with ACT as a covariate however, revealed no effect related to persistence.

High school GPAs were available for 347 FYE students and 322 non-FYE students. The FYE students had significantly higher high school GPAs, \( t (667) = 3.12, p < .01 \) than non-FYE students (3.42 to 3.32). Using high school GPA as a covariate, ANCOVA found high school GPA had a significant main effect for spring 2000 to fall 2000 persistence \( F (1,668) = 11.992, p < .001 \), but was not significant for fall 1999 to spring 2000 or fall 1999 to fall 2000.
Non-Traditional Category Differences

Among the four RFI categories for all students, ACT scores \((r = -.13, p < .01)\) and high school GPA \((r = -.08, p < .05)\) were significantly correlated with students’ RFI category. Highly non-traditional RFI students had significantly lower ACT composite scores, \(F (3, 657) = 4.887, p < .01\), than Traditional and Minimally non-traditional RFI students, but not for the Moderate RFI category. ACT differences across FYE and non-FYE students for equivalent RFI categories (the focus of this study) were found to be significant for only the Traditional category, \(t (92) = 2.162, p < .05\), as Traditional status FYE students had a higher mean high school GPA. Results of a separate ANCOVA for ACT found no effect related to persistence however.

No significant difference was found in high school GPAs between the four RFI categories within either FYE group. Differences in high school GPA between FYE and non-FYE groups were determined to be significant for only the Moderately RFI category students, \(t (332) = 1.986, p < .05\). ANCOVA with high school GPA as a covariate found significant main effects for fall 1999 to spring 2000 – \(F (3,668) = 3.020, p < .05\) and spring 2000 to fall 2000 – \(F (3,668) = 6.764, p < .001\) persistence.

Thus, students’ high school GPA was a covariate for student persistence in this sample while ACT composite score was not. The follow-up multiple regression analysis with persistence as the outcome variable found that high school GPA was a significant predictor of persistence into both spring and fall 2000 semesters. For each analysis, FYE status was not a predictor.

Persistence Differences between FYE Groups

This study used continued enrollment into spring and fall 2000 semesters as a measure of student persistence. There were 674 (362 FYE and 312 non-FYE) students (95%) who persisted through the spring 2000 semester and 578 (303-80% FYE and 275-83% non-FYE) students (81%) were enrolled in and completed the fall 2000 semester. Persistence rates between FYE and
non-FYE students were not significant across either fall 1999 to spring 2000, spring 2000 to fall 2000, or fall 1999 to fall 2000 semesters (Table 3).

[Table 3]

Persistence Differences between RFI Categories

Based upon the 15% lower persistence for the Highly non-traditional group [Table 3], Kruskal-Wallis was used to explore overall persistence difference between RFI categories. The analysis found small magnitude significance between RFI categories for fall 1999 to spring 2000, $H_{3,713} = 18.974, p < .001, \eta^2 = .03$ and spring 2000 to fall 2000, $H_{3,713} = 15.623, p < .01, \eta^2 = .02$.

Highly RFI students exhibited the lowest mean rank in both analyses, even though differences in college success predictors, ACT and high school GPA, were not significant.

Discussion

Conclusions and Implications

Clearly within this sample, persistence within RFI groups was unrelated to FYE completion. Students sharing a common number of non-traditional traits and who completed a FYE course did not persist in higher proportions. Overall, students with fewer non-traditional traits persisted in greater proportions than highly non-traditional students. This study contributed greatly to the literature in that it examined an important student dimension of persistence utilizing a fine-grained analysis. Although within traditionality groups, persistence was unrelated to FYE, the framework of examining degrees of traditionality is an important idea. Only by examining these finer distinctions within traditionality groups, could one evidence subtle distinctions between students. For example, oftentimes the use of age alone as a traditionality criterion is used in studies, but the use of the RFI, as here, allowed for traditionality to be represented along multiple criteria. Utilizing this definition of traditionality is an improvement over prior, macro-level indices, and encompasses multiple types of traditionality among students.
today. This descriptive study is an initial step which will help identify student characteristics, begin to focus efforts toward identifying students with greater need, and enhance the development of predictive models. Further studies should also analyze the widest range of variables possible.

While this study adds valuable information to the literature on the effects of FYE courses on persistence, several elements presented limitations to this study. Primarily, FYE enrollment was voluntary and students enrolled in additional courses of varying difficulty whose influence on persistence could not be calculated. Further, instructor grading procedures may also influence academic performance measures in undeterminable ways. Additionally, data were not collected regarding possible variation in pedagogical difference among the 17 FYE courses utilized across instructors. Thus, it was not possible to discount extraneous factors such as how pedagogy, instructor affect, or a motivating environment (Mayo, 1933) influence persistence. Although findings in this study were contrary to common assumptions that FYE positively affects persistence, these finding further illustrate a need for institution specific examination about how FYE may best be implemented.

A conclusion of this study is therefore, that expectations that First Year courses will increase student persistence should be viewed cautiously. This study found that the university’s goal of improved persistence through FYE courses was not achieved. At XXX, FYE did not enhance persistence for Highly or Moderately non-traditional students. The expectation that FYE would raise persistence rates for non-traditional students was not fulfilled. Highly non-traditional students in this sample persisted at a lower rate than Traditional, Minimally and Moderately students regardless of FYE course completion.

These findings suggest that a “one size fits all approach to FYE content” may be less helpful to students high on the RFI. For example, is a usual topic taught in an FYE course such
as note taking helpful to a mature-aged student with extensive work experience? Maybe a topic such as time management would benefit several students, whereas study skills would be beneficial for other non-traditional students. Classroom activities which make use of multi-modal content presentation or collaborative methods may be more engaging than exercises limited to a unimodal domain (Seaman, 1998). The importance of personalizing instruction, to the degree possible, highlighted in Kulik, Kulik, and Cohen’s (1980) meta-analytic study found higher test scores, more favorable class ratings, and greater likelihood of completing classes evident among students who received a personalized approach to instruction versus the traditional lecture format.

Recommendations

Institutions considering FYE should conduct an institution-wide examination of their needs and clearly define outcomes prior to implementation. Obviously, institutional circumstances will dictate many aspects and a plan to assess proposed (or continuous) FYE programs is clearly essential. Implementation of FYE courses without adequate attention to faculty preparation, involvement, and interest as well as development of reasonable consistency of content may be of little more value than no course at all. Coordination for any freshman program will be challenging on campuses without a freshmen college, but are essential. We suggest, therefore, that first year programs make major efforts to insure course content fidelity and pedagogical homogeneity within ethical limits to reduce the magnitude of effects from extraneous factors. In addition, programs organized and courses taught with these fundamentals should prove valuable as additional predictor variables in retention modeling. Surveying the students’ needs (especially non-traditional as compared to traditional students), could help in the long range design of appropriate curricula.
Institutions should be cautious about implementing FYE without closely exploring administrative, coordination, and sustainability issues. These issues, which include faculty support, support for faculty, and staff development, can undermine course potential. Most importantly, FYE, as well as all programs, should be evaluated routinely. Resources must be allocated to determine whether benefits to students as well as the institution are being achieved to justify continued investment in human capital.

Engaging pedagogy, more than content however, may influence outcomes surrounding FYE (Swing, 2002b). Monitoring levels of engagement in FYE courses could provide an informative measure and produce findings that would assist institutions assess whether FYE is related to outcomes of interest. Recent studies (Adelman, 1999, 2004; Belcheir, 1997) have clearly demonstrated that student’s academic history manifest in their college performance remains the best overall forecaster of persistence. As in this study, where high school academic performance was highly associated with persistence, perhaps consideration should be given to limiting student development content in favor of greater emphasis on academic skills.

The possibility that FYE courses did little to enhance college student academic performance is another consideration for these outcomes. Those choosing FYE may have already been highly motivated and intellectually competent students, suggesting a ceiling effect. Conversely, those with lower high school GPAs and ACT scores did not opt for FYE, hence potential enhancement in academic success could not be indexed. The optimal way to test the effects of FYE courses would be using random assignment of students to classes, however ethical considerations make this possibility unlikely. The best one can do is to have roughly equitable comparison groups, but again, this is not feasible in many cases. Therefore, by standardizing the FYE implementation it would be possible to maximize identification of differences in outcome measures.
Future Directions

This study identified several areas for future investigations when considering implementing FYE courses with non-traditional students. First and foremost, the empirical format must assess pedagogical factors and random assignment of students with equivalent predictive measures (e.g., high school GPA) could reduce extraneous effects. Further, this study’s categories were formed based on presence/absence of risk indicators. However, are all the factors equal in terms of their degree of non-traditionality? That is, are some students more “non-traditional” based on one trait versus those categorized into a group based on another trait? This combining of types of “non-traditional” students and assessing efficacy of FYE courses for them may obscure useful outcomes of the FYE course.

A second avenue of inquiry could focus on what types of curricula work better for different types of non-traditional students. For example, would a commuting student benefit from a workshop on time management or web-based submission of assignments? Additionally, which pedagogy and media (visual, PowerPoint, lecture) have an impact on student learning based on the type of non-traditional student (e.g., older adult learner and age-based distinction)? The best method of information delivery could be explored in order to more personalize curricula based on differential students’ needs.

Finally, other potential indicators of student success, especially among non-traditional students, could be explored. For example, FYE courses could enhance self-efficacy or mastery of the college experience, qualities often overlooked in our quest for understanding how to retain students. This is an entirely new area of study related to FYE that requires exploration. This is an area which AAHE and others have termed, assessing the ineffable. Admittedly, assessing this domain will be challenging, but nonetheless may add valuable insight into curricula design which could ultimately engage more students more deeply into the learning enterprise.
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Table 1

*Risk Factor Indices by FYE Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-traditional Category (RFI)</th>
<th>FYE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NFYE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimally</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>713</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

*Distribution of Non-traditional Traits by FYE Status*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>FYE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NFYE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part-time attendance</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>***168</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>***216</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayed entry</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school size</td>
<td>*19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 hrs or more off campus employment</td>
<td>***134</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>***185</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent education</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependents</td>
<td>**6</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>**18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-traditional Traits</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05.
** p < .01.
***p < .001.
Table 3

Persistence: Non-traditional Category by FYE/NFYE Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RFI</th>
<th>FYE Persistence</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>NFYE Persistence</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F’99</td>
<td>S’00</td>
<td>F’00</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>S’00</td>
<td>F’00</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2.724</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.838</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>