

2015

## Using Academic And Demographic Characteristics to Determine Whether or Not Admitted Transfer Students Will Enroll in a Four-Year Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern Region of the United States

Barrett Palmer Linam

*Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool\\_dissertations](https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations)



Part of the [Human Resources Management Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Linam, Barrett Palmer, "Using Academic And Demographic Characteristics to Determine Whether or Not Admitted Transfer Students Will Enroll in a Four-Year Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern Region of the United States" (2015). *LSU Doctoral Dissertations*. 172.  
[https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool\\_dissertations/172](https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations/172)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized graduate school editor of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [gradetd@lsu.edu](mailto:gradetd@lsu.edu).

USING ACADEMIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS TO DETERMINE  
WHETHER OR NOT ADMITTED TRANSFER STUDENTS WILL ENROLL IN A FOUR-  
YEAR RESEARCH-EXTENSIVE UNIVERSITY IN THE SOUTHEASTERN REGION OF  
THE UNITED STATES

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the  
Louisiana State University and  
Agricultural and Mechanical College  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

in

The School of Human Resource Education  
and Workforce Development

by  
Barrett Palmer Linam  
B.S., Louisiana State University, 2007  
M.S.W., Louisiana State University, 2009  
May 2015

©Copyright 2015  
Barrett Palmer Linam  
All Rights Reserved

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation is dedicated to my grandparents Henry and Virginia Linam, Hilton and JoAnn Luneau, and Mr. Roland and Mrs. Paquin. They were very influential in my upbringing and were great motivations to complete something very difficult to achieve. I would also like to send a shout out to my aunt Nena for spending her own time in order to help edit my many papers. Thank you very much.

I would like to thank all of the members of my committee, Dr. Michael Burnett, Dr. Earl Johnson, Dr. Paul Binford, and Dr. Satish Verma. I would like to thank each of you for your guidance, support, and encouragement when this task got difficult. You pushed me and kept me on task.

I would like to especially thank Dr. Michael Burnett, but through an unorthodox way. Dr. Cleve Brooks, being a great man, saw potential in me and introduced me to Dr. Burnett and through the peer pressure of those two, I was duped into signing up for a large project in which I did not fully know the magnitude. Thank you very much Dr. Brooks for believing in me and for seeing what I did not see in that I could complete the degree.

Thank you Dr. Burnett for the countless hours working with me on this project. Thank you for making it lighthearted and fun. For the constant back and forth about Michigan/Ohio State and the Red Sox/Yankees discussions. Thank you for putting up with my self-deprecating humor and bullheadedness. I enjoyed all of our discussions. Thanks for believing in me.

I'd like to thank the Office of Undergraduate Admissions for giving me the opportunity to have a graduate assistantship to help me fund this doctorate. A special thanks to everyone from the Thomas Boyd crew. I miss that family we had. Thanks to Ms. Lupe Lamadrid (Soon to be Dr. Lamadrid) and to Mrs. Shelly Caro for mentoring me in transfer student affairs over the

past several years. They allowed me a lot of leeway and opportunities to experience things that many other graduate students hope for. Thank you.

I'd like to thank all of my friends for sticking with me and caring. I'd like to particularly thank Simone, Erastus, and Rodney. Especially Rodney who would stay up way too late listening to me complain about this dissertation. Having already completed his, he would offer me great advice on what to expect, what to do, and how to handle every situation I faced. Without his sage advice, it would have taken me even longer to complete. Also, thanks to my friends from back home who were always wondering if I was ever going to finish this dissertation. I thank them for the weekends of escape where we could go to the back porches and play dimes and deuces or enjoy some bonfires over classy beverages. I do not want forget Hov. He was always there for me when I got home from late nights of working on this to jump in my lap, try to lick my face, or just curl up into a ball in my lap and just be an awesome dog.

Thanks to Mrs. Ann Harrington for the talks and goofing around in the office and for helping me with formatting. I am glad you could help because without you I would have been lost on this one.

Most importantly I would like to thank my parents, Maurice and Marsha Linam. They've had me on "payroll" a long time waiting for me to complete this. They have listened to me gripe, complain, celebrate, and every other emotion I put them through. They always listened and offered sound advice. They never wavered in their belief. They never pressured me to speed things up. They also encouraged me to stay steady and keep the course I was on. Without them, this would never have been possible. I'd also like to thank my brother and sister-in-law, Drs. Justin and Moira Linam. Justin has been my role model since I was a kid and has stayed that way throughout my life. He has always cared about what I was doing and has always been there

to answer every question I had about growing up or life lessons. He has given me great advice when it was both wanted and unwanted. He's also convinced me that every cough or sneeze I have is not Ebola. It's probably just the pollen in the air. I love you mom, dad, Justin, and Moira with all my heart and thank you so much for believing me. Thanks for asking how it is going, how I'm doing with the stress, and letting me know that the end is close.

The last thank you goes to the person who would read this. I am not sure why you would take the time out of your day to spend any time with this document, but thanks. It makes all the blood, sweat, and tears that I put into it worth it. Thanks.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES .....	viii
ABSTRACT.....	xi
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION .....	1
Importance Of Higher Education .....	1
Initial College Choice.....	2
Dissatisfaction / Choice To Leave .....	6
Definition Of A Transfer Student .....	6
Purpose Of Study .....	8
Dependent Variable.....	8
Specific Objectives.....	8
Definition Of Terms .....	11
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	13
Recruiting .....	13
Campus Tours .....	13
Transfer Vs. Non-Transfer Students .....	14
Minority Recruitment.....	15
Recruitment Medium.....	17
Influences On Student Choices .....	19
Factors Predicting Success And Enrollment .....	26
Predictive Modeling .....	36
Summary Of The Literature Review .....	39
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY .....	41
Purpose Of Study .....	41
Dependent Variable.....	41
Specific Objectives.....	41
Population And Sample.....	44
Instrumentation.....	44
Data Collection.....	46
Data Analysis .....	46
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS.....	53
Specific Objectives.....	53
Objective One Results .....	56
Objective Two Results .....	63
Objective Three Results .....	70
Objective Four Results .....	79

CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	84
Purpose And Objectives .....	84
Methodology .....	87
Summary Of Major Findings .....	88
Conclusions, Implications, And Recommendations .....	91
REFERENCES .....	99
APPENDIX A: INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL.....	103
APPENDIX B: INDIVIDUAL HOME STATE FOR STUDENTS WHO WERE ADMITTED AND ENROLLED .....	104
APPENDIX C: TRANSFER INSTITUTIONS ATTENDED BY STUDENTS WHO WERE ADMITTED AND ENROLLED .....	106
APPENDIX D: INDIVIDUAL HOME STATE FOR STUDENTS WHO WERE ADMITTED AND DID NOT ENROLL.....	114
APPENDIX E: TRANSFER INSTITUTIONS ATTENDED BY STUDENTS WHO WERE ADMITTED AND DID NOT ENROLL.....	116
VITA.....	126

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Ethnicity of Transfer Applicants Who were Admitted and Enrolled at a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States. ....	58
Table 2	Whether or Not Enrolled Transfer Students from a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States Reported as a Permanent Address in Louisiana. ....	59
Table 3	Residence Classification of Students who Enrolled in a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States. ....	59
Table 4	Whether or Not Enrolled Transfer Students Who Applied as a Freshman to the Research-Extensive University In the Southeastern United States Enrolled. ....	59
Table 5	Whether or Not Enrolled Transfer Students Transferred from an Institution that was in Louisiana or an Institution from Another State. ....	60
Table 6	Whether or Not Enrolled Transfer Students Had a Parent Who had Graduated from the Institution. ....	60
Table 7	Table GPA of Enrolled Transfer Students at a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States. ....	61
Table 8	Number of Transfer Hours Earned by Enrolled Transfer Students at a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States. ....	62
Table 9	Number of Hours Attempted by Enrolled Transfer Students at a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States. ....	62
Table 10	Number of Enrolled Transfer Students Entering a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States with a Higher Education Degree. ....	62
Table 11	Type of Institution from which Enrolled Transfer Students Transferred into a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States. ....	63
Table 12	Ethnicity of Transfer Applicants who were Admitted and did not Enroll at a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States. ....	65
Table 13	Whether or not Non-Enrolled Transfer Students from a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States Reported as a Permanent Address in the Same or Another State. ....	65
Table 14	Residence Classification of Students who did Not Enroll in a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States. ....	66
Table 15	Whether or not Non-Enrolled Transfer Students who Applied as Freshman to the Research-Extensive University. ....	66

Table 16	Whether or Not a Non-Enrolled Transfer Student would Have Been Transferring from an Institution in Louisiana. ....	67
Table 17	Whether or Not Transfer Students Who Did not Enroll in a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States had Parent Alumnus .....	67
Table 18	Categorized GPA of Non-Enrolled Transfer Students at a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States. ....	68
Table 19	Number of Earned Hours of Non-Enrolled Transfer Students at a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States. ....	68
Table 20	Number of Hours Attempted by Non-Enrolled Transfer Students at a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States. ....	69
Table 21	Number of Non-Enrolled Transfer Students Entering a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States with a Higher Education Degree. ....	69
Table 22	Type of Institution from Which Non-Enrolled Transfer Students Transferred from into a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States. ....	70
Table 23	Comparison of Admitted and Enrolled Students with Admitted and Did Not Enroll Students at a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States. ....	72
Table 24	Cross Tabulation of Ethnicity and Enrollment Status among Admitted Transfer Students at a Research-Extensive in the University in the Southeastern United States. ....	73
Table 25	Cross Tabulation of Permanent Address Location Being in the Same State where University was Located and Enrollment Status Among Admitted Transfer Students at a Research-Extensive in the University in the Southeastern United States.....	74
Table 26	Cross Tabulation of Residence Status and Enrollment Status Among Admitted Transfer Students at a Research-Extensive in the University in the Southeastern United States.....	75
Table 27	Cross Tabulation of if a Student Applied to the University as a Freshman and Enrollment Status Among Admitted Transfer Students at a Research-Extensive in the University in the Southeastern United States. ....	75
Table 28	Cross Tabulation of Most Recent Transfer Institution Being in the Same State as the University and Enrollment Status Among Admitted Transfer Students at a Research-Extensive in the University in the Southeastern United States. ....	76
Table 29	Cross Tabulation of Parent Alum Status at the University and Enrollment Status Among Admitted Transfer Students at a Research-Extensive in the University in the Southeastern United States. ....	77

Table 30	Cross Tabulation of Having a Higher Education Degree and Enrollment Status Among Admitted Transfer Students at a Research-Extensive in the University in the Southeastern United States. ....	78
Table 31	Comparison of Selected Academic Characteristics by Enrollment Status of Admitted Transfer Students at a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States. ....	78
Table 32	Descriptive Statistics for the Variables Transfer Student GPA, Transfer Student Attempted Hours, Transfer Student Earned Hours.....	79
Table 33	Overall Group Numbers for Admitted Enrolled and Admitted Non-Enrolled Students at a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States. ....	81
Table 34	2 Log Likelihood and Nagelkerke R. Square Goodness of Fit Test. ....	82
Table 35	Hosmer and Lemeshow Goodness of Fit Test. ....	82
Table 36	Classification Table for Correctly Classified Student Enrollment Status from Selected Academic and Demographic Characteristics for Admitted Transfer Students.....	83
Table 37	Other Variables. ....	83

## ABSTRACT

The primary purpose of this study was to determine whether or not selected demographic, academic, and institutional characteristics influence the decision of admitted transfer students to enroll in a research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States.

The transfer student population is an untapped student population that could help benefit many universities. If these students are targeted like potential freshmen, then universities can increase their enrollment. Being able to identify the correct characteristics for potential transfer students would help conserve resources and maximize the incoming transfer student population.

This study used the standards of a research-extensive university in the Southeastern region of the United States to identify transfer students who were admitted and either enrolled or did not enroll. A transfer student was defined as a student with at least 30 hours of college course work, a college-level English, a college-level math, and a minimum 2.5 GPA. The population came from the summer 2013-spring 2014 academic semesters. There were 12 independent variables provided by the Office of Enrollment Management and input into a computerized statistics program.

Using logistic regression, the researcher was able to identify two characteristics that were statistically significant in correctly classifying enrollment status. Residence and having a higher education degree correctly classified 77.5% of the transfer student population. The other variables that were statistically significant were the variable multi-racial, transfer hours attempted, and transfer hours earned.

The researcher recommended that surveys be conducted to determine why students complete a higher education degree and get admitted, but do not enroll in university. The researchers also recommended working with different ethnicities to determine why multi-racial students have a different enrollment pattern than the other ethnicities. Research also needs to be

conducted concerning the role transfer parent alumni have on whether or not a student will or will not enroll after being admitted to the university.

## CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

### **Importance of Higher Education**

Attending a higher education institution is an important, highly beneficial endeavor in a person's life. Higher education offers an employee more opportunities to advance at a job, as well as increases the amount of yearly earnings that a person can potentially make. According to the U.S. Department of Education (U.S. DOE) (2012), women with a bachelor degree who work full time average 15,000 dollars more per year than those women who graduated solely from high school. In keeping with this theme, men with a high school degree earned 17,000 dollars less than men who graduated with a bachelor degree. The U.S. DOE also noted that those young adults that completed an associate degree earned 12,000 dollars less than those that completed a bachelor degree. Those young adults completing some college but did not earn a degree earned roughly 6,000 dollars more than those that just completed a high school or equivalent degree. Those that completed some college but did not earn a degree earned approximately 14,000 dollars and 17,000 dollars less for women and men, respectively, than those with a bachelor degree. These statistics show that higher education is an important step a person can take in order to achieve a greater financial gain over those only completing secondary school.

Outside of monetary gains, education can offer a person the opportunity to work in conditions not available to all education levels. Completing advanced degrees can offer an option for greater access to certain amenities that are not available to everyone with secondary degrees. These needs can be highlighted by looking at Maslow's hierarchy of needs (McLeod, 2007). Greater income can help ensure that a person can meet their basic needs of food and water. It can help move up the hierarchy of meeting a person's inherent need for security and protection of one's family. Though earning a higher education does not guarantee love,

friendship, or intimacy, it can help provide an individual with self-confidence and a self-achievement of a student's goals. The final step in achieving Maslow's Hierarchy is self-actualization. A higher education degree can help a person achieve the ability to not only think on their own, but to understand why they believe the things they do. The more education a person receives, the more of an opportunity they have to make informed decisions concerning different aspects of their lives.

Though completing a higher level of education offers the opportunity to receive more money, it does not necessarily ensure that a person will find a job that meets all of their needs. When economies recede or job markets dwindle, persons with post-secondary degrees are not guaranteed jobs in their chosen fields nor do they offer the possibility of making more money. They may be forced to choose, potentially temporarily, jobs that do not meet some of their personal needs or educational expertise, however he/she must choose to support their family. Nevertheless, having a degree from a higher education institution offers financial benefits to someone to begin the ascent up the hierarchy of needs that Maslow created.

### **Initial College Choice**

While completing an advanced education is important, it is also very important for a student to choose the right institution and to succeed at that chosen institution. Success at an institution would be the attendance, retention, and completion of a bachelor degree. Students choose a specific institution on numerous factors. One factor is the quality of the programs. Institutions that have a good reputation among certain professional fields are crucial for student selection. It is important for students to attend an institution that offers an opportunity to learn in a high quality academic program in their desired profession so that the student will be able to succeed.

Funding also plays a role in deciding where a student might attend a higher education institution. If the institution offers financial incentives, such as scholarships or loans, then a student might consider a particular institution to attend. In some instances, states offer potential students financial incentives to stay in-state and keep homegrown talent within the state to boost the state's workforce with capable, educated employees. Other funding can come from other entities. Private scholarships can be awarded to students for attending a certain institution and pursuing a degree in a certain field.

Research opportunities and institution faculty can attract students to higher education. Some institutions employ leading professors on the cutting edge of research. Students interested in certain fields may be attracted to attending higher education because of the accomplished faculty members in a field of their interest. Research funding and departmental personnel allow the opportunity for students to work with the best faculty and participate in some of the best research available by simply attending a higher education institution.

The location of a higher education institution may influence whether or not a student attends a certain college or university or attends higher education at all. Each student has different views regarding which institution, if any, to attend. Location can influence this because students may want to stay near family or escape from family. Both location and funding can be intertwined. A student may have the opportunity to enroll at an in-state institution and receive financial benefits from the state, fulfilling their desire to gain some independence from their family and helping with the cost of attending a higher education institution.

Success at a higher education institution is also influenced by the resources a certain college or university has to offer. Higher education institutions have departments and resources in place to help ensure that every student has the chance to succeed. These resources may

include tutors to ensure that students have the opportunity to get help in their courses. This helps ensure that struggling students will not achieve less than passing grades, which might discourage the student from continuing their education. Another resource universities use to assist students in succeeding is the orientation process. Many institutions offer an orientation process that allows students to become acclimated to the university setting before attendance starts so that the student knows what to expect regarding the jump from secondary school to higher education. These orientation programs show the students where buildings and school landmarks are, teach the students about the school's spirit, and allow them to meet other students so that they have an opportunity to interact with other students who are navigating the same, new process. Orientation is a vital part of a student's transition and plays a crucial role in a student's success when moving from secondary school to higher education.

Once a student decides what factors are important to their attendance at a specific university, a student can then choose which institution they are going to attend. Enrollment in a university depends on many things. One of those things is athletics. Students who are passionate about sports tend to want to enroll in a university or college that has a passionate student fan base. This allows the student to participate in activities that the student enjoys.

Quality of the university is also important for student enrollment. If a student wants to attend a top tier university, then the student will look at the quality of a university before deciding whether or not to attend. This includes the competency of the faculty, the amount of public and private funding the department the student is interested in receives, as well as the amount of money and attention the university or college itself is willing to invest. Students entering certain fields can be specific and particular about choosing a school based on quality. Reputation of a school can also influence a student's choice. If a school is renowned in one

program and another program is not recognized as a top program, this could influence whether or not a student chooses a certain school. The popularity of certain universities can influence a student.

Tuition is an important factor students use to decide which university to attend. The price of attendance varies from university to university. In public universities and colleges, tuition also usually increases for students who do not reside in the state of the university or college, and this can be a deterrent for a student to attend out-of-state universities. However, in cases where an in-state university has a lesser reputation and a lower quality of education, students can choose an out-of-state university to attend and pay the out-of-state fees. In some cases, to offset the cost of out-of-state tuition and fees, students can establish residency in a state and attend that state paying in-state tuition. The cost of attending a university or college does impact whether or not a student will attend a particular university. Private schools and public schools are looked at differently. Private schools have different funding available than most public schools. The cost of a public school versus a private school, regardless of reputation, may influence which school a student decides to attend.

Enrollment can also depend on who else in the student's circle of friends and acquaintances choose to attend a university. Students can be more apt to attend a university that their friends are going to attend instead of a higher education institution where they are less likely to know others that are going to attend. If a student has parents and friends who have attended or are attending, those students will consider enrollment in that university or college more seriously over a college or university where a student might be embarking on an educational journey alone. Relationships can be a very important factor on where a student chooses to attend a school and receive a diploma from a higher education institution.

### **Dissatisfaction / Choice to Leave**

The previous factors are important, however, for some students, their expectations are not met. When a student attends a school and the school does not meet their expectations, the student has the option to transfer to a school that will meet their expectations. This could be because of a change in their major or changes in the academic program they are attending at a certain school. Transferring institutions helps ensure that a student does not have to continue at a higher education institution that is not fitting their needs. Transfer students choose to change institutions for the same reasons they chose their original institution. The priorities for the current college they are attending change. Some of their priorities are not being met at their current institution, and the student decides to transfer to an institution that will help the student achieve their goals.

### **Definition of a Transfer Student**

Considering the previously mentioned factors, freshman and transfer students can choose to enroll in a specific university or college. A university or college can be defined as a 4-year or 2-year institution. These include universities, colleges, community colleges, junior colleges and online institutions. There are two types of students that enroll in higher education, freshman students and transfer students. Freshman students are the most common kind of enrollees. Freshman students are those students who enter higher education with no previous attendance at another college or university. However, freshman students may already have college credit based on standardized test scores or certain scores on different placement exams. These credits do not exclude these freshman students from being considered freshmen instead of transfer students. Freshman students attend orientation in order to prepare themselves for the transition from high school to an institution. Freshman students can be enrolled part-time or full-time, and

their successful graduation time is measured by the federal government as obtaining a bachelor degree within the six-year period of beginning their college education.

The other type of enrollment is a transfer student. Each university determines its own definition of a transfer student. While the definition of a transfer student varies amongst different institutions, an agreeable measure is one that a transfer student moves from one institution to another institution with college work completed after high school graduation (Louisiana State University, 2014). These credits help determine what classification in a university or college the student needs to be enrolled in, such as freshman, sophomore, junior, or senior status. It also helps to determine what senior college or program a student is eligible for in which to enroll. Transfer students are already acclimated to the university setting and lifestyle and are thus required to complete different institutionally mandated activities. A transfer orientation focuses less on understanding university life and tends to focus more on what courses will transfer as to the university and how these courses will help the student graduate. Transfer students make up less of a university or college's population. These students can also become lost in the university because of a lack of attention a university focuses on them. Transfer students are vital to enrollment and pay the same tuition as the freshman students with the same residential characteristics such as in-state students and out-of-state students.

The research institution uses two different types of transfer student criteria. One is for students who enter the university with less than 30 college hours. These students also have to meet the requirements for incoming freshman students (i.e. high school record) as well as the criteria for transfer students. The second criterion is for students who have 30 or more transferrable hours. The criterion of a 30 transfer hour delineation as described above, will allow for the exclusion of high school information from students with less than 30 transferrable hours

needing to be used for analysis. Using the 30 hour delineation criterion, only students who are transferring with at least 30 hours of college course work, a college-level English, a college-level math, and a minimum 2.5 GPA will be evaluated on acceptance and enrollment to the university (Louisiana State University, 2014).

### **Purpose of Study**

The primary purpose of this study was to determine whether or not selected demographic, academic, and institutional characteristics influence the decision of admitted transfer students to enroll in a research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States.

### **Dependent Variable**

The dependent variable for the study was whether or not a transfer student who was admitted to the university then enrolled in a research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States for the summer 2013-2014 academic school year.

### **Specific Objectives**

The following specific objectives were formulated to guide this research study:

1. To describe transfer students who were admitted and enrolled for the summer 2013-2014 academic school year as defined by their payment of fees and inclusion in the 14th class-day statistics at a research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States on the following demographic and academic characteristics:
  - a) Gender;
  - b) Race;
  - c) State the student reported as his/her permanent address;
  - d) Whether or not the student was classified as a resident of the state;
  - e) Whether or not the student applied as a freshman;

- f) Whether the most recent transfer institution was in-state or out-of-state;
- g) Whether or not the student's parent graduated from the institution;
- h) Overall transfer grade point average;
- i) Overall number of transfer credit hours earned;
- j) Overall number of transfer hours attempted;
- k) Whether or not a student has a degree from a higher education institution;
- l) Whether a student is transferring from a two-year or four-year institution.

2. To describe transfer students who were admitted but did not enroll for the summer 2013-2014 academic school year as defined by their nonpayment of fees and non-inclusion in the 14 class-day statistics at a research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States on the following demographic and academic characteristics:

- a) Gender;
- b) Race;
- c) State the student reported as his/her permanent address;
- d) Whether or not the student was classified as a resident of the state;
- e) Whether or not the student applied as a freshman;
- f) Whether or not the more recent transfer institution was in-state or out-of-state;
- g) Whether or not the student's parent graduated from the institution;
- h) Overall transfer grade point average;
- i) Overall number of transfer credit hours earned;
- j) Overall number of transfer credit hours attempted;
- k) Whether or not a student has a degree from a higher education institution;
- l) Whether a student is transferring from a two-year or four-year institution.

3. To compare transfer students who were admitted and enrolled for the summer 2013-2014 academic school year as defined by their payment of fees and inclusion in the 14<sup>th</sup> class-day statistics at a research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States to those transfer students who were admitted but did not enroll for the summer 2013-2014 academic school year as defined by their nonpayment of fees and non-inclusion in the 14<sup>th</sup> class-day statistics at the same institution on the following demographic and academic characteristics:

- a) Gender;
- b) Race;
- c) State student reported as his/her permanent address;
- d) Whether or not the student was classified as a resident of the state;
- e) Whether or not the student applied as a freshman;
- f) Whether the most recent transfer institution was in-state or out-of-state;
- g) Whether or not the student's parent graduated from the institution;
- h) Overall transfer grade point average;
- i) Overall number of transfer credit hours earned;
- j) Overall number of transfer credit hours attempted;
- k) Whether or not a student has a degree from a higher education institution;
- l) Whether a student is transferring from a two-year or four-year institution.

4. To determine if a model existed that allows the researcher to correctly classify transfer students who are admitted to a Research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States on whether or not the student will enroll from the following characteristics:

- a) Gender;
- b) Race;

- c) State student reported as his/her permanent address;
- d) Whether or not the student was classified as a resident of the state;
- e) Whether or not the student applied as a freshman;
- f) Whether the most recent transfer institution was in-state or out-of-state;
- g) Whether or not the student's parent graduated from the institution;
- h) Overall transfer grade point average;
- i) Overall number of transfer credit hours earned;
- j) Overall number of transfer credit hours attempted;
- k) Whether or not a student has a degree from a higher education institution;
- l) Whether a student is transferring from a two-year or four-year institution.

### **Definition of Terms**

The instrument used to gather the data consisted of a computerized recording form with specific variables identified based on relevant literature and obtainable data. The obtainable data were gathered from the Office of Enrollment Management database regarding applicants and the appropriate admission decision of admit and enrollment. The information was downloaded from a secure file with no personal identifiable information. The recorded variables were defined as follows:

- a) Gender- As reported by the student;
- b) Race- As reported by the student;
- c) State- As reported to the Office of Enrollment Management as home address;
- d) Residency- As defined as in-state or out-of-state for fee purposes;
- e) Whether or not the student applied as a freshman- As determined by the Office of Enrollment Management records;

- f) Most recent transfer institution- whether most recent transfer institution was designated as in in-state institution or an out-of-state institution;
- g) Parental Attendance-Whether or not the student's parent(s) attended the university as reported on the application by the student;
- h) Overall Transfer GPA- Cumulative grade point average from all institutions attended prior to attending new transfer institution;
- i) Overall Transfer Earned Credit Hours- As determined by the Office of Enrollment Management. This includes all credit hours from accredited higher education institutions. No remedial courses count toward earned credit hours;
- j) Overall Transfer Attempted Credit Hours- As determined by the Office of Enrollment Management. This includes all credit hours from accredited higher education institutions. No remedial courses counted toward attempted credit hours;
- k) Degree-Whether or not a student had an associate degree upon transferring;
- l) Whether the institution transferring from is a two-year or four-year institution- A two-year institution is defined as a higher education institution that offers primarily an associate degree. A four-year institution is defined as one that primarily offers a bachelor degree.

## CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

### **Recruiting**

Recruiting is a vital part of a university's success in enrolling the maximum amount of prospective students. Recruiting allows universities to showcase their academic achievements, their campus, and the opportunities that prospective students will have upon attending the university. Universities use many different methods to recruit students. These can range from group campus tours, to individual tours, or recruitment letters.

### **Campus Tours**

There are many different strategies and methods focused upon by universities to make sure that the maximum amount of potential students are positively influenced by the admissions process. One of these methods is the implementation of campus tours. Washburn and Petroschius (2004) analyzed and worked on a campus tour program to help improve the quality. They estimated that this tour program potentially influenced more than 10,000 prospective students. Working with the admissions' office, they incorporated university students in a marketing class to help develop an appropriate strategy for the tour office. The recommendations the students gave revolved around the importance of keeping the same tour guides in the office. The importance of this would be that the tour guides would know the information better and would, therefore, be better able to disseminate the information more appropriately (Washburn & Petroschius, 2004). The most important findings that they suggested and that were implemented involved making sure that the potential students on the tour felt a personal connection to the university. The tour guides were given business cards to hand out and were then evaluated by the members of the tour in order to make sure they were doing their job effectively and that student's needs were met. Washburn and Petroschius (2004) also suggested that the tour guides

keep in contact with the members of the tour to reinforce the personal relationship. Campus tours are very important for potential students.

On campus tours, members of the tour are taken around campus to see different buildings and dorm rooms that the students could possibly be using while enrolled at the university. To evaluate how important it is for these students to enjoy their campus visit and appreciate the layout of the campus, Reynolds (2007) studied how important perceptions of buildings on campus really are to students. In order to do this, he gathered information from 16,153 students from 46 higher education institutions. Of these, 13,782 were from the U.S., and that is what he described in his study. Sixty-seven percent reported that they currently attended a university with over 25,000 students. Thirty-one percent reported that they were enrolled in a school with less than 2,500 students and the remaining 2% were in other types of institutions. From his study, two-thirds of the respondents felt that the quality of the campus facilities was a factor in attending an institution, while half were influenced by the attractiveness of the campus as important for attendance. Academic facilities were rated at the top of the reasons for selecting a campus. Residence halls were also rated highly in importance to visit while taking a tour. Reynolds (2007) also noted the importance of low quality facilities. Twenty-nine percent, 26%, and 16% of students indicated that they had rejected a university for lack of a building, an inadequate building, or poor maintenance of a building, respectively.

### **Transfer vs. Non-Transfer Students**

In his study concerning the importance of facilities, Reynolds (2007) uncovered an interesting finding regarding non-transfer students and transfer students. Non-transfer students visited a campus more often than did transfer students, but this finding was really reflected in the components of the university that each group held important. Non-transfer students wanted to

see campus facilities and many of the student life facilities more often than transfer students. Transfer students were more concerned with academic facilities such as the library and research laboratories. This finding sheds light on the idea that transfer students are already past the initial phase of leaving their home and starting new and are more concerned with the level of education that they are receiving. This may also be due to the fact that there is a rift between transfer students and the universities that they are attempting to attend next. Handel (2009) discussed the problems that transfer students have in the United States. He argued for a more streamlined, accepting process for transfer students in admissions' offices around the country. Handel (2009) accused full-time faculty at selective institutions of looking down upon students that are transferring from other universities, specifically community colleges and 2-year institutions. However, he offered suggestions on how to bridge the gap between the two factions. He suggested that 4-year institutions offer more support to incoming transfer students. This in turn would allow them to make the grades in order to retain at their new university. Handel (2009) also called for the recruiting of transfer students because it can enhance the diversity of a 4-year institution's campus.

### **Minority Recruitment**

In terms of recruiting for two-year colleges, Opp (2001) stressed the importance for these institutions to implement policies that catered to minority students. He studied the effect that the race of chief student affairs officers had on the ability to recruit minority students. He also studied the influence of race on potential students when they had interactions with minority faculty and staff. Six hundred and forty-one chief student affairs officers were surveyed with a response rate of 54.6%. Opp (2001) discovered that almost two-thirds of the respondents reported making advances in recruiting minority students. Of those returning the survey, the

chief student affairs officers reporting that affirmative action was important to their institution for financial reasons had more minority students (Opp, 2001). Offering information in a student's native language was an important factor in recruiting minority students to these 2-year institutions. Opp (2001) argued that this sends the message to potential students that the institution is accepting to everyone. Also, a positive predictor of minority enrollment included having members of minority members of boards at the institution. Institutions with minority administrators and faculty showed an increase in minority students. This could be due to the fact that minority students feel more welcome at these universities because they can relate to the faculty.

Opp (2001) also made two other important findings in his report. One was that institutions that were involved in the community high schools to develop appropriate college courses had greater percentages of minority students. This could be attributed to their constant interaction with the students at these high schools. Another finding was that dual-enrollment programs in minority high schools attracted more minority students to a 2-year community college (Opp, 2001). This, he argued, is because it shows students that they are capable of pursuing higher education and they have the support of college faculty. In accordance with these findings, Pitts (2009) also discussed the increase in enrollment when her university's faculty started to get more involved with the community. Pitts (2009) began an initiative to get the faculty into the community and establish relationships with minority youth in order to foster a desire to continue their education once graduating from high school. She began a program where students could come together during the summer and learn about business topics that were not only applicable to their everyday lives, but also to prepare them for postsecondary education. To

go along with this initiative, she started a program where students could take an accounting course for college credit so that these disadvantaged youth have an opportunity to attend college.

### **Recruitment Medium**

In order to best recruit students to a university, the university needs to know and understand what medium is the most effective way to sell the university to the potential students. Since there are so many different ways to pass along information to students, Goff, Patino, and Jackson (2004), analyzed the data to determine what type of students responded to certain types of information. They collected data from 813 high school students from 14 schools. Of these, only 716 students expressed the desire to attend college and the rest of the respondents' information was discarded. The students were then divided into two groups, those planning to attend 4-year institutions and those planning to attend 2-year institutions (Goff, Patino, & Jackson, 2004). They used three categories to study: media sources, social normative sources, and direct sources. For those planning on attending 4-year institutions, social normative (family, peers, students) and direct sources (counselors, college fairs, scholarships, websites, etc.) were significantly different than those for 2-year institutions. Important sources for 2-year institutions included scholarship resources, family, websites, school officials, fairs, and other students (Goff et al., 2004). According to Goff et al. (2004), the most important for 4-year institutions included scholarship resources, websites, school counselors, other students, family, fairs, and libraries. There were also differences among different races going to 2-year colleges as to what the preferred medium was to get information. Asians and other races preferred magazines more than African Americans. Hispanics and other races preferred teachers more than African Americans. Whites, Hispanics, and other races preferred other students more than African Americans (Goff et al., 2004). Goff et al. (2004) also found differences among races planning on attending 4-year

institutions. African Americans and Hispanics preferred school counselors more than Whites. They also preferred college fairs more than Whites and Asians. They argued that neighborhoods are usually composed of likes (Goff et al., 2004). This means that there is a potential commonality in members of neighborhoods concerning socioeconomic status (SES), race, culture, and life styles. These findings could help universities target the appropriate race based on the demographics of a neighborhood.

The previous study noted that students planning to attend either 2-year or 4-year institutions depended on websites for obtaining information and making decisions to attend certain universities. Lindbeck and Fodrey (2009) examined what websites and technology are most frequently used by universities and also what tend to be used by most high school students preparing for college. They surveyed 36 institutions concerning the types of communication these universities were using to connect with students. They argued that this is important because millennial students are looking for more focused communications such as text messages, instant messaging, social networks, and other technological forms. Their study focused on what specific activities these 36 institutions were using in order to communicate with prospective students. Lindbeck and Fodrey (2009) found that the most commonly used technologies were social networking, school website, email, and cell phones. The top 20 types of communication all fell within the realm of these four categories. These communications fell into the categories of either a two-way or a one-way communication style. In their study, Lindbeck and Fodrey (2009) found that the most commonly used communications are reported to have a very low return. This translates to the idea that universities are consistently using technology that they do not feel like it helps with recruiting.

In order to effectively use the new technology that is available to students, Mentz and Whiteside (2003) laid out the parameters for an admissions office to use for setting up a website to maximize recruiting potential. They argued that this is important because high school graduates are spending less time at universities and more time researching universities in the privacy of their own homes. School websites are tailored to members of the university; however, they should be tailored to those outside the university who are simply looking for information about the university (Mentz & Whiteside, 2003). Mentz and Whiteside (2003) suggested tying in relevant school information onto the website. This information could include alumni information such as annual salaries post-graduation. It should also include statistics of where former students are and give pictures and testimonials from these students. They also stressed promoting the professors and administration. Students want to learn from respected experts in the fields of study (Mentz & Whiteside, 2003). They suggested including scholarship information and how long it normally takes to hear back after the admission process begins. One very interesting suggestion from the authors was to have an 800 number for contact. This allows students who live out of the area code the opportunity to contact the university without being charged for the long distance call. Another interesting note from these authors was the necessity to take into account internet capabilities. Not all prospective students live in an area with high speed internet but must use dial-up modems. They suggested making sure that web pages are either simple or that the website offers different formats to view the web page.

### **Influences on Student Choices**

#### **Cost**

There are many different influences on students that make them apply to certain institutions. One of these influences concerns cost. Students must take into account the tuition,

cost-of-living, room and board, etc. that a university requires in order to attend. Lillis and Tian (2008) analyzed how influential cost actually was on students attending a certain university. They studied 289 undergraduate students. The sample consisted of 58 freshmen, 118 sophomores, 75 juniors, and 38 seniors from a small university. In order to help with their data, they also received information regarding the student's financial situation. Six students reported being affluent, 17 very rich, 44 rich, 186 well-to-do, 20 poor, 1 very poor, and 15 reported as other (Lillis & Tian, 2008). They were then grouped into three categories of upper income, representing affluent, very rich, rich, and well-to-do; lower income, consisting of poor and very poor; and middle income, which had two other categories. Their findings suggested that tuition was the most important factor students took into account when deciding on which college to attend. The authors found that fewer students applied at more expensive universities, even though they expected there to be fewer applicants. Their study also provided information about upper income students being more likely to apply to institutions than lower income students when the cost of tuition was high. The opposite also holds true. When the cost of tuition is low, lower income students are more likely to apply to institutions than upper income students (Lillis & Tian, 2008). Concerning an institution's reputation, the authors found that a less reputable school with a low tuition will be chosen if the cost is appropriate.

They also analyzed how students perceived an institution's support for students with financial aid. The authors found that as the tuition increases, students who placed more weight on supportive institutions are more likely to apply to those institutions than students who were not as concerned with costs. To follow along with these findings, students who self-finance their higher education are more likely to apply to institutions that offer more financial aid and scholarships. Lillis and Tian (2008) also found that if a student lives close to an institution, this

increases the chances that a student will attend due to the money saved by living close to the institution and their home. The influence of distance is one of many factors that influence where a student chooses to go to college.

Not surprisingly, the economy plays an important role in whether or not a person goes to college and where a person attends college. To study the importance of the economy on people pursuing higher education, Bozick (2009) studied the phenomenon of how, when the economy is prospering and jobs are available, why people tend to not pursue higher education. He also studied the reverse effect to see if more people attended postsecondary education when the economy and unemployment rates were high. He argued that youth in locales that have an abundance of jobs that do not require a college degree will not pursue college and instead, these youth will enter the workforce upon graduation. However, if the youth live in an area where jobs are not plentiful, then these youth will graduate and pursue a postsecondary education. This is important because more youth from low socioeconomic status (SES) backgrounds are attending college, and tuition costs are rising (Bozick, 2009). Bozick (2009) also hypothesized that 2-year institutions are geared towards preparing students for the workforce more immediately than are 4-year institutions. This means that more students ready to enter the workforce may attend 2-year institutions because they will graduate faster and the education is less expensive than a 4-year institution. Bozick (2009) studied 14,713 students who were sophomores in high school in 2002 and then again completed another questionnaire as seniors in 2004. His findings confirmed a hypothesis that students will enroll in postsecondary education when job opportunities are scarce. Bozick found that the job market had no influence on whether or not a student entered a 2- or 4-year institution. Bozick's (2009) study confirmed his idea that youth enter school based on unemployment. If unemployment rates are low, students are more likely to attend 2- and 4-

year institutions equally. However, as unemployment increases, students are more likely to attend 4-year institutions than 2-year institutions (Bozick, 2009).

## Parents

Parents also play an important role in helping decide where a student will apply and possibly attend college. Turley (2006) studied the influence of parents who want their children to stay at home and attend college versus parents who have no preference whether their child leaves home to go to college. She posited that no matter what a student's SES is, most parents want their children to attend college and at least get a bachelor degree (Turley, 2006). According to her, some parents wanted their children to stay at home because the financial benefits are greater than moving away. Students do not have to contend with the issues of paying rent and traveling to and from home. Students also do not need to pay for new furniture or other necessities that they already have in the parents' home, especially at in-state institutions and community colleges (Turley, 2006). Turley (2006) surveyed 25,000 eighth graders in 1988 and followed up with these students again their senior year of high school. Of the 25,000 students originally surveyed, the second follow-up included 17,153 students. Her survey asked these students about the number of colleges the students applied to. She examined the data comparing students who did apply to college against those who did not. Then, she studied the responses of students only applying to one college against those students applying to many. The author did several follow-up surveys with the students after the second survey was completed. She found that those students who did not apply to college during their senior year were less likely to finish a degree, even if they did go to college. Also, of those students who did not apply their senior year, one-third were enrolled in a postsecondary institution in a follow-up survey. However, of these, 79% did not obtain a degree from a 4-year institution.

Turley (2006) also included the parents in the study. She grouped them into two categories, parents who wanted their children to stay close to home (college-at-home parents) and those who were indifferent as to where their children attended school (college-anywhere parents). Slightly over half of the parents in the study were college-at-home parents. She found that students with college-at-home parents were almost 33% less likely to apply to college than students with college-anywhere parents. However, college-at-home students were almost three-fourths as likely to apply to multiple colleges as college-anywhere students.

Turley (2006) also examined if this had anything to do with test scores. Her study revealed that students whose parents wanted them to stay close to home applied to fewer schools no matter what the students' test scores were. Some characteristics common to college-at-home parents were racial minority, lack of a college education, single parents, and not willing to go into debt for child's education (Turley, 2006). Turley (2006) showed that students tended to follow their parents' preferences when applying to college. About three-fourths of students with college-at-home parents did apply to schools near home. The trend continued with students of college-anywhere parents with 91% of students agreeing with applying to college away from home. The author uncovered interesting findings regarding race and application to college. Turley (2006) found that Asian American and Black students were twice as likely to apply to multiple colleges as White students. Also Hispanic students were just as likely as Whites to apply to multiple colleges.

#### Distance

With the parent's influence playing a part in the decision of where students actually apply to school, Mattern and Wyatt (2009) evaluated how far students actually did travel away from home in order to attend college. They created a sample size of 916,466 students who completed

the SAT. In order to analyze distance, the authors used the zip code provided on the SAT registration form and the university zip code of where the students actually attended college. The calculated distance between the two zip codes came from the center point in each one, not necessarily the driving distance. Their information found that the median distance traveled was 94 miles with the 25<sup>th</sup> percentile comprising 23 miles and the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile comprising 230 miles. Of these slightly over 70% of the students stayed in-state and around 12% attended school in a bordering state. For 31 states, most students attended school within 100 miles of the address they used to receive their SAT scores.

### Family Income

A subset of the previous paragraph's sample, 697,610 students, was used in order to do further analysis. This set was used because all these students took the SAT and their student demographic information was fully available. When the authors studied student's family income, not surprisingly, it was found that students of families with high income traveled farther away from home in order to attend college (Mattern & Wyatt, 2009). This is probably due to the fact that these families can afford the costs of a student moving out of the house, as well as paying out-of-state tuition. In accordance with Turley (2006), Mattern and Wyatt (2009) also found that students with family members receiving a postsecondary degree tended to move away from home at a greater rate. Race also played a part in the distance students were willing to travel to attend college. American-Indian students traveled around the same distance away from home to attend school with African-American students slightly behind their median distance. Hispanic and Asian students traveled the least farthest away from home. The median distance for females to travel away from home was less than the distance males traveled, though not by much.

## Financial Aid Model

Another factor in attending college concerns the perception and ability for prospective students to receive financial aid. Tierney and Venegas (2009) analyzed three different state models in providing financial aid to students attempting to attend college. They argued that there are numerous environmental factors that allow access to financial aid. They analyzed funding programs in California, Nevada, and Kansas to determine if the programs set in place in those states actually increase the likelihood and probability that a student will attend college. They argued that implementing programs to disadvantaged youth early on in their secondary careers, such as promoting the importance of classes and keeping grades up, will keep the focus on higher education by offering incentives to do well and then receive funding for college. In California, a program is in place where a student has to graduate with a 2.0 grade point average (GPA) in order to receive a grant. However, there are different levels of this grant. Tierney and Venegas (2009) focused on Cal Grant A, which is the most fully funded option. For this grant, however, students must maintain at least a 3.0 GPA. Students applying for this grant also have to be low income students. Tierney and Venegas (2009) argued that there is a disconnect between the information given to the students and the actual requirements of the grants. Students do not realize that there are certain courses that they must take in order to be eligible for the colleges they are hoping to attend. Also, California only allots enough money to the program based on how many people are applying for the program. If no one is applying, then the state does not put a significant amount of money into the program. Kansas State Scholars is a program offered by the state of Kansas for which students can take advantage and receive money for college. In order to receive this money, students must achieve certain ACT scores, income status, education requirements, and GPA requirements. This program changes yearly. It is based

on the scores of the state as a whole. If scores increase, then the competitive nature of the award increases. If scores are low, then the requirements are not as high (Tierney & Venegas, 2009). There are several other programs in Kansas for the students who do not receive this award, however, the monetary value is not as high as the Kansas State Scholars program. The authors then analyzed the state of Nevada's Millenium Scholars Program. To be eligible for this program, students must live in Nevada, be accepted to a Nevada school, and have a GPA of at least 2.0. This program is not based on SES or family income. According to Tierney & Venegas (2009), recently Nevada has changed these requirements and is now losing much of its pool of students because the information provided to the students keeps changing. The authors' conclusion that the pool of potential students is decreasing does not stem from poor academic performance or state willingness to increase financial aid for students to attend college. They suggested that the lack of information disseminated to students and parents creates the problem. Families do not think that they are eligible for financial aid and they do not have access to the information to check to see if they are because the information is difficult for them to interpret (Tierney & Venegas, 2009).

### **Factors Predicting Success and Enrollment**

#### **Standardized Test Scores and Class Rank**

After targeting what factors can influence a student to attend a university, it is also important to know how that student is going to perform at the university and the likelihood that the student will remain in school. Admissions' offices look at many different factors to assist in determining if a student is a right fit for the school. Espenshade, Hale, and Chung (2005) examined whether or not it is more beneficial for a student to have a high class rank in a lesser known school or if it is better to have a lower rank in a school that performs at a high caliber.

They gathered information on 45,549 students from three highly selective private universities. They used SAT I and Advanced Placement (AP) scores to help determine what high schools to choose. They also incorporated admissions' officers to help in the study by determining their top 72 high schools in the nation. Of the students, the authors noted that females, Black students, Hispanic students, athletes, and legacy applicants have a significantly greater chance of getting in than others. Asian students with the same high school accomplishments as their White counterparts are 30% less likely to be admitted into the selective universities studied. Espenshade et al. (2005) found that a student's SAT score is a significant predictor of whether or not a student will gain admission to the university. AP scores are also a predictor of admission. Students who took an AP course are 31% more likely to be admitted over a student with none. The more AP courses a student takes, the greater the chance a student has of getting into the selective university.

Other researchers have studied other factors that could possibly predict whether or not a student is going to succeed in school. One of these factors is the opportunity to take AP courses. Klopfenstein and Thomas (2009) studied the effect that taking AP courses has on admissions to a university and the retention of students in the university they first attend. They noted that AP courses are not just school courses. They are an entity that state government uses as a means to evaluate high schools as they believe that AP courses ensure college success.

The authors acknowledged the importance universities place on high school rank and argued that students who do not take many AP courses at schools where they are offered are at a disadvantage because AP courses carry more weight than other courses. To study the effect that AP courses actually have on student success in college, Klopfenstein and Thomas (2009) studied 28,000 Texas high school graduates. Their definition of success was second year retention and

first-year GPA. Non-AP taking Black and Hispanic students had the lowest retention rates with the highest retention rates belonging to AP taking White students. First-year GPA also follows the retention rates. White students who took AP courses had the highest GPA while the lowest belonged to non-AP taking Black students. After studying the data, the researchers found that taking a greater number of AP courses only benefited White students. Black and Hispanic students increased their likelihood of retention up until the fourth AP course after which the retention levels began to decrease (Klopfenstein & Thomas, 2009). When including non-AP courses with taking AP courses, the probability of retention among Hispanic students increased. According to the data of the authors, for Hispanic students, participating in an AP science course significantly increases retention while AP science is not significant for White or Black students. For Whites and Blacks, completing AP Economics is a significant predictor of retention until other courses taken by a student are included. The retention rate for these two races drop around 75% when AP English is added to a student's non-AP curriculum.

Klopfenstein and Thomas (2009) also measured the students' GPA against AP courses. Their research showed different results than previous research. When evaluating the influence of AP courses on GPA, the authors found the data to be insignificant correlating these two for Hispanic and Black students. However, when including non-AP courses, the coefficient is nearly eight times larger for Hispanic and Black students. AP Economics is beneficial to White students regarding GPA. AP science, AP Economics, and AP Psychology are reported to be beneficial to Hispanic students regarding GPA. However, no courses show significant correlations for Black students. The authors' data showed that the most common AP courses, English, calculus, and history, show no positive effect on retention or GPA. Regardless of whether it is or is not an AP course, taking calculus is a positive predictor of GPA and retention.

Regarding SAT scores, if a student does not score high in a school that has an average SAT score ranging from 1000-1200, then the student has a 20% less chance of being accepted at these universities over a student who has a high score in a school of scores below 1000. Espenshade et al. (2005) also compared SAT and ACT probabilities upon these universities. They found that students taking the ACT had a 31% better chance to gain admission into the university than those taking the SAT. These authors also discussed class rank as a variable concerning admission into a university. According to them, a student with an “A” average is over four times more likely to be accepted into a university than a “B” average student. Also, students in the top 10<sup>th</sup> percentile at a high school double their chances of admission (Espenshade et al., 2005). These findings suggested that high school quality is a factor in determining admission into universities.

Since the high school a student attends is important, Tam and Sukhatme (2004) analyzed data to determine the importance of having a model to better develop a student’s class rank relative to the quality of the student’s school. Like Espenshade et al. (2005), Tam and Sukhatme (2004) included a high school’s average ACT score as a predictor of quality. Other factors they included in the evaluation of a high school’s quality include the academic performance of students, number of students going to college, teacher qualification, and if AP courses are offered (Tam & Sukhatme, 2004). They decided to use a new model involving these characteristics to determine high school quality and studied information of 2,529 students who attended college in 1994. They followed these students for six years in order to establish a method for determining whether or not their model would prove effective. Their new model included four variables. They tested a student’s ACT score, the average ACT score of student’s high school, high school percentile rank, and a modified high school percentile rank, student’s

school rank and high school quality (Tam & Sukhatme, 2004). They found that the ACT score, also the most significant of the variables on graduation in six years, had an impact twice as large when compared against a student's high school percentile rank.

### School Type

Another question the authors attempted to answer concerned the type of school that students attended. Students attending private schools were over 25% more likely to gain admission into a university than students graduating from public schools. Students attending religious affiliated schools were slightly less likely to gain admission. Of the top 72 schools that the admissions' officers targeted, students coming from these schools were almost 35% more likely to gain admission than students who did not attend these schools (Espenshade, Hale, & Chung, 2005).

Espenshade et al. (2005) also looked at admission acceptance for students with regards to their high schools. They used the average SAT score for a high school and the average number of AP courses taken at a high school to measure against student acceptance. When looking at this, attending a private school gave a student a 40% greater chance of admission over the other schools. Also, students from religiously affiliated schools and schools from the 72 preferential schools had around a 10% advantage over public school attendees. Their findings also revealed that students that come from high schools where no AP courses are taken compared to those students where high schools offer AP courses are taken have a greater chance of being accepted to a school. However, if a student comes from a school where a great number of AP tests are taken, but the student does not take any, then the chances of being admitted decrease (Espenshade et al., 2005). At high schools where students took an average of 1.5 AP tests or

more, but a student did not take any AP tests, then the chances of that student being accepted dropped by over 50%.

### Financial Aid

DesJardins, Ahlburg, and McCall (2006) investigated the role tuition and financial aid has on students applying and enrolling in universities. They noted the fact that tuition is increasing and with this, universities may have to address this fact with a different approach to financial aid. They hypothesized that students choose universities with students similar to themselves and to where they feel like others that attend are similar to them. As noted by Tierney and Venegas (2009), there are financial aid opportunities available, just not all students take advantage of the opportunity. In order to combat this problem in their study, DesJardins et al. (2006) built into the study the idea that everyone applied and received the appropriate amount of aid needed. In order to make sure they achieved their goal, they looked at student characteristics such as ACT score, high school GPA, AP courses, high school rank, etc. They also looked at demographic characteristics such as race, ethnicity, and gender. In beginning their study, DesJardins et al. (2006) initiated a sample of 97,636 students who sent their ACT information to the institution. From these, over 86,000 students' information was useable and 40% actually applied to attend the university. Of those that applied, 90% were admitted and roughly 47% of these students enrolled (DesJardins, Ahlburg, & McCall, 2006). Their initial information showed that those with lower scores did not even apply to the university. However, students with high ACT scores and rank did apply. This could be because they knew they would meet the requirements. Their study found that African-Americans and Hispanics were more likely to receive financial aid from the university over White students. This followed other studies' findings.

Another interesting finding by the authors was the fact that high-achieving students tended to get less financial aid than students with lower ACT scores and lower high school ranks. Their study found that women have a higher probability, 22%, of applying than do men. White students' odds of applying for aid were 85% and 27% less likely than Asian Americans and Hispanics, respectively. The farther a student lived from campus, the likelihood of applying dropped. Every 100 miles from campus brought about a 9% decrease in a student's likelihood of applying to the university (DesJardins et al., 2006). Other data they found showed that as tuition and unemployment in other states increased, applications at their university increased as well. Concerning enrollment, students with high test scores and grades tended not to enroll. Also, White students were more likely to enroll than African American and Hispanic students (DesJardins et al., 2006). Their findings showed that a student's expectation of receiving aid from an institution is significantly related to whether or not that student will actually apply and enroll. Also, the amount a student expected and received played a role in whether or not a student enrolled. If a student received less aid than initially thought, the student was not likely to enroll compared to students who received aid in excess of expectations (DesJardins et al., 2006).

### Learning Style

Garton, Ball, and Dyer (2002) studied different learning styles and the impact that university admission requirements have on admission into the university and college success. In order to understand this relationship, Garton et al. (2002) studied two sets of students, 245 freshmen in 1997 and 195 freshmen in 1998. To best evaluate college success, the authors used the academic GPA at the end of the academic freshmen year. The two learning styles that the authors investigated were field-dependent and field-independent learning styles. Field-dependent learners were motivated by outside forces; field-independent learners were learners

who were more individualistic (Garton, Ball, & Dyer, (2002). In their study, the majority of students tended to be field-independent learners for both years. For both years, field-independent students were more likely to earn a higher GPA than students classified as field-dependent learners. This, however, does not translate to field-independent learning style predicting the success of freshmen. In their study, the success of the 1997 sample of freshmen was best predicted by evaluating their high school GPAs and their ACT scores. This was not the best prediction for the 1998 sample. For the 1998 sample, the high school GPA was the best characteristic to use in predicting whether or not a student performed well their freshmen year.

In contrast to Epsenshade et al. (2005), Rothstein (2004) studied the predictive power of SAT scores and found them to be less predictive than other researchers. In order to test the hypothesis, the author studied 22,526 students that applied to, were accepted by, and enrolled in the University of California system. The components of his study included the SAT scores, freshmen GPA, information provided by test takers on the SAT, and demographics. In this data, the author found that SAT scores are more correlated with a student's background than GPA in either high school or college freshmen year. He also found that females have higher high school and freshmen year GPA's than do males. Asians have higher high school GPAs and lower freshmen GPAs and SAT scores than whites. Rothstein (2004) argued that students' backgrounds and their high school's characteristics play an important role in the predictive power of the SAT. The study showed that high school GPA is more of a predictor of SAT scores than race or gender. Rothstein argued that a school's demographics (e.g. race and socioeconomic status) lower the SAT's predictive power by 50% (Rothstein, 2004). He argued that eliminating a student's background when calculating SAT scores helps to increase the effectiveness of the standardized test.

Test scores are a frequently used predictor of academic success and are the focal point of college admission. Another important factor in increasing diversity at higher education institutions is SES. SES affects the quality of schools that students attend and the opportunities available to them. Young and Johnson (2004) evaluated an SES model of admission in order to avoid any legal problems if affirmative action is no longer used in the role of admitting prospective college students. For their study, Young and Johnson (2004) selected 9,806 applicants to a university. Of the sample, yield rates for minority students were higher than non-minority students. However, non-minority students scored higher on the SAT, had a higher rank in high school class, and were predicted to have a higher GPA than minority students (Young & Johnson, 2004). Non-minority students also showed higher values on four SES variables: parental education, total income, high school SAT scores, and the percentage of students attending a 4-year institution from their high school. Young and Johnson (2004) included a predictive model based on SES. From this model, non-minority students were predicted to have high first-year GPAs, however, the differences between the SES model and the non-SES model for this variable, first-year GPAs, were closer to the actual GPAs when the SES model was included. The model studied by the authors based solely on academics showed an acceptance decrease in minority students at about 33.2% as opposed to around 17% when using the created SES model. From the overall study, Young and Johnson (2004) argued that quality of students is higher when using the SES model over the traditional method and the academic method. They also argued that this outcome is good because it avoids the practice of using race and affirmative action and instead focuses on socioeconomic status, which would be more likely to hold up in a legal situation.

Like Young and Johnson (2004), Mattson (2007) studied an aspect of university admissions concerning students who are at-risk for not succeeding in college. Mattson (2007) gathered data on over 900 students who entered a university in a program targeting students that were academically vulnerable, meaning low test scores and low GPAs. Of these students, around 40% were White, 20% black/African American, 9% Asian/Pacific Islander, 20% Hispanic, and 11% other with a significantly lower than average GPA and SAT score from the normal population of the university. From this study, Mattson (2007) found that there were three main factors contributing to the success and retention of this sample. The first was that a higher high school GPA correlated with both a higher first semester GPA and a higher first-year GPA. Gender was also a contributing factor for a high first semester GPA and a first-year GPA. Women showed better scores in both of these categories than males. However, males outscored women on the SAT. Students who had leadership experience, meaning activities that included other students and held positions where authority was perceived, exhibited higher first semester and higher first-year GPAs than did students without this experience.

Zwick and Sklar (2005) studied at-risk youth and their potential success in college. Their study focused on student's ethnicity and the language that that students natively speak. Their study compared Hispanic students who learned to speak Spanish before English, Hispanic students who first spoke English, Black students who first spoke English, and White students who first learned to speak English. They collected data from 14,825 students. From this information, White students had the highest SAT scores and GPA followed by the Hispanic groups and then the Black students. Their study also found that high school GPA was a stronger predictor of success than SAT scores. Black students tended to have lower college GPAs than White students with similar high school GPAs and SAT scores. The analysis model used by

Zwick and Sklar (2005) reported a higher freshmen year GPA than what the students actually achieved. Taking into account the language of origin for these students, all groups, except the Hispanic group that spoke Spanish first, showed significance in high school GPA predicting college success. An interesting finding from the study of Zwick and Sklar (2005) was that Hispanic students who spoke Spanish first had higher college grades than Hispanic students who spoke English first. Hispanic students who spoke English first did have higher SAT scores than did the other Hispanic group.

### **Predictive Modeling**

After researchers gather the appropriate characteristics to determine which ones influence an incoming freshmen class, they can build predictive models to analyze the students' information that apply in order to help them determine which students might enroll. González and DesJardins (2002) compared a logistic regression model to an artificial neural networks (ANN) model to see which best predicts an applicant's school choice. According to the authors, the ANN model is mainly used in engineering, mathematics, and cognitive psychology. ANN is designed to work like a biological model. It theoretically runs like a neuron does in the human brain. González and Desjardins (2002) showed that ANN, like a neuron, is designed to learn from the information it receives and solves problems through these experiences. The ANN model has three layers. The input layer is the independent variables, the output layer is the dependent variables, and the hidden layer controls the weights placed on different information. These weights are initially set low and then adjusted as the process moves along. The authors argued that this model is beneficial because it allows the researcher to analyze the data one layer at a time in order to see if there are any trends. It also allows the researcher to stop the process in the event that adjustments need to be made. Once this information has been trained into the

program, new information can be input and the model will know what do to with it (Gonzalez & DesJardins, 2002).

The authors studied information of around 20,000 students' ACT scores who applied for admission into a university. Using the ANN model, the authors trained the model and tested the data. Eighty percent of the prospective students were classified correctly. This percentage included both those applying and those not applying. In their finding, the variable that is most predictive to the ANN model is the information regarding students who send their ACT scores. The next variable showing the most importance included the university in the ranking of the schools the student wanted to attend, and the next most important variable was the student's ACT score (González & DesJardins, 2002). Overall, this model had a better chance at predicting who would not apply than who would apply. The authors suggested that ANN models are very good at recognizing patterns so they could be used when logistic regression models are unable to handle the data (González & DesJardins, 2002). According to the authors, ANN models can give multiple outputs at a time, allowing for the detection of nonlinearity and other interactions. ANN models do, however, take a lot of training in order to be able to use properly. It is so new that it is not fully understood. A crucial setback with the ANN model is that the process does not fully allow for the researcher to understand what is being studied in terms of the independent and dependent variables (González & DesJardins, 2002).

As researchers' analyzed data trying to determine which students will or will not enroll in 4-year universities, Wyman (1997) studied 16 2-year colleges in the South Carolina Technical College System for retention rate of students. These were chosen because of their geographic qualities, similar financial situations, and because they have quantifiable data. Two separate years were observed for the study. The study found that when analyzing the data, the predictive

model showed that unemployment in the area and the amount of time and money an institution spent on each student compared to the amount of money a student could earn per job in the region were strongly related to retention (Wyman, 1997).

Goenner and Pauls (2006) attempted to build a predictive model that would help enhance recruitment in a university. Their model looks at data concerning enrollment and what students actually apply and enroll in a university. Their information comes from the possibility that students who live in the same zip code will have like characteristics. Instead of using individual student's demographics, this study used the demographics of the zip code a student inquired from to the university. They used a Bayesian model averaging method and found that their method correctly predicted almost 90% of enrollment decisions.

According to the authors, a desire to fulfill one's needs and expectations are reasons why students choose certain universities. They also noted that social interaction, such as peer influence and family influence, play a crucial role in where a student pursues a higher education. Goenner and Pauls' (2006) study included 15,827 students with 2,067 students actually enrolling. Their study found that as a student's zip code extends from the university, the student is less likely to enroll, however, if the student's zip code increases in distance from a rival university, the probability of the student enrolling in this institution increases. The college's demographics and the average income of the student's zip code provided a positive correlation with the probability of enrollment (Goenner & Pauls, 2006). Contacting the institution had positive effects on enrollment. As the number of inquiries and campus visits increased, so did the likelihood of a student actually enrolling.

### **Summary of the Literature Review**

One of the issues addressed in the review of literature was recruitment. Campus tours are important in recruiting students to universities. Retaining tour guides was important for students when choosing a university. Having the ability to establish a relationship with a tour guide was important. On these tours, students felt that the quality of the school's facilities was very important in the decision to choose a university. Students rated academic facilities and residence halls as important to attendance. Also, if a school had inadequate facilities, students would reject that institution. On these tours, nontransfer students were more interested in visiting student life facilities and transfer students tended to be more concerned with the library and other research facilities.

The research discussed the problems that transfer students have when coming from their initial university. Researchers have discussed how poor the perception of transfer students from two-year schools tended to be with faculty at the four-year university. The suggestions offered to combat this problem were to offer more support to students so that they would be retained at the university as well as increase diversity among four-year universities.

In recruiting students, the research showed that there was a difference in the way to recruit a student depending on what type of institution, two-year versus four-year, that student was going to attend. Students planning to attend four-year institutions were more apt to use their social normative (i.e. family, friends) and direct (i.e. counselors, scholarships) sources to choose their school. Those planning to attend a two-year higher education institution tended to depend on social normative, direct sources, and other students. Other research showed that technology played a key role. Social networks, an institution's website, and other technologies influenced where the student chose to attend school.

Cost of attendance and financial aid were also found to be important. The research showed that tuition was the most important factor. Upper income students were more likely to apply to institutions where cost is high than lower income students. When tuition at a school was low, lower income students were more likely to apply to an institution than upper income students. As expected, students who are more concerned with money tended to apply to institutions when there was more financial aid available.

Parents also play a role in where students apply. The research showed that most parents wanted their children to attend school close to home. Students who had parents that wanted them to attend school close to home tended to apply to fewer schools than students whose parents wanted them to apply anywhere.

Standardized test scores were important to admission and success to a university. Not only performing well was important for admission to a university, just having the ability to take an Advanced Placement (AP) test helps a student. The research showed that the more AP tests a student took increased their chances of getting admitted to an institution.

Looking at success and retention, the research showed that the higher the high school grade point average (GPA), the higher the first semester and first-year GPA at an institution. Women had higher first-year and first semester GPAs. Students who participated in activities in high school where they were perceived as having a position of power had higher first-semester and four-year GPAs than those without any leadership experience.

## CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

### **Purpose of Study**

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the influence of selected demographic, academic, and institutional characteristics on the decision of transfer students to enroll in a research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States.

### **Dependent Variable**

The dependent variable for the study was whether or not a transfer student who was admitted to the university enrolled in a research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States for the summer 2013-2014 academic school year.

### **Specific Objectives**

The following specific objectives were formulated to guide this research study:

1. To describe transfer students who were admitted and enrolled for the summer 2013-2014 academic school year as defined by their payment of fees and inclusion in the 14th class-day statistics at a research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States on the following demographic and academic characteristics:

- a) Gender;
- b) Race;
- c) State the student reported as his/her permanent address;
- d) Whether or not the student was classified as a resident of the state;
- e) Whether or not the student applied as a freshman;
- f) Whether the most recent transfer institution was in-state or out-of-state;
- g) Whether or not the student's parent graduated from the institution;
- h) Overall transfer grade point average;

- i) Overall number of transfer credit hours earned;
  - j) Overall number of transfer hours attempted;
  - k) Whether or not a student had a degree from a higher education institution;
  - l) Whether a student is transferring from a two-year or four-year institution.
2. To describe transfer students who were admitted but did not enroll for the summer 2013-2014 academic school year as defined by their nonpayment of fees and non-inclusion in the 14 class-day statistics at a research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States on the following demographic and academic characteristics:
- a) Gender;
  - b) Race;
  - c) State the student reported his/her permanent address;
  - d) Whether or not the student was classified as a resident of the state;
  - e) Whether or not the student applied as a freshman;
  - f) Whether the most recent transfer institution was in-state or out-of-state;
  - g) Whether or not the student's parent graduated from the institution;
  - h) Overall transfer grade point average;
  - i) Overall number of transfer credit hours earned;
  - j) Overall number of transfer credit hours attempted;
  - k) Whether or not a student had a degree from a higher education institution;
  - l) Whether a student is transferring from a two-year or four-year institution.
3. To compare transfer students who were admitted and enrolled for the summer 2013-2014 academic school year as defined by their payment of fees and inclusion in the 14<sup>th</sup> class-day statistics at a research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States to

those transfer students who were admitted but did not enroll for the fall 2005 semester as defined by their nonpayment of fees and non-inclusion in the 14<sup>th</sup> class-day statistics at the same institution on the following demographic and academic characteristics:

- a) Gender;
- b) Race;
- c) State student reported as his/her permanent address;
- d) Whether or not the student was classified as a resident of the state;
- e) Whether or not the student applied as a freshman;
- f) Whether the most recent transfer institution was in-state or out-of-state;
- g) Whether or not the student's parent graduated from the institution;
- h) Overall transfer grade point average;
- i) Overall number of transfer credit hours earned;
- j) Overall number of transfer credit hours attempted;
- k) Whether or not a student has a degree from a higher education institution;
- l) Whether a student is transferring from a two-year or four-year institution.

4. To determine if a model existed that allows the researcher to correctly classify transfer students who are admitted to a research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States on whether or not the student enrolled from the following demographic characteristics:

- a) Gender;
- b) Race;
- c) State student reported as his/her permanent address;
- d) Whether or not the student was classified as a resident of the state;

- e) Whether or not the student applied as a freshmen;
- f) Whether the most recent transfer institution was in-state or out-of-state;
- g) Whether or not the student's parent graduated from the institution;
- h) Overall transfer grade point average;
- i) Overall number of transfer credit hours earned;
- j) Overall number of transfer credit hours attempted;
- k) Whether or not a student had a degree from a higher education institution;
- l) Whether a student is transferring from a two-year or four-year institution.

### **Population and Sample**

The target population for this study was defined as all transfer students who applied and were admitted to a research-extensive university. "Transfer student" was defined as a student that transferred from one higher education institution with 30 or more earned hours to another higher education institution. The accessible population was defined as all transfer students who applied, were admitted, and enrolled at one specific research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States for the summer 2013-2014 academic school year. The sampling plan for this study consisted of the following steps:

1. All transfer students who were admitted to this research-extensive university for the summer 2013-2014 academic school year were identified by the Office of Enrollment Management database. This accessible population consisted of 1753 admitted students.
2. The sample was 100% of the accessible population 1753 admitted students.

### **Instrumentation**

The instrument used to gather the data consisted of a computerized recording form with specific variables identified based on relevant literature and obtainable data. The obtainable data

were gathered from the Office of Enrollment Management and Student Aid database regarding applicants and the appropriate admission decision of admit and enrollment. The information was downloaded from a secure file with no personal identifiable information. The recorded variables were:

- a) Gender- As reported by the student;
- b) Race- As reported by the student;
- c) Permanent address- As reported to the Office of Enrollment Management as home address;
- d) Residency- As defined as in-state or out-of-state for fee purposes;
- e) Whether or not the student applied as a freshman- As determined by the Office of Enrollment Management records;
- f) Whether or not the most recent transfer institution was in-state or out-of-state- As determined by the Office of Enrollment Management;
- g) Parental Attendance-Whether or not the student's parent(s) attended the university;
- h) Overall Transfer GPA- Cumulative grade point average from all institutions attended prior to attending new transfer institution;
- i) Overall Transfer Earned Credit Hours- As determined by the Office of Enrollment Management. This includes all credit hours from accredited higher education institutions. No remedial courses count toward earned credit hours;
- j) Overall Transfer Attempted Credit Hours- As determined by the Office of Enrollment Management. This includes all credit hours from accredited higher education institutions. No remedial courses counted toward attempted credit hours;
- k) Degree-Whether or not a student had a previously completed degree (typically an associate degree) upon transferring;

- l) Whether the institution transferring from was a two-year or four-year institution- A two-year institution is defined as a higher education institution that offers primarily an associate degree. A four-year institution is defined as one that primarily offers a bachelor degree.

### **Data Collection**

In order to gather the data, the Office of Undergraduate Admission and Student Aid was contacted and produced a downloadable computerized recording form containing the researcher's specific objectives as stated above.

### **Data Analysis**

The first objective was to describe transfer students who were admitted and enrolled for the summer 2013-2014 academic school year as defined by their payment of fees and inclusion in the 14th class-day statistics at a research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States on the following demographic and academic characteristics:

- a) Gender;
- b) Race;
- c) State the student reported as his/her permanent address;
- d) Whether or not the student was classified as a resident of the state;
- e) Whether or not the student applied as a freshman;
- f) Whether the most recent transfer institution was in-state or out-of-state;
- g) Whether or not the student's parent graduated from the institution;
- h) Overall transfer grade point average;
- i) Overall number of transfer credit hours earned;
- j) Overall number of transfer hours attempted;
- k) Whether or not a student had a degree from a higher education institution;

- l) Whether a student was transferring from a to a two-year or four-year institution.

This objective was descriptive and evaluated those characteristics for students who did enroll in the research-extensive university. To describe the data, frequencies and percentages were used for categorical scale data. The variables for this part of the objective are:

- a) Gender;
- b) Race;
- c) State the student reported as his/her permanent address;
- d) Whether or not the student was classified as a resident of the state;
- e) Whether or not the student applied as a freshman;
- f) Whether the most recent transfer institution was in-state or out-of-state;
- g) Whether or not the student's parent graduated from the institution;
- h) Whether or not a student had a degree from a higher education institution;
- i) Whether a student was transferring from a two-year or four-year institution.

Means and standard deviations were used to measure variables that were on an interval or ratio scale. Those specific variables were:

- a) Overall transfer grade point average;
- b) Overall number of transfer credit hours earned;
- c) Overall number of transfer credit hours attempted.

The second objective was to describe transfer students who were admitted but did not enroll for the summer 2013-2014 academic school year as defined by their nonpayment of fees and non-inclusion in the 14 class-day statistics at a research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States on the following demographic and academic characteristics:

- a) Gender;
- b) Race;
- c) State the student reported as his/her permanent address;
- d) Whether or not the student was classified as a resident of the state;
- e) Whether or not the student applied as a freshman;
- f) Whether the most recent transfer institution was in-state or out-of-state;
- g) Whether or not the student's parent graduated from the institution;
- h) Overall transfer grade point average;
- i) Overall number of transfer credit hours earned;
- j) Overall number of transfer credit hours attempted;
- k) Whether or not a student had a degree from a higher education institution;
- l) Whether a student is transferring from a two-year or four-year institution.

This objective was descriptive and evaluated those characteristics for students who did not enroll, but were admitted in the research-extensive university. To describe the data, frequencies and percentages were used for categorical scale data. The variables for this part of the objective are:

- a) Gender;
- b) Race;
- c) State the student reported as his/her permanent address;
- d) Whether or not the student was classified as a resident of the state;
- e) Whether or not the student applied as a freshman;
- f) Whether the most recent transfer institution was in-state or out-of-state;
- g) Whether or not the student's parent graduated from the institution;

- h) Whether or not a student had a degree from a higher education institution;
- i) Whether a student was transferring from a two-year or four-year institution.

Means and standard deviations were used to measure variables that were on an interval or ratio scale. Those specific variables were:

- a) Overall transfer grade point average;
- b) Overall number of transfer credit hours earned;
- c) Overall number of transfer credit hours attempted.

The third objective was to compare transfer students who were admitted and enrolled for the summer 2013-2014 academic school year as defined by their payment of fees and inclusion in the 14th class-day statistics at a research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States to those transfer students who were admitted but did not enroll for the summer 2013-2014 academic school year as defined by their nonpayment of fees and non-inclusion in the 14th class-day statistics at the same institution on the following demographic and academic characteristics:

- a) Gender;
- b) Race;
- c) State student reported his/her permanent address;
- d) Whether or not the student was classified as a resident of the state;
- e) Whether or not the student applied as a freshman;
- f) Whether the most recent transfer institution was in-state or out-of-state;
- g) Whether or not the student's parent graduated from the institution;
- h) Overall transfer grade point average;
- i) Overall number of transfer credit hours earned;

- j) Overall number of transfer credit hours attempted;
- k) Whether or not a student has a degree from a higher education institution;
- l) Whether a student is transferring from a two-year or four-year institution.

In order to compare these two populations, a chi-square test of independence and an independent t test were used. For the categorical data, the chi-square test of independence was used to compare those students who were admitted and enrolled to those students who were admitted and did not enroll. The variables for this part of the objective are:

- a) Gender;
- b) Race;
- c) State the student reported as his/her permanent address;
- d) Whether or not the student was classified as a resident of the state;
- e) Whether or not the student applied as a freshman;
- f) Whether the most recent transfer institution was in-state or out-of-state;
- g) Whether or not the student's parent graduated from the institution;
- h) Whether or not a student had a degree from a higher education institution;
- i) Whether a student was transferring from a two-year or four-year institution.

To compare admitted students who enrolled to students who were admitted and did not enroll on interval or higher scales, an independent t test was used. Those specific variables were:

- a) Overall transfer grade point average;
- b) Overall number of transfer credit hours earned;
- c) Overall number of transfer credit hours attempted.

The fourth objective was to determine if a model existed that allows the researcher to correctly classify transfer students who are admitted to a research-extensive university in the

southeastern region of the United States on whether or not the student will enroll from the following demographic characteristics:

- a) Gender;
- b) Race;
- c) State student reported his/her permanent address;
- d) Whether or not the student was classified as a resident of the state;
- e) Whether or not the student applied as a freshman;
- f) Whether the most recent transfer institution was in-state or out-of-state;
- g) Whether or not the student's parent graduated from the institution;
- h) Overall transfer grade point average;
- i) Overall number of transfer credit hours earned;
- j) Overall number of transfer credit hours attempted;
- k) Whether or not a student had a degree from a higher education institution;
- l) Whether a student was transferring from a two-year or four-year institution.

In order to determine if this model existed, the researcher used a logistic regression analysis to achieve this objective. In order to ensure that all variables could be included, categorical data were changed into dichotomous variables. The student's enrollment status was categorized as a dichotomous variable with the dependent variables entered as continuous or dichotomous. The following information defines the coding process:

- a) Gender- 0 = male and 1 = female;
- b) Race- was coded in binary code with the presence of a trait of a race as 1 and without the presence of the trait as 0. For example, the trait of being African American will be coded as

1. Absence of the trait of African American as a race will be coded as a 0. This was repeated for each race with an adequate number of subjects;
- c) State student reported his/her permanent address;
- d) Whether or not the student was classified as a resident of the state- 0 = nonresident and 1 = resident;
- e) Whether or not the student applied as a freshman- 0 = no and 1 = yes;
- f) Whether the most recent transfer institution was in-state or out-of-state- 0 = out-of-state and 1 = in-state;
- g) Whether or not the student's parent graduated from the institution 0 = no and 1 = yes;
- h) Overall transfer grade point average- continuous variable;
- i) Overall number of transfer credit hours earned- continuous variable;
- j) Overall number of transfer credit hours attempted- continuous variable;
- k) Whether or not a student had a degree from a higher education institution- 0 = no and 1 = yes;
- l) Whether a student is transferring from a two-year or four-year institution- 0 = two-year institution and 1 = four-year institution.

## CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which selected demographic, academic, and institutional characteristics influence the decision of admitted transfer students to enroll in a research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States. The dependent variable for the study was whether or not a transfer student who was admitted to the university subsequently enrolled in a research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States for the summer 2013-2014 academic school year.

### **Specific Objectives**

The following specific objectives were formulated to guide this research study:

1. To describe transfer students who were admitted and enrolled for the summer 2013-2014 academic school year as defined by their payment of fees and inclusion in the 14th class-day statistics at a research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States on the following demographic and academic characteristics:

- a) Gender;
- b) Race;
- c) State the student reported as his/her permanent address;
- d) Whether or not the student was classified as a resident of the state;
- e) Whether or not the student applied as a freshman;
- f) Whether the most recent transfer institution was in-state or out-of-state;
- g) Whether or not the student's parent graduated from the institution;
- h) Overall transfer grade point average;
- i) Overall number of transfer credit hours earned;
- j) Overall number of transfer hours attempted;

- k) Whether or not a student had a degree from a higher education institution;
  - l) Whether a student is transferring from a two-year or four-year institution.
2. To describe transfer students who were admitted but did not enroll for the summer 2013-2014 academic school year as defined by their nonpayment of fees and non-inclusion in the 14 class-day statistics at a research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States on the following demographic and academic characteristics:
- a) Gender;
  - b) Race;
  - c) State the student reported as his/her permanent address;
  - d) Whether or not the student was classified as a resident of the state;
  - e) Whether or not the student applied as a freshman;
  - f) Whether the most recent transfer institution was in-state or out-of-state;
  - g) Whether or not the student's parent graduated from the institution;
  - h) Overall transfer grade point average;
  - i) Overall number of transfer credit hours earned;
  - j) Overall number of transfer credit hours attempted;
  - k) Whether or not a student had a degree from a higher education institution;
  - l) Whether a student is transferring from a two-year or four-year institution.
3. To compare transfer students who were admitted and enrolled for the summer 2013-2014 academic school year as defined by their payment of fees and inclusion in the 14<sup>th</sup> class-day statistics at a research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States to those transfer who were admitted but did not enroll for the summer 2013-2014 academic school

year as defined by their nonpayment of fees and non-inclusion in the 14<sup>th</sup> class-day statistics at the same institution on the following demographic and academic characteristics:

- a) Gender;
- b) Race;
- c) State student reported as his/her permanent address;
- d) Whether or not the student was classified as a resident of the state;
- e) Whether or not the student applied as a freshman;
- f) Whether the most recent transfer institution was in-state or out-of-state;
- g) Whether or not the student's parent graduated from the institution;
- h) Overall transfer grade point average;
- i) Overall number of transfer credit hours earned;
- j) Overall number of transfer credit hours attempted;
- k) Whether or not a student had a degree from a higher education institution;
- l) Whether a student is transferring from a two-year or four-year institution.

4. To determine if a model existed that allows the researcher to correctly classify transfer students who are admitted to a Research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States on whether or not the student will enroll from the following characteristics:

- a) Gender;
- b) Race;
- c) State student reported as his/her permanent address;
- d) Whether or not the student was classified as a resident of the state;
- e) Whether or not the student applied as a freshman;
- f) Whether the most recent transfer institution was in-state or out-of-state;

- g) Whether or not the student's parent graduated from the institution;
- h) Overall transfer grade point average;
- i) Overall number of transfer credit hours earned;
- j) Overall number of transfer credit hours attempted;
- k) Whether or not a student had a degree from a higher education institution;
- l) Whether a student was transferring from a two-year or four-year institution.

With the assistance of the Office of Enrollment Management's database, application, admission, and enrollment information regarding transfer students was gathered. A "transfer student" was defined as a student who earned 30 or more hours, achieved a 2.5 grade point average or higher, and completed a college-level English course and a college-level math course. From this database, 1,753 students were identified as "transfer students" who met the requirements. The sample was defined as 100% of the accessible population. Of the 1,753 students who were admitted, 1,152 students enrolled in the university. Six hundred and one students were admitted to the university, but did not enroll for that academic year. This chapter presents the results of this study presented by each objective.

### **Objective One Results**

The first objective was to describe transfer students who were admitted and enrolled for the summer 2013-2014 academic school year as defined by their payment of fees and inclusion in the 14th class-day statistics at a research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States on the following demographic and academic characteristics:

- a) Gender;
- b) Race;
- c) State the student reported as his/her permanent address;

- d) Whether or not the student was classified as a resident of the state;
- e) Whether or not the student applied as a freshman;
- f) Whether the most recent transfer institution was in-state or out-of-state;
- g) Whether or not the student's parent graduated from the institution;
- h) Overall transfer grade point average;
- i) Overall number of transfer credit hours earned;
- j) Overall number of transfer hours attempted;
- k) Whether or not a student had a degree from a higher education institution;
- l) Whether a student was transferring from a two-year or four-year institution.

There were 1,152 transfer students who enrolled in the four-year, research-extensive university that served as the data source for this study. The results for this objective are presented in the following section.

#### Gender

One variable on which study subjects were described was gender. Of the 1,152 enrolled transfer students, 528 were male. This represented 45.8% of the population. There were 624 (54.2%) of the enrolled transfer students who were female.

#### Ethnicity

Another variable studied was ethnicity. Of the 1,152 enrolled transfer students, 820 (71.6%) identified with a white or Caucasian ethnicity. One hundred and fifty-three of the enrolled transfer students (13.4%) identified with the Black or African American ethnicity. This was the second largest group in the study. The remaining 15% was divided among five other ethnicities (See Table 1). There were seven students who chose not to respond, regarding their ethnicity.

Table 1 Ethnicity of Transfer Applicants Who were Admitted and Enrolled at a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States.

Ethnicity	Frequency	Percent
White	820	71.6
Black	153	13.4
Hispanic	88	7.7
Asian	51	4.5
Multi-Racial	26	2.3
American Indian	5	.4
Pacific Islander	2	.2
Total	1145 <sup>a</sup>	100.0

*Note.* Seven enrolled students did not respond

#### State the Student Reported as his/her Permanent Address

Another variable on which the enrolled transfer students were described was the state they indicated as their state of permanent residence. The largest number ( $n = 898$ , 78%) reported Louisiana as their state of permanent residence. Five other states were reported by more than one percent of the students included in the study. These states included Texas ( $n = 73$ , 6.3%); California ( $n = 26$ , 2.3%); Florida ( $n = 18$ , 1.6%); Georgia ( $n = 16$ , 1.4%); and Mississippi ( $n = 15$ , 1.3%). A complete listing of the states reported as the state of permanent residence by the participants is provided in Appendix B.

To further describe the study participants in a manner that could be used in subsequent analyses, these data were summarized as those who reported Louisiana and those who reported another state as their permanent residence. When these data were summarized, 78.0% ( $n = 898$ ) were classified as Louisiana and 22.0% ( $n = 254$ ) were classified as having a state other than Louisiana as their state of permanent residence (See Table 2).

Table 2 Whether or Not Enrolled Transfer Students from a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States Reported as a Permanent Address in Louisiana.

Permanent Address State	Frequency	Percent
Louisiana	898	78.0
Other State	254	22.0
Total	1152	100.0

#### Whether or Not the Student was Classified as a Resident of the State

When students were described regarding whether or not they were residents of the state, 892 students were classified as residents, which constituted 77.4% of the enrolled population.

Non-residents constituted 22.6% of the participants with 260 students (see Table 3).

Table 3 Residence Classification of Students who Enrolled in a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States.

Residence Status	Frequency	Percent
Resident	892	77.4
Non-Resident	260	22.6
Total	1152	100.0

#### Whether or Not the Student Applied as a Freshman

Some students apply to the higher education institution as a freshman and are either not admitted or choose not to attend. Among the population of enrolled transfer students, there were 312 (21.1%) who had applied for admission to the university as a freshman. The other 72.9% of (n = 840) students, who enrolled as transfer students had not applied to the university as a freshman (See Table 4).

Table 4 Whether or Not Enrolled Transfer Students Who Applied as a Freshman to the Research-Extensive University In the Southeastern United States Enrolled.

Applied as a Freshman	Frequency	Percent
No	840	72.9
Yes	312	27.1
Total	1152	100.0

### Whether the Most Recent Transfer Institution was In-State or Out-of-State

When comparing institutions, in-state institutions were those that were located within the state of Louisiana and out-of-state institutions were those classified as any institution outside of the state or country. Some students may have transferred with credit from several different institutions, so the most recent institution was used. Of the students transferring into the university, 436 or 37.8% of the population transferred from an institution that was out-of-state. The remaining 716 or 62.2% of students transferred from an institution located from within the state where the research-extensive university was located (See Table 5). A complete list of transfer institutions is in Appendix C.

Table 5 Whether or Not Enrolled Transfer Students Transferred from an Institution that Was in Louisiana or an Institution from Another State.

Location of Transferring Institution	Frequency	Percent
Another Louisiana Institution	716	62.2
Institution from Another State	436	37.8
Total	1152	100.0

### Whether or not the Student's Parent(s) Graduated from the Institution

Another variable on which the transfer students who enrolled in the university was described was whether or not at least one of the parents graduated from the institution. The majority (946, 82.1%) of the students did not have a parent who was an alumnus of the university while 206 (17.9%) students did (See Table 6).

Table 6 Whether or Not Enrolled Transfer Students Had a Parent Who had Graduated from the Institution.

Parent Alum	Frequency	Percent
No	946	82.1
Yes	206	17.9
Total	1152	100.0

### Overall Transfer GPA

When the overall GPA of the enrolled transfer students was described, the mean value was 3.07. (SD=0.511). The minimum GPA was a 0.00 and the maximum GPA was 4.00. To further describe the students on the GPA measure, the overall GPA was broken down into the following categories: 0.00-2.49; 2.50-2.99; 3.00-3.49; 3.50-4.00. The largest group of students (n = 475, 41.2%) were in the 2.50-2.99 GPA category. The second largest number of students (n = 392, 34.0%) were in the 3.00-3.49 GPA category. Only 44 (3.8%) of the students had GPAs of less than 2.50. (See Table 7).

Table 7 Table GPA of Enrolled Transfer Students at a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States.

Overall Transfer GPA	Frequency	Percent
0.00-2.49	44	3.8
2.50-2.99	475	41.2
3.00-3.49	392	34.0
3.50-4.00	241	20.9
Total	1152	100.0

*Note.* M= 3.07; SD=0.511; Range = 0.00 – 4.00

### Overall Number of Transfer Hours Earned

The overall number of transfer hours earned by the enrolled transfer students was also described. The mean number of transfer hours earned was 60.06 (SD=27.32). This means that based on the mean number of transfer hours, the students transferring into the research-extensive university started their education as a junior. The minimum number of transfer hours earned was 30 with the maximum number earned being 210 hours. This description was further broken down into categories to reflect the university's classification of a student's year classification, i.e. freshman, junior, etc. The first category was 30-59 earned hours or a sophomore designation. The largest number of students (n = 636, 55.2%) were in this category. One hundred twenty-two (10.6%) enrolled transfer students had 92 or more earned hours (See Table 8).

Table 8 Number of Transfer Hours Earned by Enrolled Transfer Students at a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States.

Earned Transfer Hours	Frequency	Percent
30-59	636	55.2
60-91	394	34.2
92+	122	10.6
Total	1152	100.0

*Note.* M= 60.06; SD=27.32; Range = 30 - 210

#### Overall Number of Transfer Hours Attempted

When describing the number of hours enrolled transfer students attempted, the mean number of hours attempted was 59.45 (SD=29.11). The attempted hours categories are 0-59, 60-91, and 92 or more hours. The minimum number of hours a student attempted was 0.00 and the maximum of number of hours attempted was 202 (See Table 9).

Table 9 Number of Hours Attempted by Enrolled Transfer Students at a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States.

Attempted Transfer Hours	Frequency	Percent
0-59	643	55.8
60-91	379	32.9
92+	130	11.3
Total	1152	100.0

*Note.* M= 59.45; SD=29.11; Range = 0 - 202

#### Whether or Not a Student Has a Degree from a Higher Education Institution

Of the transfer students who enrolled in the university, 997 (86.5%) did not have a completed degree from a higher education institution. The other 155 (13.5%) students enrolled in the university with a higher education degree completed (See Table 10).

Table 10 Number of Enrolled Transfer Students Entering a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States with a Higher Education Degree.

Higher Education Degree	Frequency	Percent
No	997	86.5
Yes	155	13.5
Total	1152	100.0

## Whether a Student is Transferring from a Two-Year or Four-Year Institution

When describing students transferring into the university on whether they transferred from a two-year or a four-year institution, 33 students transferred into the university from schools where their designation could not be determined. Of the students from whom data were available, 509 (45.5%) students transferred to the university from a two-year institution. The remaining 54.5% of the transfer students ( $n = 610$ ), transferred to the university from a four-year institution (See Table 11).

Table 11 Type of Institution from which Enrolled Transfer Students Transferred into a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States.

Institution Classification	Frequency	Percent
2-year	509	45.5
4-year	610	54.5
Total	1119 <sup>a</sup>	100.0

<sup>a</sup> The two-year/four-year status of 33 of the transfer institutions could not be determined

## Objective Two Results

The second objective was to describe transfer students who were admitted and did not enroll for the summer 2013-2014 academic school year as defined by their payment of fees and inclusion in the 14th class-day statistics at a research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States on the following demographic and academic characteristics:

- a) Gender;
- b) Race;
- c) State the student reported as his/her permanent address;
- d) Whether or not the student was classified as a resident of the state;
- e) Whether or not the student applied as a freshman;
- f) Whether the most recent transfer institution was in-state or out-of-state;
- g) Whether or not the student's parent graduated from the institution;

- h) Overall transfer grade point average;
- i) Overall number of transfer credit hours earned;
- j) Overall number of transfer hours attempted;
- k) Whether or not a student had a degree from a higher education institution;
- l) Whether a student was transferring from a two-year or four-year institution.

Six hundred one transfer students who applied to a four-year, research-extensive university and were admitted did not enroll. The results for this population are as follows:

#### Gender

A variable on which study subjects was described was gender. Of the 601 non-enrolled transfer students, 321 were male. This represented 53.4% of the participants. There were 280 (48.6%) of the non-enrolled transfer students who were female.

#### Race

Another variable studied was ethnicity. Of the 601 non-enrolled transferred students, 350 (60.0%) identified with a White or Caucasian ethnicity. In addition, 87 (14.9%) of the non-enrolled transfer students identified with the Black or African American ethnicity. This was the second largest group in the study. Non-enrolled students identifying with the Hispanic or Latino ethnicity (n = 65, 11.1%) were the third largest group. The remaining 14% was divided among four other ethnicities (See Table 12). There were 18 students who chose not to respond.

#### State the Student Reported as his/her Permanent Address

Another variable on which the non-enrolled transfer students was described was the state they indicated as their state of permanent residence. The largest population of non-enrolled students came from other states (n = 379, 63.1%). The top states from which non-enrolled other students applied included Texas (n = 97, 16.1%); California (n = 55, 9.2%); Florida (n = 22,

3.7%); Mississippi (n= 19, 3.2%); Georgia (n = 13, 2.2%); Illinois (n= 13; 2.2%) and Maryland (n = 13, 2.2%). A complete listing of the states non-enrolled students reported as the state of permanent residence by the participants is provided in Appendix D.

Table 12 Ethnicity of Transfer Applicants who were Admitted and did not Enroll at a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States.

Ethnicity	Frequency	Percent
White	350	60.0
Black	87	14.9
Hispanic	65	11.1
Asian	39	6.7
Multi-Racial	40	6.9
American Indian	1	.2
Pacific Islander	1	.2
Total	583 <sup>a</sup>	100.0

*Note.* Eighteen non-enrolled students did not respond

To further describe the study participants in a manner that could be used in subsequent analyses, these data were summarized as those who reported Louisiana and those who reported another state as their permanent residence. When these data were summarized, 36.9% (n = 222) reported Louisiana as their permanent residence and 63.1% (n = 379) had a permanent residence in a state other than Louisiana (See Table 13).

Table 13 Whether or not Non-Enrolled Transfer Students from a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States Reported as a Permanent Address in the Same or Another State.

Permanent Address	Frequency	Percent
Other State	379	63.1
Louisiana	222	36.9
Total	601	100.0

#### Whether or Not the Student Was Classified as a Resident of the State

Subjects were also described on whether or not they were classified as a resident of the state. Dissimilar from the enrolled population, the non-enrolled population's residential status

generally matched the data for the state of permanent address. When these non-enrolled students were described regarding whether or not they were residents of the state, 174 students were classified as residents which constituted 29.0% of the population. Non-residents constituted 71.0% of the participants with 427 students (see Table 14).

Table 14 Residence Classification of Students who did Not Enroll in a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States.

Residence	Frequency	Percent
Non-Resident	427	71
Resident	174	29
Total	601	100.0

#### Whether or Not the Student Applied as a Freshman

Students who apply as a freshman also have the opportunity to reapply if they are not initially accepted. Students can attend a higher education institution elsewhere and then reapply to the university after a certain amount of credits, 30 or more hours. Among the population of non-enrolled transfer students, there were 98 (16.3%) who applied for admission to the university as a freshman. The other 83.7%, 503 students, who did not enroll had not applied to the university as a freshman (See Table 15).

Table 15 Whether or not Non-Enrolled Transfer Students who Applied as Freshman to the Research-Extensive University.

Applied as a Freshman	Frequency	Percent
No	503	83.7
Yes	98	16.3
Total	601	100.0

#### Whether or Not the Most Recent Transfer Institution was In-State or Out-of-State

Of the non-enrolled transfer students, 444 or 73.9% of the population would have been transferring from an institution that was out-of-state. The remaining 157 or 26.1% of non-enrolled students were transferring from an institution located within the state where the

research-extensive university was located (See Table 16). A complete list of transfer institutions is in Appendix E.

Table 16 Whether or Not a Non-Enrolled Transfer Student would Have Been Transferring from an Institution in Louisiana.

Location of Transferring Institution	Frequency	Percent
Institution from Another State	444	73.9
Institution From Same State	157	26.1
Total	601	100.0

#### Whether or Not the Student's Parent(s) Graduated from the Institution

Another variable on which the students who did not enroll in the university was described was whether or not a parent graduated from the institution. The majority (556, 92.5%) of the students did not have a parent who was an alumnus of the university while 45 (7.5%) students did (See Table 17).

Table 17 Whether or Not Transfer Students Who Did not Enroll in a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States had Parent Alumnus

Parent Alum	Frequency	Percent
No	556	92.5
Yes	45	7.5
Total	601	100.0

#### Overall Transfer GPA

When the overall GPA of the non-enrolled students was described, the mean value was a 3.02. (SD=0.703). The minimum GPA was a 0.00 and the maximum GPA was a 4.00. To further describe the students on the GPA measure, the overall GPA was then broken down into different categories. The GPA category that had the largest number of non-enrolled transfer students was 2.50-2.99 (n = 233, 38.8%). The GPA category with the smallest number of subjects was 0.00-2.49 (n = 31, 5.2%) (See Table 18).

Table 18 Categorized GPA of Non-Enrolled Transfer Students at a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States.

Overall Transfer GPA	Frequency	Percent
0.00-2.49	31	5.2
2.50-2.99	233	38.8
3.00-3.49	221	36.8
3.50-4.00	116	19.3
Total	601	100.0

*Note.* M= 3.02; SD=0.703; Range 0 - 4.00

#### Overall Number of Transfer Hours Earned

The overall number of transfer hours earned was also described. The mean number of transfer hours earned was 65.33 (SD=33.54). Sixty hours denotes junior classification. Based on the mean number of transfer hours, students attempting to transfer into the research-extensive university started transfer college careers with a classification of a junior. The minimum number of transfer hours earned was 30 with the maximum amount earned being 209 hours. This description was further broken down into categories to reflect the university's classification of a student's year classification. The category with the largest number of subjects was 30-59 earned hours. There were 349 (58.1%) transfer students in this designation. The category of 60-91 hours was the category with the second largest number of subjects (n = 149, 24.8%) (See Table 19).

Table 19 Number of Earned Hours of Non-Enrolled Transfer Students at a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States.

Earned Transfer Hours	Frequency	Percent
30-59	349	58.1
60-91	149	24.8
92+	103	17.1
Total	601	100.0

*Note.* M= 65.33; SD=33.54; Range 30 – 209

### Overall Number of Transfer Hours Attempted

When describing the number of hours non-enrolled transfer students attempted, the mean number of hours attempted was 63.44 (SD=35.79). The minimum number of hours a student attempted was 0.00 and the maximum number of hours attempted was 195.) Subjects were further described on the number of transfer hours attempted. The category with the largest number of subjects was 0-59 hours (n= 347, 57.7%). The next largest group of students, 155 (25.8%), had 60 to 91 transfer hours attempted (See Table 20).

Table 20 Number of Hours Attempted by Non-Enrolled Transfer Students at a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States.

Attempted Transfer Hours	Frequency	Percent
0-59	347	57.7
60-91	155	25.8
92+	99	16.5
Total	601	100.0

*Note.* M= 63.44; SD=35.79; Range 0 - 195

### Whether or Not a Student has a Degree from a Higher Education Institution

Of the transfer students who did not enroll in the university 600 or 99.8% of the students did not have a completed degree from a higher education institution. The one (0.2%) student who did not enroll in the university did have a higher education degree (See Table 21).

Table 21 Number of Non-Enrolled Transfer Students Entering a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States with a Higher Education Degree.

Higher Education Degree	Frequency	Percent
No	600	99.8
Yes	1	0.2
Total	601	100.0

### Whether a Student is Transferring from a Two-Year or Four-Year Institution

When describing the students who did not transfer into the university, 35 non-enrolled, admitted transfer students applied to the university from schools where their designation could

not be determined. Of the transfer students from whom data were available, 253 (44.7%) students were applying to transfer from a two-year institution. The remaining 55.3% of the non-enrolled transfer students (n = 313), applied to transfer to the university from a four-year institution (See Table 22).

Table 22 Type of Institution from Which Non-Enrolled Transfer Students Transferred from into a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States.

Institution Classification	Frequency	Percent
2-year	253	44.7
4-year	313	55.3
Total	566 <sup>a</sup>	100.0

<sup>a</sup> The two-year/four-year status of 35 of the transfer institutions could not be determined

### Objective Three Results

The third objective was to compare transfer students who were admitted and enrolled for the summer 2013-2014 academic school year as defined by their payment of fees and inclusion in the 14th class-day statistics at a research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States to those transfer students who were admitted but did not enroll for the summer 2013-2014 academic school year as defined by their nonpayment of fees and non-inclusion in the 14th class-day statistics at the same institution on the following demographic and academic characteristics:

- a) Gender;
- b) Race;
- c) State student considered his/her permanent address;
- d) Whether or not the student was classified as a resident of the state;
- e) Whether or not the student applied as a freshman;
- f) Whether the most recent transfer institution was in-state or out-of-state;
- g) Whether or not the student's parent graduated from the institution;

- h) Overall transfer grade point average;
- i) Overall number of transfer credit hours earned;
- j) Overall number of transfer credit hours attempted;
- k) Whether or not a student had a degree from a higher education institution;
- l) Whether a student was transferring from a two-year or four-year institution.

In order to compare these two populations, chi-square tests of independence and independent t-tests were used. For the categorical data, the chi-square test of independence was used to compare those students who were admitted and enrolled to those students who were admitted and did not enroll. The variables for this part of the objective are:

- a) Gender;
- b) Race;
- c) State the student reported as his/her permanent address;
- d) Whether or not the student was classified as a resident of the state;
- e) Whether or not the student applied as a freshman;
- f) Whether or not the most recent transfer institution was in-state or out-of-state;
- g) Whether or not the student's parent graduated from the institution;
- h) Whether or not a student had a degree from a higher education institution;
- i) Whether a student was transferring from a two-year or four-year institution.

Using a chi-square tests of independence with a significance level of .05, the following variables were found to be statistically significant when they were examined for independence from enrollment status (See Table 23):

- 1) Ethnicity;
- 2) State the student reported as his/her permanent address;

- 3) Whether or not student was classified as a resident of the state;
- 4) Whether or not the student applied as a freshman;
- 5) Whether or not the most recent transfer institution was in-state or out-of-state;
- 6) Whether or not the student's parent graduated from the institution;
- 7) Whether or not a student had a degree from a higher education institution.

Table 23 Comparison of Admitted and Enrolled Students with Admitted and Did Not Enroll Students at a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States.

Variable	N	df	X <sup>2</sup>	p
Residency	1753	1	389.492	<.001
Permanent Address	1753	1	287.958	<.001
Whether or Not the Most Recent Transfer Institution was In-State or Out-of-State	1753	1	205.084	<.001
Whether or Not a Student has a Higher Education Degree	1753	1	86.026	<.001
Ethnicity	1719	4	38.45	<.001
Whether or Not the Student's Parent(s) Graduated From the Institution	1753	1	34.783	<.001
Whether or Not the Student Applied as a Freshman	1753	1	25.601	<.001
Whether or Not a Student Transferred From a Two-year or four-year Institution	1685	1	.094	.759
Gender	1753	1	.091	.763

#### Ethnicity

When examining the independence of the variable ethnicity and whether or not an admitted student enrolled in the university, the first analysis revealed that an excessive number of cells had frequencies with less than five observations. Therefore, the categories of American Indian and Pacific Islander were eliminated from the analysis. The researcher decided that these two categories should not be combined with any of the other categories. The chi-square was re-computed and showed that no other cells had less than the minimum number of subjects. The

chi-square was found to be significant indicating that ethnicity and enrollment status were not independent of one another. The chi-square value was  $X^2(4, N=1719) = 38.545, p < .001$  (See Table 24).

Since the variables ethnicity and enrollment were not independent, the nature of the relationship was examined and revealed that Multi-Racial, Hispanic and Asian ethnicities showed a smaller proportion than expected who enrolled. Additionally, for Multi-Racial (39.4%) students, the proportions of admitted transfer students who enrolled in the university was reversed from the expected enrollment status. The proportions for White/Caucasian and Black or African-American students were close to the expected enrollment and non-enrollment proportions.

Table 24 Cross Tabulation of Ethnicity and Enrollment Status among Admitted Transfer Students at a Research-Extensive in the University in the Southeastern United States.

Enrollment Status			Ethnicity <sup>a</sup>					Total
			White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Multi-Racial	
Enrolled	No	N	350	87	65	39	40	581
		%	29.9	36.3	42.5	43.3	60.6	33.8
	Yes	N	820	153	88	51	26	1138
		%	70.1	63.7	57.5	56.7	39.4	66.2
Total		N	1170	240	153	90	66	1719
		%	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note.  $X^2(4, N=1719) = 38.545, p < .001$

<sup>a</sup>American Indian, Pacific Islander, and No Response were Not Included in the analysis

#### State Student Reported as Permanent Address

A chi-square was also used to examine the independence of State of Permanent Address and Whether or not the Student Enrolled. This variable was described as whether or not the student listed their permanent address as being in the state where the institution was located or if

the student listed their permanent address outside of the state. When analyzed, this  $X^2$  was statistically significant ( $X^2 (1, N= 1753) = 287.958, p= <.001$ ). When the cross tabulation table was examined, the nature of the association between the variables Enrollment status and Permanent Address was such that the majority of students (898,  $n= 80.20\%$ ) who lived within the state enrolled in the institution while the majority of students (379,  $59.90\%$ ) who lived outside the state did not enroll (See Table 25).

Table 25 Cross Tabulation of Permanent Address Location Being in the Same State where University was Located and Enrollment Status Among Admitted Transfer Students at a Research-Extensive in the University in the Southeastern United States.

Enrollment Status			Permanent Address		Total
			Out-of-State	In-State	
Enrolled	No	N	379	222	601
		%	59.9	19.8	34.3
	Yes	N	254	898	1152
		%	40.1	80.2	65.7
Total		N	633	1120	1753
		%	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note.  $X^2 (1, N=1753) = 287.958, p= <.001$

#### Whether or Not the Student was Classified as a Resident

Another variable analyzed for independence from enrollment status with a chi-square test was whether or not the student was classified as a resident as determined by the Office of Enrollment Management. The variables Enrollment Status and Residency were found not to be independent ( $X^2 (1, N=1753) = 389.492, p= <.001$ ). The majority ( $n= 892, 83.7\%$ ) of students who were classified as residents enrolled in the university while the majority ( $n= 427, 62.2\%$ ) of students who were not residents did not enroll in the university (See Table 26).

Table 26 Cross Tabulation of Residence Status and Enrollment Status Among Admitted Transfer Students at a Research-Extensive in the University in the Southeastern United States.

Enrollment Status			Resident		Total
			No	Yes	
Enrolled	No	N	427	174	601
		%	62.2	16.3	34.3
	Yes	N	260	892	1152
		%	37.8	83.7	65.7
Total		N	687	1066	1753
		%	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note.  $X^2(1, N=1753) = 389.492, p < .001$

### Whether or Not the Student Applied as a Freshman

Whether or not a student applied as a freshman was analyzed for independence from enrollment status. This variable was found not to be independent from enrollment status ( $X^2(1, N=1753) = 25.601, p < .001$ ). The majority of students who applied as a freshman and then applied to transfer into the institution ( $n = 312, 76.1\%$ ) enrolled while a smaller proportion who did not apply as a freshman ( $n = 840, 62.5\%$ ) subsequently enrolled as a transfer student. Ninety-eight ( $23.9\%$ ) of students who applied as a freshman and were admitted did not enroll as a transfer student (See Table 27).

Table 27 Cross Tabulation of if a Student Applied to the University as a Freshman and Enrollment Status Among Admitted Transfer Students at a Research-Extensive in the University in the Southeastern United States.

Enrollment Status			Applied as a Freshman		Total
			No	Yes	
Enrolled	No	N	503	98	601
		%	37.5	23.9	34.3
	Yes	N	840	312	1152
		%	62.5	76.1	65.7
Total		N	1343	410	1753
		%	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note.  $X^2(1, N=1753) = 25.601, p < .001$

## Whether the Most Recent Transfer Institution Was In-State or Out-of-State

Enrollment status and the variable Whether the Most Recent Transfer Institution Was In-state or Out-of-State were found to not be independent ( $X^2(1, N=1753) = 205.084, p = <.001$ ).

The nature of the association between these variables was such that the majority ( $n = 716, 82.0\%$ ) of students who applied from an institution in-state subsequently enrolled in the university. Among those students whose most recent transfer institution was an out-of-state school, the majority ( $N=444, 50.5\%$ ) did not enroll (See Table 28).

Table 28 Cross Tabulation of Most Recent Transfer Institution Being in the Same State as the University and Enrollment Status Among Admitted Transfer Students at a Research-Extensive in the University in the Southeastern United States.

Enrollment Status			Institution Location		Total
			Out-of-State	In-State	
Enrolled	No	N	444	157	601
		%	50.5	18.0	34.3
	Yes	N	436	716	1152
		%	49.5	82.0	65.7
Total		N	880	873	1753
		%	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note.  $X^2(1, N=1753) = 205.084, p = <.001$

## Whether or Not the Student's Parent(s) Graduated From the Institution

The variable Whether or Not the Student's Parent(s) Graduated From the Institution was defined by the student's answer to their question on the application. When analyzed, the variable Whether or Not the Student's Parent(s) Graduated From the Institution and enrollment status were found not to be independent ( $X^2(1, N=1753) = 34.783, p = <.001$ ). The nature of the association between these variables was such that the majority of admitted students who had a parent alumnus enrolled ( $N=206, 82.1\%$ ). Still, a majority, but a smaller proportion of students who did not have a parent alumnus enrolled ( $N=946, 63.0\%$ ) (See Table 29).

Table 29 Cross Tabulation of Parent Alum Status at the University and Enrollment Status Among Admitted Transfer Students at a Research-Extensive in the University in the Southeastern United States.

Enrollment Status			Institution Location		Total
			Out-of-State	In-State	
Enrolled	No	N	556	45	601
		%	37.0	17.9	34.3
	Yes	N	946	206	1152
		%	63.0	82.1	65.7
Total		N	1502	251	1753
		%	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note.  $X^2(1, 1753) = 34.783, p = <.001$

#### Whether or Not a Student Had Completed a Higher Education Degree

The final variable found not to be independent from the variable Enrollment status was Whether or Not a Student Has a Higher Education Degree ( $X^2(1, N = 1753) = 86.026, p = <.001$ ). Only one admitted transfer student (0.6%) who had a higher education degree did not enroll while 155 (99.4%) students who applied with a higher education degree and were admitted did enroll in the institution. The majority, but a smaller percentage ( $N = 997, 62.4\%$ ) of students who did not have a higher education degree and were admitted did enroll in the university (See Table 30).

To compare admitted transfer students who enrolled with admitted transfer students who were admitted and did not enroll on variables that were measured at an interval or higher level of measurement, an independent t test was used. The specific variables were:

- Overall transfer grade point average;
- Overall number of transfer credit hours earned;
- Overall number of transfer credit hours attempted.

Table 30 Cross Tabulation of Having a Higher Education Degree and Enrollment Status Among Admitted Transfer Students at a Research-Extensive in the University in the Southeastern United States.

Enrollment Status			Higher Education Degree		Total
			No	Yes	
Enrolled	No	N	600	1	601
		%	37.6	0.6	34.3
	Yes	N	997	155	1152
		%	62.4	99.4	65.7
Total	N	1597	156	1753	
	%	100.0	100.0	100.0	

Note.  $X^2(1, N=1753) = 86.026, p = <.001$

Using an independent t-test with a significance level of .05, the following variables were found to be significantly different by enrollment status (See Table 31):

- 1) Overall transfer credit hours earned;
- 2) Overall transfer credit hours attempted.

Table 31 Comparison of Selected Academic Characteristics by Enrollment Status of Admitted Transfer Students at a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States.

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Transfer Student Attempted Hours		22.362	<.001			
	Equal variances not assumed			2.357	1022.181	.019
Transfer Student Earned Hours		25.252	<.001			
	Equal variances not assumed			3.320	1023.323	.001
Transfer Student GPA		7.360	.007			
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.719	939.516	.086

When these three variables were analyzed using an Independent Samples t-test, Transfer Attempted Hours ( $t(1751) = 2.357, p = <.001$ ) and Transfer Earned Hours ( $t(1751) = 3.320, p =$

<.001) were found to be significantly different when comparing students who were admitted and enrolled and those students who were admitted and did not enroll. The Transfer GPA variable ( $t(1751) = -1.719, p = .007$ ) was found to not be significantly different between students who enrolled and those who did not enroll (See Table 31).

When the mean attempted hours were examined the students who did not enroll were found to have significantly more credit hours ( $M = 63.45; SD = 35.796$ ) than the students who did enroll ( $M = 59.46; SD = 29.115$ ) ( $t_{(1022.181)} = 2.357; p = .019$ ). Similarly, admitted transfer students who did not enroll had significantly more earned hours ( $M = 65.34; SD = 33.547$ ) than those who did enroll ( $M = 60.07; SD = 27.325$ ) ( $t_{(1023.323)} = 3.320; p = .001$ ) (See Table 32).

Table 32 Descriptive Statistics for the Variables Transfer Student GPA, Transfer Student Attempted Hours, Transfer Student Earned Hours.

	Enrolled	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Transfer Attempted Hours	No	601	63.45	35.80	1.46
	Yes	1152	59.46	29.12	.86
Transfer Earned Hours	No	601	65.34	33.55	1.37
	Yes	1152	60.07	27.32	.81
Transfer GPA	No	601	3.02	.70	.03
	Yes	1152	3.08	.51	.02

#### Objective Four Results

The fourth objective was to determine if a model existed that allows the researcher to correctly classify transfer students who are admitted to a Research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States on whether or not the student will enroll from the following characteristics:

- a) Gender;
- b) Race;
- c) State student reported as his/her permanent address;

- d) Whether or not the student was classified as a resident of the state;
- e) Whether or not the student applied as a freshman;
- f) Whether the most recent transfer institution was in-state or out-of-state;
- g) Whether or not the student's parent graduated from the institution;
- h) Overall transfer grade point average;
- i) Overall number of transfer credit hours earned;
- j) Overall number of transfer credit hours attempted;
- k) Whether or not a student had a degree from a higher education institution;
- l) Whether a student was transferring from a two-year or four-year institution.

A binary logistic regression was used to analyze the variables to determine if a model could be found that would allow the researcher to correctly explain whether or not a transfer student who was admitted enrolled. When computing the logistic regression, the model included 1,660 cases with 93 cases omitted due to missing data on one or more of the variables. Each variable is listed with the number and percentage of those that did enroll and those that did not enroll (See Table 33).

In conducting the logistic regression, whether or not the admitted transfer student enrolled was treated as the dependent variable, and each of the variables listed in Table 33 were used as independent variables.

When the analysis was examined, four variables were found to enter the initial explanatory model. However, the researcher examined the following measures to determine if the initial model was the most appropriate model. First, the -2 log likelihood (-2LL) and the Nagelkerke R-Square (N.  $R^2$ ) were examined. The -2LL and the N.  $R^2$  both revealed greater changes between steps one and two than the other steps (See Table 34). The Hosmer and

Table 33 Overall Group Numbers for Admitted Enrolled and Admitted Non-Enrolled Students at a Research-Extensive University in the Southeastern United States.

		N	%
Higher Education Degree	No	1510	90.9
	Yes	150	9.1
White	No	522	31.4
	Yes	1138	68.6
Black	No	1429	86.1
	Yes	231	13.9
Hispanic	No	1515	91.3
	Yes	145	8.7
Asian	No	1586	95.5
	Yes	74	4.5
Multi-Racial	No	1597	96.2
	Yes	63	3.8
State Student Reported as Home State	No	578	34.8
	Yes	1082	65.2
Resident	No	628	37.9
	Yes	1032	62.1
Whether or Not The Transferring Institution was a Two-year or four-year Institution	2-year	753	45.4
	4-Year	907	54.6
State in which the Transferring Institution is Located	No	791	47.6
	Yes	869	52.4
Whether or Not the Student Applied as a Freshman	No	1254	75.5
	Yes	406	24.5
Parent Alum	No	1414	85.2
	Yes	246	14.8
Gender	Female	781	47.1
	Male	879	52.9

Lemeshow Test evaluates the significance of the model by the closer the significance level is to one. In this logistic regression, the greatest significance was at the second step. The significance for the Hosmer and Lemeshow Test statistics was 0.924. After examining these results, it was clear to the researcher that the second model was the model that appropriately classified the cases.

Table 34 2 Log Likelihood and Nagelkerke R. Square Goodness of Fit Test.

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Nagelkerke R Square
1	1767.813 <sup>a</sup>	.256
2	1649.174 <sup>b</sup>	.335
3	1611.443 <sup>b</sup>	.358
4	1602.485 <sup>b</sup>	.364
5	1597.906 <sup>b</sup>	.367

The researcher determined that this model was optimal by evaluating the Hosmer and Lemeshow Test which showed a significance level of 0.924. When interpreting this statistic, the models that are not statistically significant have the greater number of students correctly classified (See Table 35). All three of these statistics showed a large change in their interpretations between the second step and the third step. Therefore, the researcher decided that the second step was the most appropriate step for interpreting the model.

Table 35 Hosmer and Lemeshow Goodness of Fit Test.

Step	Chi-square	df	Sig.
1	<.001	0	.
2	.009	1	.924
3	23.125	8	.003
4	22.654	8	.004
5	27.419	8	.001

After the computation was completed, the logistic regression showed that two variables had the greatest predictive value. The variable with the greatest predictive power was Whether or Not a Student was a Resident of the state. The second variable was Whether or not a Student has a Degree from a Higher Education Institution (See Table 35 & 36).

The other variables were left out of this model (See Table 37). Although other variables were found to be statistically significant, they did not contribute to the classification results.

Table 36 Classification Table for Correctly Classified Student Enrollment Status from Selected Academic and Demographic Characteristics for Admitted Transfer Students.

Observed			Predicted		
			Enrolled		Percentage Correct
			No	Yes	
		No %	378 (60.1)	170 (16.5)	548 69.0
		Yes %	250 (39.8)	862 (83.5)	1102 77.5
	Overall Percentage				74.7
Step 2	Enrolled	No %	378 (49.9)	170 (15.8)	548 69.0
		Yes %	204 (35.1)	908 (84.2)	1112 81.7
	Overall Percentage				77.5

Note. Overall Correctly Classified Percentage was 77.3%.

Table 37 Other Variables.

Model	X <sup>2</sup>		df	Sig	
	496.582		2	<.001	
Variables in the Equation					
Variable		B <sup>a</sup>	S.E.	Wald	Sig
Resident		-2.107*	.121	301.971	<.001
Higher Education Degree		-4.668*	1.009	21.391	<.001
-Variables Not in the Equation-					
Variables		Score		Sig	
Gender		.558		.455	
White		2.896		.089	
Black		2.802		.094	
Hispanic		.635		.425	
Asian		.002		.967	
Multi-Racial		7.288		.007	
State Student Reported as Home State		.164		.685	
Parent Alum		3.629		.057	
Whether or Not the Student Applied as a Freshman		3.198		.074	
State in which the Transferring State is Located		2.682		.101	
Whether or Not The Transferring Institution was a Two-year or four-year Institution		3.741		.052	
Transfer Hours Attempted		37.91		<.001	
Transfer Hours Earned		34.912		<.001	
Transfer GPA		1.089		.297	

Note. <sup>a</sup> Constant is = 6.165, \* Indicates a variable

## CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### **Purpose and Objectives**

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the influence of selected demographic, academic, and institutional characteristics on the decision of transfer students to enroll in a research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States.

The dependent variable for the study was whether or not a transfer student who was admitted to the university enrolled in a research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States for the summer 2013-2014 academic school year.

The following specific objectives were formulated to guide this research study:

1. To describe transfer students who were admitted and enrolled for the summer 2013-2014 academic school year as defined by their payment of fees and inclusion in the 14th class-day statistics at a research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States on the following demographic and academic characteristics:

- a) Gender;
- b) Race;
- c) State the student reported as his/her permanent address;
- d) Whether or not the student was classified as a resident of the state;
- e) Whether or not the student applied as a freshman;
- f) Whether the most recent transfer institution was in-state or out-of-state;
- g) Whether or not the student's parent graduated from the institution;
- h) Overall transfer grade point average;
- i) Overall number of transfer credit hours earned;
- j) Overall number of transfer hours attempted;

- k) Whether or not a student had a degree from a higher education institution;
  - l) Whether a student was transferring from a two-year or four-year institution.
2. To describe transfer students who were admitted but did not enroll for the summer 2013-2014 academic school year as defined by their nonpayment of fees and non-inclusion in the 14 class-day statistics at a research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States on the following demographic and academic characteristics:
- a) Gender;
  - b) Race;
  - c) State the student reported his/her permanent address;
  - d) Whether or not the student was classified as a resident of the state;
  - e) Whether or not the student applied as a freshman;
  - f) Whether the most recent transfer institution was in-state or out-of-state;
  - g) Whether or not the student's parent graduated from the institution;
  - h) Overall transfer grade point average;
  - i) Overall number of transfer credit hours earned;
  - j) Overall number of transfer credit hours attempted;
  - k) Whether or not a student had a degree from a higher education institution;
  - l) Whether a student was transferring from a two-year or four-year institution.
3. To compare transfer students who were admitted and enrolled for the summer 2013-2014 academic school year as defined by their payment of fees and inclusion in the 14<sup>th</sup> class-day statistics at a research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States to those transfer who were admitted but did not enroll for the fall 2005 semester as defined by their

nonpayment of fees and non-inclusion in the 14<sup>th</sup> class-day statistics at the same institution on the following demographic and academic characteristics:

- a) Gender;
- b) Race;
- c) State student reported as his/her permanent address;
- d) Whether or not the student was classified as a resident of the state;
- e) Whether or not the student applied as a freshman;
- f) Whether the most recent transfer institution was in-state or out-of-state;
- g) Whether or not the student's parent graduated from the institution;
- h) Overall transfer grade point average;
- i) Overall number of transfer credit hours earned;
- j) Overall number of transfer credit hours attempted;
- k) Whether or not a student had a degree from a higher education institution;
- l) Whether a student was transferring from a two-year or four-year institution.

4. To determine if a model existed that allows the researcher to correctly classify transfer students who are admitted to a Research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States on whether or not the student enrolled from the following demographic characteristics:

- a) Gender;
- b) Race;
- c) State student reported as his/her permanent address;
- d) Whether or not the student was classified as a resident of the state;
- e) Whether or not the student applied as a freshman;

- f) Whether the most recent transfer institution was in-state or out-of-state;
- g) Whether or not the student's parent graduated from the institution;
- h) Overall transfer grade point average;
- i) Overall number of transfer credit hours earned;
- j) Overall number of transfer credit hours attempted;
- k) Whether or not a student had a degree from a higher education institution;
- l) Whether a student was transferring from a two-year or four-year institution.

### **Methodology**

The purpose of this study was to compare admitted transfer students on whether or not they enrolled in a research-extensive university. The target population was all transfer students who applied during the summer 2013-spring 2014 academic school year. Transfer student was defined as any student with 30+ transferrable hours, a college-level Math, a college-level English, and a minimum GPA of 2.5. Using these parameters, 1753 students met this criteria. This was 100% of the accessible population. One thousand one hundred fifty-two students were admitted to the university and then enrolled. Six hundred one students were admitted to the university but did not enroll.

The data were obtained from the Office of Enrollment Management. The variables were chosen based on the review of literature and availability in the database. The variables were downloaded from the database and kept on a secure thumb drive to protect any sensitive information. Permission was granted by the Institutional Review Board to obtain and use the data for the research (See IRB Approval in Appendix A).

## **Summary of Major Findings**

The major findings of this study are discussed.

### **Objective One**

The first objective was to describe transfer students who were admitted and enrolled for the summer 2013-2014 academic school year.

There were 1152 students who fell into this category, 624 (54.2%) were male and 528 (45.8%) were female. The majority of transfer students were White ( $n = 820$ ; 71.6%) with the second largest ethnic category being Black ( $n = 153$ ; 13.4%). A large portion ( $n = 892$ ; 77.4%) of the students who enrolled were residents of the state in which the institution was located while 260 (22.6%) were from out-of-state. Another variable studied was whether or not a student applied as a freshman and did not attend. The majority ( $n = 840$ ; 72.9%) did not apply as a freshman while the remaining 312 (27.1%) transfer students did apply as freshmen. Transfer students applied from both in-state ( $n = 716$ ; 62.2%) and out-of-state ( $n = 436$ ; 37.8%). Of the transfer students who enrolled, 946 (82.1%) students did not have any parent as an alum and 206 (17.9%) had a parent who graduated from the institution. A total of 155 students (13.5%) of the students who enrolled had a higher education degree, 997 (86.5%) did not have a higher education degree. Five hundred nine (45.5%) students transferred from a two-year institution. The remaining transfer students ( $n = 610$ ; 54.5%) transferred from a four-year institution.

Regarding transfer student GPA, the mean was 3.07 and the standard deviation was 0.511. The students' number of average earned hours was 60.06 ( $SD = 27.32$ ) and attempted hours was 59.45 ( $SD = 29.11$ ).

## Objective Two

The second objective was to describe transfer students who were admitted but did not enroll for the summer 2013-2014 academic school year.

Of the six hundred one transfer students who did not enroll, 321 (53.4%) were male and 280 (46.6%) were female. The majority of the non-enrolled students were White ( $n = 350$ ; 60.0%). The largest minority group ( $n = 87$ ; 14.9%) in the ethnic category was Black. For those students who did not enroll and were residents ( $n = 427$ ; 71.0%), there were 174 (29.0%) of students who did enroll. Five hundred three (83.7%) students submitted an application for freshman enrollment and did not enroll after applying for transfer admission. Ninety-eight (16.3%) students applied as a freshman and did not enroll. Of the students who did not enroll, 444 (73.9%) transferred from an out-of-state school, while 157 (26.1%) students applied from an in-state school. Five hundred fifty-six (92.5%) students who did not enroll did not have a parent graduate from the institution. Forty-five (7.5%) students applied, were admitted, and did not enroll whose parents were graduates from the institution. Six hundred (99.8%) students who did not enroll had a higher education degree. One student (0.2%) had a higher education degree and did not enroll in the university.

The mean GPA for the transfer students who did not enroll in the university was 3.023 ( $SD = 0.703$ ). Students who did not enroll had a mean number of transfer earned hours of 65.337 ( $SD = 33.547$ ) with the mean number of attempted hours of 63.449 ( $SD = 35.796$ ).

## Objective Three

The third objective was to compare transfer students who were admitted and enrolled for the summer 2013-2014 academic school year as defined by their payment of fees and inclusion in the 14<sup>th</sup> class-day statistics at a research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the

United States to those transfer students who were admitted but did not enroll for the summer 2013-2014 academic school year.

The majority of students who enrolled were White ( $n = 820$ ) while the majority of students who did not enroll were White ( $n = 350$ ). The overall percentages of students who were admitted and enrolled was 66.2% to 33.8% who were admitted but did not enroll. An interesting finding was that the Multi-Racial ethnic group was reversed in that 60.6% of those students who were admitted did not enroll and 39.4% did enroll. Ethnicity was found not to be independent from enrollment status  $X^2(4, n = 1719) = 38.545, p < .001$ . Residency was also a statistically significant variable ( $X^2(1, n = 1753) = 389.492, p < .001$ ). Eight hundred ninety-two (83.7%) of those students who were residents enrolled. One hundred seventy-four (16.3%) students were residents, but did not enroll. Students who had a higher education degree were not found to be independent from enrollment status. For those students with a higher education degree ( $n = 155$ , 99.4%) enrolled. Only one student (0.6%) with a higher education degree chose not to enroll after being admitted ( $X^2(1, n = 1753) = 86.026, p < .001$ ).

Transfer GPA was found to be significant when comparing enrolled students and non-enrolled students ( $t_{1751} = -1.719, p = .007$ ). The mean GPA for enrolled students was 3.08 while the mean GPA for students who did not enroll was 3.02. The number of non-enrolled students was significant ( $p < .001$ ) when compared to enrolled students on the variable transfer earned hours. The mean number of transfer earned hours for non-enrolled students was 65.34 hours and the mean number of transfer earned hours for enrolled students was 60.07 ( $t_{1751} = 3.320$ ). Regarding attempted transfer hours, there was a significant difference between the mean of non-enrolled students (63.45) and the mean of enrolled students (59.46). The independent t test was  $t_{1751} = 2.36, p < .001$ .

## Objective Four

The fourth objective was to determine if a model existed that allowed the researcher to correctly classify transfer students who are admitted to a Research-extensive university in the southeastern region of the United States on whether or not the student will enroll from the following characteristics. When observing the regression, only two variables contributed to the model. These variables were residency of the student, whether or not the student was a resident of Louisiana. The second contributing variable was whether or not a student had a higher education degree. With this model, 77.5% of the students were classified correctly.

## **Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations**

Based on the findings of the study, the researcher formulated the following conclusions:

1. Whether or not a student was classified as a resident of the state in which the research institution was located is related to whether or not an admitted transfer student enrolled. The conclusion is based on multiple findings of the study. The residence variable was found to be related to the enrollment status. In addition, residence was the first variable that entered the logistic regression model explaining enrollment status. The predictive model showed that residence was the greatest factor in predicting enrollment. The Wald score for the impact of whether or not a student was a resident on their enrollment status was 303.108 ( $p < .001$ ).

This conclusion and these findings give researchers several different issues to address. If students who reside in the state are yielding greater enrollment, then the institution needs to determine whether or not more resources should be allocated to this population in attempts to yield a greater student population. Also, the amount of resources being used to recruit out-of-state students needs to be researched to determine whether or not more resources need to be allocated to this population in order to maximize the number of out-of-state students. Helping

maximize each population can help the institution maximize the number of students and the amount of tuition flowing into the university.

Recruiting students in-state tends to be less expensive than out-of-state. Spending the money to recruit out-of-state students can be more costly, but can be more cost effective. Out-of-state students pay more in tuition than in-state students. Recruiting students from an out-of-state residence will provide more income to the university and also provide more opportunities for scholarships and research programs.

Based on this conclusion and these findings the researcher recommends additional research in the form of follow up studies regarding the amount of funding for in-state and out-of-state students. Researchers could use follow-up focused interviews with transfer students who enrolled to help determine what factors were important in their recruitment and subsequent enrollment. Researchers could also use these interviews to analyze what areas in the recruitment process tend to be effective and ineffective. Researchers should also study the amount of funding it takes to recruit students in an institution's home state or with students who are applying and enrolling from out-of-state. Financing is important to institutions, and these follow-up studies could be used to determine the amount of tuition money and scholarship money, and other funding coming to the institutions from out-of-state enrollments. Universities use different recruiters to recruit in different areas for in-state and out-of-state recruitment activities. Often this is even specialized for specific regions of the home state and other specific states. In order to maximize use of their resources, research needs to be done to determine the most effective and efficient use of funds for both in-state and out-of-state recruitment. For example, if there are two different recruiters recruiting separate sides of the country, each recruiter's yields need to be studied. If a university is pouring the same amount of money into

each area and only one area is producing a high yield of out-of-state students, then the budget may need to be reviewed. This is because out-of-state recruiting is so vital to universities. Knowing what states are producing enrollees will help the university gain more funding and continue to grow relationships in different regions.

2. Another conclusion from the study is that whether or not a student had a degree from a higher education institution was related to residency when observing whether or not a student enrolled. This variable was the second entered into the logistic regression explaining enrollment status. When adding this variable, the Hosmer and Lemeshow Test was well above the significance level at 0.924. The closer the significance level is to one, the greater the fit of the test.

This information goes along with many states' initiatives in providing opportunities for students to achieve associate degrees before entering a four-year institution. If a student achieving a higher education degree prior to transferring to another institution improves their likelihood of enrolling and subsequently the development of a closer working relationship between community colleges and universities, this would be beneficial to all parties involved. For recruiting, this relationship between having a degree and enrollment status allows four-year institutions a better, more plausible reason to allocate funding for recruiting these students.

A more informed, educated workforce benefits society. Students who achieve any degree are potentially increasing their salary while also increasing their contribution to the workforce with the knowledge the student has obtained. Transfer students who obtain an associate degree from a community college or university are applying to a four-year institution to obtain another degree. If students with a higher education degree are enrolling in greater numbers, then this gives universities cause to invest resources to recruit at two-year institutions.

The next logical step in this area of research would be to compare students who did achieve a higher education degree and then went on to transfer to another institution to pursue another degree with those students who chose to finish a degree and then not pursue another degree. One factor that might have influenced their decision is that the U.S. DOE (2012) shows that there is a 12,000 dollar a year in income difference between graduates with an associate degree and those with a bachelor's degree. A qualitative study should be conducted to determine why those who did enroll after completing a higher education degree and those who did not enroll after applying for transfer followed these respective paths. With research showing that more money is earned with the higher education a person obtains, the follow-up research can help identify the factors that influenced the transfer decision.

Universities should set up special programs or initiatives that cater to the two-year school and help ease the process for students to transfer to a four-year institution. If a university decided to set up a special program, researchers should monitor the success of the students who participated in the program and see how many students enrolled and then actually transferred to the institution. Universities should establish "2+2 programs" or pipeline programs. These programs would offer students at certain community colleges to ensure if a student completes all of the required courses at one program, then they would have automatic admission to the four-year institution. Researchers should then follow these students' progress using quantitative data such as GPA, graduation, rates, etc. If the transfer students with higher education degrees are performing well and/or better than students without a transfer degree, universities need to decide how important entering with a higher education degree is when transferring. If students completed the program or obtained a degree through the program and did not enroll, qualitative studies should be conducted to focus on what factors are influencing the decision not to enroll.

This would show whether or not the resources being allocated to the programs are justified or if just focusing on any student with a degree is most beneficial.

3. Ethnicity of admitted transfer students is related to whether or not they enrolled. This conclusion is based on the chi-square test of independence for the variables enrollment status and ethnicity 38.545 ( $p < .001$ ). Specifically, Caucasian students were more likely to enroll and minority students were less likely to enroll. Among the groups of minority students, those who identified themselves as Multi-Racial were least likely to enroll. In fact, the majority (60.6%) of this group did not enroll. Implications of this conclusion can be seen most clearly in the area of minority recruitment and enrollment. Though 1865 brought the end of slavery in the United States, the problem minority students faced did not end with the Emancipation Proclamation. The economic strain and the poverty that many minority ethnic groups are still faced with today influence what students can apply and then afford higher education opportunities. Also, the location of the university can be a deterrent to minority students applying. In a city where there are two land-grant universities, one being majority White and the other being majority Black, enticing minority groups to a campus where they are overwhelmingly in the minority can be tough. These actions can be a deterrent to minority recruitment. Researchers need to perform follow-up studies with students who do enroll and who do not enroll to determine if the discrepancy in ethnic groups is an issue or if there are other problems preventing ethnic minorities from enrolling in the university.

Based on this conclusion and these implications, further research should be conducted to determine why this finding shows a near mirror image in enrollment status for multi-racial students when compared to the overall findings of the study. Institutions need to make sure that they are not alienating entire populations. Qualitative research needs to be conducted to

determine if the multi-racial population does or does not identify with the multi-racial category; and if not, to determine if they are identifying solely with one ethnicity or not reporting ethnicity at all due to perceived ramifications. Different programs, societies, and/or groups should be established to help ensure that a university takes actions to make minority students feel comfortable and/or welcome on the university's campus. Qualitative studies could provide information to these groups to assist the university with helping grow the minority population. Finally, groups catering to minority students should be established. These groups should help foster a sense of community for minority groups and give them an outlet to express any issues the students might have.

4. Based on the findings, if a student had a parent who was an alumnus of the university, the student's decision of whether or not to enroll was statistically significant. Students who had a parent alum were more likely to enroll than those who did not. When analyzing the chi-square test of independence the Pearson Chi-Square ( $X^2 = 34.783$ ,  $p < .001$ ) showed that whether or not a student's parent was an alumnus was statistically significant in the bivariate analysis. Nine hundred forty-six (63.0%) students without a parent alum, enrolled. Five hundred fifty-six students did not have a parent alum and did not enroll. Of the students who had a parent alum, 45 did not enroll while 206 (82.1%) did enroll.

An alumni base is extremely important to universities. Alumni help support a university by providing money and sending their children to the university. During times of economic crisis and state budget cuts, alumni from a particular university are crucial in donating money and helping the institution survive the cuts. Universities run many different campaigns to fundraise. The more alumni a university has, the more potential money they have available. In practice, enticing parent alumni to send their children to a specific university helps the university

with funding and diversity. Also, parent alumni help students make a choice when they decide to go to a university. Parent alumni are already familiar with particular universities and can help advise their children about the positives and negatives of a university.

Universities sometimes offer scholarships to the children of alumni, which is very beneficial to families who live outside of the state. This can help families when they have to pay out-of-state tuition and fees. In these cases, the university does not collect out-of-state tuition, however, they do collect tuition. In overall business, it is better to have some client or student attending the university, even if it means sacrificing out-of-state tuition than to have a student not attend the university because they cannot afford any of the tuition. Generally, it is better to waive out-of-state tuition and collect some tuition than to lose a student altogether because an out-of-state scholarship was not available.

This finding allows researchers the opportunity to discover whether or not students who have parents as alums of the university perform as well as those without a parent alum. The researcher recommends using quantitative research to analyze grades, graduation rates, and money spent by the family. It can help the university determine whether or not offering scholarships to students with parent alum actually is cost-effective or if their academic performance may hurt the universities six-year graduation rates. Working with a loyal constituency that contributes financially to the university, offering potential tuition incentives for their children may benefit the university. Researchers need to determine whether or not using valuable resources to recruit children of parents who graduated from the university is important to the success of the university to the student, the alums, and the university. Offering scholarships to children of parent alums would be beneficial. It would continue to expand the student population while also increasing funding. Another solution would be to offer

scholarships specifically catered to out-of-state students. The researcher recommends using quantitative research to determine if students who receive these scholarships are performing appropriately academically, socially, and graduating on time in accordance with retention and graduation policy.

## REFERENCES

- Bozick, R. (2009). Job opportunities, economic resources, and the postsecondary destinations of American youth. *Demography*, 46, 493-512. Retrieved from <http://www.lib.lsu.edu.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/apps/onoffcampus.php?url=http://search.ebscohost.com.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=43381349&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
- DesJardins, S. L., Ahlburg, D. A., & McCall, B. P. (2006). An integrated model of application, admission, enrollment, and financial aid. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77, 381-429. Retrieved from <http://www.lib.lsu.edu.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/apps/onoffcampus.php?url=http://search.ebscohost.com.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=20280568&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
- Espenshade, T. J., Hale, L. E., & Chung, C. Y. (2005). The frog pond revisited: High school academic context, class rank, and elite college admission. *Sociology of Education*, 78, 269-293. Retrieved from <http://www.lib.lsu.edu.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/apps/onoffcampus.php?url=http://search.ebscohost.com.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=19205095&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
- Fulks, D. L. (2009). 2004-2008 NCAA revenues and expenses of division 1 intercollegiate athletics programs reports. Retrieved from [http://www.ncaapublications.com/Uploads/PDF/Revenues\\_Expenses\\_10\\_208ac1ac8-caf1-42ad-9e1e-dc6c399c227b.pdf](http://www.ncaapublications.com/Uploads/PDF/Revenues_Expenses_10_208ac1ac8-caf1-42ad-9e1e-dc6c399c227b.pdf).
- Garton, B. L., Ball, A. L., & Dyer, J. E. (2002). The academic performance and retention of college of agriculture students. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 43, 46-56. Retrieved from <http://pubs.aged.tamu.edu/jae/pdf/vol43/43-01-46.pdf>.
- Goenner, C. F., & Pauls, K. (2006). A predictive model of inquiry to enrollment. *Research in Higher Education*, 47, 935-956. doi: 10.1007/s11162-006-9021-8.
- Goff, B., Patino, V., & Jackson, G. (2004). Preferred information sources of high school students for community colleges and universities. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 28, 795-803. doi: 10.1080/10668920390276957.
- González, J. M. B., & DesJardins, S. L. (2002). Artificial neural networks,: A new approach to predicting application behavior. *Research in Higher Education*, 43, 235-258. Retrieved from <http://www.lib.lsu.edu.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/apps/onoffcampus.php?url=http://search.ebscohost.com.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=7432431&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
- Handel, S. J. (2009). Transfer and the part-time student. *Change*, 41, 48-53. Retrieved from <http://www.lib.lsu.edu.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/apps/onoffcampus.php?url=http://search.ebscohost.com.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=7432431&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.

ost.com.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=44435893&site=ehost-live&scope=site.

- Klopfenstein, K., & Thomas, M. K. (2009). The link between advanced placement experience and early college success. *southeastern Economic Journal*, 73, 873-891.  
<http://www.lib.lsu.edu.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/apps/onoffcampus.php?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/libezp.lib.lsu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=37603768&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
- Letawsky, N., Schneider, R., Pedersen, P., & Palmer, C. (2003). Factors influencing the college selection process of student-athletes: Are their factors similar to non-athletes?. *College Student Journal*, 37(4), 604-610. Retrieved from  
<http://www.lib.lsu.edu.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/apps/onoffcampus.php?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/libezp.lib.lsu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=12104593&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
- Lillis, M. P., & Tian, R. G. (2008). The impact of cost on college choice: Beyond the means of the economically disadvantaged. *Journal of College Admission*, 200, 4-14. Retrieved from  
<http://www.lib.lsu.edu.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/apps/onoffcampus.php?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/libezp.lib.lsu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ829466&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
- Lindbeck, R., & Fodrey, B. (2009). Using technology in undergraduate admission: Current practices and future plans. *Journal of College Admission*, 204, 25-30. Retrieved from  
<http://www.lib.lsu.edu.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/apps/onoffcampus.php?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/libezp.lib.lsu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=43582305&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
- Louisiana State University (2014). Transfer student admission requirements. Retrieved from  
<http://sites01.lsu.edu/wp/admissions/become-a-tiger-2/transfer-students/transfer-student-admission-requirements/>.
- Mattern, K., & Wyatt, J. (2009). Student choice of college: How far do students go for an education?. *Journal of College Admission*, 203, 18-29. Retrieved from  
<http://www.lib.lsu.edu.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/apps/onoffcampus.php?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/libezp.lib.lsu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=37564129&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
- Mattson, C. E. (2007). Beyond admission: Understanding pre-college variables and the success of at-risk students. *Journal of College Admission*, 196, 8-13. Retrieved from  
<http://www.lib.lsu.edu.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/apps/onoffcampus.php?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/libezp.lib.lsu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=25468198&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
- Mentz, G., & Whiteside, R. (2003). Internet college and recruiting and marketing: Web promotion, techniques and law. *Journal of College Admission*, 181, 10-17. Retrieved

from <http://www.lib.lsu.edu.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/apps/onoffcampus.php?url=http://search.ebscohost.com.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=11067692&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.

- Opp, R. D. (2001). Enhancing recruitment success for two-year college students of color. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 25, 71-86. doi: 10.1080/10668920150218461.
- Pitts, B. (2009). Minority recruitment at a private school. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 2, 16-18. doi: 10.1037/a0013682.
- Reynolds, G. L. (2007). The impact of facilities on recruitment and retention of students. *New Directions For Institutional Research*, 135, 63-80. doi: 10.1002/ir.223.
- Rothstein, J. M. (2004). College performance predictions and the SAT. *Journal of Econometrics*, 121, 297-317. doi: 10.1016/j.jeconom.2003.10.003.
- Tam, M., & Sukhatme, U. (2004). How to make better college admission decisions: Considering high school quality and other factors. *Journal of College Admission*, 183, 12-16. Retrieved from <http://www.lib.lsu.edu.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/apps/onoffcampus.php?url=http://search.ebscohost.com.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=12750203&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
- Tierney, W. G., & Venegas, K. M. (2009). Finding money on the table: Information, financial aid, and access to college. *Journal of Higher Education*, 80, 363-388. Retrieved from <http://www.lib.lsu.edu.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/apps/onoffcampus.php?url=http://search.ebscohost.com.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=43216453&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
- Turley, R. N. L., (2006). When parents want children to stay home for college. *Research in Higher Education*, 47, 823-846. doi: 10.1007/s11162-006-9017-4.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2012). Median annual earnings of all full-time, full-year wage and salary workers ages 25–34, by sex and educational attainment: Selected years, 1995–2010. *The Condition of Education 2012* (NCES 2012–045). Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=77>.
- Washburn, J. H., & Petroschius, S. M. (2004). A collaborative effort at marketing the university: Detailing a student-centered approach. *Journal of Education for Business*, 80, 35-40. Retrieved from <http://www.lib.lsu.edu.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/apps/onoffcampus.php?url=http://search.ebscohost.com.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=14934158&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
- Wyman, F. J. (1997). A predictive model of retention rate at regional two-year colleges. *Community College Review*, 25, 29-58. doi: 10.1177/009155219702500104.

- Young, J. W., & Johnson, P. M. (2004). The impact of an ses-based model on a college's undergraduate admissions outcomes. *Research in Higher Education*, 45, 777-797. Retrieved from <http://www.lib.lsu.edu.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/apps/onoffcampus.php?url=http://search.ebscohost.com.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=14676762&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
- Zwick, R., & Sklar, J. G. (2005). Prediction college grades and degree completion using high school grades and SAT scores: The role of student ethnicity and first language. *American Educational Research Journal*, 42, 439-464. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3700459>.

## APPENDIX A: INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL

### ACTION ON EXEMPTION APPROVAL REQUEST



Institutional Review Board  
Dr. Dennis Landin, Chair  
130 David Boyd Hall  
Baton Rouge, LA 70803  
P: 225.578.8692  
F: 225.578.5983  
[irb@lsu.edu](mailto:irb@lsu.edu) | [lsu.edu/irb](http://lsu.edu/irb)

TO: Barrett Linam  
Human Resource Education & Workforce Development

FROM: Dennis Landin  
Chair, Institutional Review Board

DATE: August 28, 2014

RE: IRB# E8904

TITLE: The Influence of Selected Personal and Academic Characteristics on the Decision of  
Admitted Transfer Student to Enroll at Research Extensive University

New Protocol/Modification/Continuation: New Protocol

Review Date: 8/27/2014

Approved X Disapproved \_\_\_\_\_

Approval Date: 8/27/2014 Approval Expiration Date: 8/26/2017

Exemption Category/Paragraph: 4a

Signed Consent Waived?: Yes

Re-review frequency: (three years unless otherwise stated)

LSU Proposal Number (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_

Protocol Matches Scope of Work in Grant proposal: (if applicable) \_\_\_\_\_

By: Dennis Landin, Chairman 

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING –  
Continuing approval is **CONDITIONAL** on:

1. Adherence to the approved protocol, familiarity with, and adherence to the ethical standards of the Belmont Report, and LSU's Assurance of Compliance with DHHS regulations for the protection of human subjects\*
2. Prior approval of a change in protocol, including revision of the consent documents or an increase in the number of subjects over that approved.
3. Obtaining renewed approval (or submittal of a termination report), prior to the approval expiration date, upon request by the IRB office (irrespective of when the project actually begins); notification of project termination.
4. Retention of documentation of informed consent and study records for at least 3 years after the study ends.
5. Continuing attention to the physical and psychological well-being and informed consent of the individual participants, including notification of new information that might affect consent.
6. A prompt report to the IRB of any adverse event affecting a participant potentially arising from the study.
7. Notification of the IRB of a serious compliance failure.
8. SPECIAL NOTE:

*\*All investigators and support staff have access to copies of the Belmont Report, LSU's Assurance with DHHS, DHHS (45 CFR 46) and FDA regulations governing use of human subjects, and other relevant documents in print in this office or on our World Wide Web site at <http://www.lsu.edu/irb>*

APPENDIX B: INDIVIDUAL HOME STATE FOR STUDENTS WHO WERE ADMITTED  
AND ENROLLED

Home State	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
AK	1	.1	.1
AL	3	.3	.3
AR	2	.2	.5
AZ	1	.1	.6
BR	1	.1	.7
CA	26	2.3	3.0
CE	1	.1	3.0
CH	4	.3	3.4
CO	6	.5	3.9
CS	1	.1	4.0
CT	2	.2	4.2
DE	1	.1	4.3
FL	18	1.6	5.8
GA	16	1.4	7.2
GM	1	.1	7.3
IA	3	.3	7.6
ID	2	.2	7.7
IL	5	.4	8.2
IN	1	.1	8.2
KS	1	.1	8.3
KU	1	.1	8.4
KY	2	.2	8.6
LA	898	78.0	86.5
MA	3	.3	86.8
MD	9	.8	87.6
MI	2	.2	87.8
MO	1	.1	87.8
MS	15	1.3	89.1
MY	2	.2	89.3
NC	4	.3	89.7
NI	1	.1	89.8
NJ	2	.2	89.9
NV	3	.3	90.2
NY	2	.2	90.4
OH	1	.1	90.5
OK	2	.2	90.6
OR	1	.1	90.7
PA	4	.3	91.1
PR	3	.3	91.3
RI	1	.1	91.4

Home State	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
RQ	1	.1	91.5
SC	1	.1	91.6
SP	1	.1	91.7
SY	1	.1	91.8
TN	8	.7	92.4
TX	73	6.3	98.8
UK	1	.1	98.9
VA	9	.8	99.7
VE	1	.1	99.7
WA	2	.2	99.9
WV	1	.1	100.0
Total	1152	100.0	

APPENDIX C: TRANSFER INSTITUTIONS ATTENDED BY STUDENTS WHO WERE  
ADMITTED AND ENROLLED

Transfer Institution	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College (0781)	1	.1	.1
Air University (0037)	1	.1	.2
Alvin Community College (4054)	1	.1	.3
American Intercontinental U (Dunwoody) (6227)	1	.1	.3
American Public University System (APUS)	1	.1	.4
American University of Beirut (LE01)	1	.1	.5
Anne Arundel Community College (1678)	1	.1	.6
Arizona State University (0088)	1	.1	.7
Arkansas Baptist College (0152)	1	.1	.8
Arkansas State University @ Jonesboro (0116)	1	.1	.9
Auburn University (0011)	1	.1	1.0
Austin Community College (4059)	4	.3	1.3
Barry University (Barry College) (0718)	1	.1	1.4
Baton Rouge Community College (1603)	223	19.4	20.7
Baylor University (4062)	1	.1	20.8
Beijing Univ of Agriculture (CN06)	1	.1	20.9
Belmont Abbey College (3070)	2	.2	21.1
Belmont University (3946)	1	.1	21.2
Berry College (0798)	1	.1	21.3
Birmingham-Southern College (0012)	1	.1	21.4
Black Hawk College (1082)	1	.1	21.4
Blinn College-Brenham (4068)	4	.3	21.8
Blue River Cc-Independence (2288)	1	.1	21.9
Bossier Parish Community College (1573)	8	.7	22.6
Boston Architectural College (8040)	1	.1	22.7
Boston College (1788)	1	.1	22.7
Brainerd Community College (2090)	1	.1	22.8
Brevard Community College (0769)	1	.1	22.9
Briarcliffe College (3109)	1	.1	23.0
Brigham Young University (4266)	1	.1	23.1
Brown University (3800)	1	.1	23.2
Butte College (0165)	1	.1	23.3
Cameron University (3386)	1	.1	23.4
Campbell University (3076)	1	.1	23.4
Centenary College of Louisiana (1576)	2	.2	23.6
Central Texas College (4081)	1	.1	23.7
Clarendon College (4076)	1	.1	23.8
Clemson University (3842)	1	.1	23.9
Cloud County Community College (1401)	1	.1	24.0
Coastal Carolina University (Conway) (3843)	1	.1	24.0

Transfer Institution	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
College of Alameda (0238)	1	.1	24.1
College of Charleston (3846)	3	.3	24.4
College of Du Page (1003)	1	.1	24.5
College of Marin (0232)	1	.1	24.6
College of Southern Nevada (2498)	3	.3	24.8
College of the Canyons (0419)	2	.2	25.0
Collin College (4046)	3	.3	25.3
Colorado School of Mines (0500)	2	.2	25.4
Colorado State University (0504)	1	.1	25.5
Columbia College (1002)	1	.1	25.6
Concordia University (2442)	1	.1	25.7
Craven Community College (3182)	1	.1	25.8
Dallas Baptist College (4080)	1	.1	25.9
Darton College (Albany Jr Coll) (0783)	2	.2	26.0
David Lipscomb University (3956)	1	.1	26.1
Daytona State College (0723)	1	.1	26.2
De Anza College (0253)	1	.1	26.3
Dean College (1816)	1	.1	26.4
Delaware County Community College (3542)	2	.2	26.6
Delaware Technical Community College (0631)	1	.1	26.6
Delgado Community College (1577)	46	4.0	30.6
DePaul University (1012)	1	.1	30.7
Diablo Valley College (0254)	1	.1	30.8
Dillard University (1578)	5	.4	31.3
Drake University (1302)	1	.1	31.3
Drexel University (3556)	1	.1	31.4
Drury University (2292)	1	.1	31.5
Duquesne University (3560)	1	.1	31.6
East Carolina University (3094)	1	.1	31.7
East Miss Comm Coll (Goldn Trngl V/T Ct) (2196)	1	.1	31.8
Eastern Kentucky University (1512)	2	.2	31.9
Edmonds Community College (4307)	1	.1	32.0
Elgin Community College (1018)	1	.1	32.1
Excelsior College (NY04)	1	.1	32.2
Fashion Institute of Technology (2744)	1	.1	32.3
Florida A&M University (0726)	1	.1	32.4
Florida International University (0776)	1	.1	32.5
Florida State College at Jacksonville (0717)	1	.1	32.6
Florida State Univ-Panama Canal Branch (0701)	1	.1	32.6
Florida State University (0734)	1	.1	32.7
Foothill College (0263)	1	.1	32.8
Fort Valley State College (0814)	1	.1	32.9

Transfer Institution	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Fullerton College (0270)	1	.1	33.0
Furman University (3858)	1	.1	33.1
Future University (EG19)	1	.1	33.2
Georgia College at Milledgeville (0828)	1	.1	33.2
Georgia Gwinnett College (5478)	1	.1	33.3
Georgia Military College (0822)	1	.1	33.4
Georgia Perimeter College(Dekalb College (0806)	3	.3	33.7
Georgia Southern University (0830)	1	.1	33.8
Germanna Community College (4359)	1	.1	33.9
Grambling State University (1582)	3	.3	34.1
Grand Rapids Community College (2004)	1	.1	34.2
Grossmont College (0279)	1	.1	34.3
Guilford Technical Community College (5134)	2	.2	34.5
Hardin-Simmons University (4096)	1	.1	34.5
Hawaii Pacific University (0900)	1	.1	34.6
High Point College (3108)	1	.1	34.7
Hinds Community College-Raymond Campus (2198)	1	.1	34.8
Ho Chi Mihn Univ of Industry (VM07)	1	.1	34.9
Holmes Community College (2200)	2	.2	35.1
Houston Community College System (4105)	8	.7	35.8
Hudson County Community College (NJ01)	1	.1	35.9
Illinois Central College (1035)	1	.1	35.9
Indian River State College (0774)	1	.1	36.0
Irvine Valley College (0293)	1	.1	36.1
Ivy Tech CC - Central Indiana (1223)	1	.1	36.2
Jackson State University (2204)	4	.3	36.5
Jefferson College (2313)	1	.1	36.6
Jones County Junior College (2206)	2	.2	36.8
Kaplan College (3064)	1	.1	36.9
Kaplan University (5184)	2	.2	37.1
Kennesaw State Univ (Kennesaw College) (0833)	1	.1	37.2
Kirkwood Community College (1275)	1	.1	37.2
Lamar State College @ Orange (8094)	1	.1	37.3
Lamar University (4114)	4	.3	37.7
Lambuth University (3974)	1	.1	37.8
Le Tourneau University (4120)	1	.1	37.8
Lebanese American University (LE03)	1	.1	37.9
Lehigh Carbon Community College (3611)	1	.1	38.0
Liberty University (4364)	1	.1	38.1
Lone Star College - Cyfair (4786)	2	.2	38.3
Lone Star College - Kingwood (4260)	3	.3	38.5
Lone Star College - Montgomery (4262)	2	.2	38.7

Transfer Institution	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Lone Star College - North Harris (4139)	3	.3	39.0
Lone Star College - Tomball (4261)	1	.1	39.1
Lone Star-University Park (LS01)	1	.1	39.1
Lord Fairfax Community College (4377)	1	.1	39.2
Los Medanos College (0325)	1	.1	39.3
Louisiana College (1586)	9	.8	40.1
Louisiana Delta Community College (1655)	2	.2	40.3
Louisiana State University-Alexandria (1589)	8	.7	41.0
Louisiana State University-Eunice (1587)	39	3.4	44.4
Louisiana State University-Shreveport (1593)	11	1.0	45.3
Louisiana Tech University (1588)	20	1.7	47.0
Lower Columbia College (4464)	1	.1	47.1
Loyola University (1592)	5	.4	47.6
Manchester Community College (0569)	1	.1	47.7
Manhattan College (2796)	1	.1	47.7
Marion Military Institute (0026)	2	.2	47.9
Marymount College of Virginia (4378)	1	.1	48.0
McHenry County College (1075)	2	.2	48.2
McLennan Community College (4131)	1	.1	48.3
McNeese State University (1594)	16	1.4	49.7
Meridian Community College (2210)	1	.1	49.7
Merritt College (0348)	1	.1	49.8
Mesa Community College (0093)	1	.1	49.9
Metropolitan State College (0519)	2	.2	50.1
Miami-Dade College (0770)	2	.2	50.3
Mid South Community College (6011)	1	.1	50.3
Middle Georgia State College (0837)	1	.1	50.4
Middle Tennessee State University (3994)	1	.1	50.5
Middlesex County College (2573)	2	.2	50.7
Midwestern Baptist Seminary (8067)	1	.1	50.8
Millsaps College (2212)	5	.4	51.2
Miracosta College (0352)	1	.1	51.3
Miss Gulf Coast CC-Perkinston (2234)	2	.2	51.5
Miss Gulf Coast Cc(Jackson County) (2203)	2	.2	51.6
Mississippi College (2214)	2	.2	51.8
Mississippi State University (2220)	5	.4	52.3
Missouri Valley College (2330)	1	.1	52.3
Monterey Peninsula College (0336)	2	.2	52.5
Montgomery College (1725)	1	.1	52.6
Moorpark College (0335)	1	.1	52.7
Morehouse College (0792)	1	.1	52.8
Morningside College (1338)	1	.1	52.9

Transfer Institution	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Motlow State Community College (4003)	1	.1	53.0
Nashville State Community College (3983)	1	.1	53.0
Navarro College (4134)	1	.1	53.1
Nicholls State University (1580)	31	2.7	55.8
North Georgia College (0848)	3	.3	56.1
North Greenville College (3872)	1	.1	56.2
North Lake College (4141)	1	.1	56.3
Northeast Forestry University (CC52)	2	.2	56.4
Northeastern Junior College (0520)	1	.1	56.5
Northeastern University (1880)	1	.1	56.6
Northern Virginia Community College (4381)	2	.2	56.8
Northwestern State Univ of Louisiana (1600)	9	.8	57.6
Nova Southeastern University (6706)	2	.2	57.7
Nunez Community College (1605)	1	.1	57.8
Ohio State University (3312)	2	.2	58.0
Orange Coast College (0354)	1	.1	58.1
Our Lady of Holy Cross College (1574)	2	.2	58.2
Our Lady of the Lake College (1621)	12	1.0	59.3
Panola College (4144)	1	.1	59.4
Patten University (0369)	1	.1	59.5
Pearl River Junior College (2232)	1	.1	59.5
Pennsylvania State University (3656)	1	.1	59.6
Point Loma Nazarene Coll(Point Loma Clg) (0370)	1	.1	59.7
Polk State College (0757)	1	.1	59.8
Pontifical Catholic University of PR (PR07)	1	.1	59.9
Portland Community College (3489)	1	.1	60.0
Previous Transfer Credit (TRFC)	2	.2	60.2
Prince Georges Community College (1731)	2	.2	60.3
Raritan Valley Comm Coll (2609)	1	.1	60.4
Rhodes College (Southwstn at Memphis) (4008)	3	.3	60.7
Richland College (4153)	1	.1	60.8
River Parishes Community College (1607)	35	3.0	63.8
Rockland Community College (2873)	1	.1	63.9
Saddleback College (0383)	1	.1	64.0
Sam Houston State University (4162)	3	.3	64.2
Samford University (0016)	3	.3	64.5
San Diego Mesa College (0337)	1	.1	64.6
San Diego Miramar College (8024)	1	.1	64.7
San Diego State University (0398)	1	.1	64.8
San Jacinto College-North Campus (4165)	1	.1	64.8
San Jacinto College-South Campus (4154)	2	.2	65.0
Santa Barbara City College (0418)	1	.1	65.1

Transfer Institution	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Savannah State College (0858)	1	.1	65.2
Schoolcraft College (2070)	1	.1	65.3
Service Record-Air Force (SERF)	1	.1	65.4
Service Record-Army (SERA)	11	1.0	66.3
Service Record-Marine Corp (SERM)	7	.6	66.9
Service Record-Navy (SERN)	4	.3	67.3
Shelton State Community College (0007)	1	.1	67.4
South Florida Junior College (0759)	1	.1	67.4
South Louisiana Community College (1615)	7	.6	68.1
South Plains College (4169)	2	.2	68.2
Southeast Community College-Lincoln (4787)	1	.1	68.3
Southeastern Louisiana University (1608)	96	8.3	76.6
Southern Union State Junior College (0040)	1	.1	76.7
Southern University-Baton Rouge (1610)	8	.7	77.4
Southern University-New Orleans (1611)	1	.1	77.5
Southern University-Shreveport (1613)	1	.1	77.6
Southwest Mississippi Junior College (2242)	2	.2	77.8
Southwestern Michigan College (2055)	1	.1	77.9
Spring Hill College (0042)	4	.3	78.2
St Edwards University (4156)	1	.1	78.3
St Johns River State College (0753)	1	.1	78.4
St Petersburg College (0752)	1	.1	78.5
State College of FL Manatee-Sarasota (0741)	1	.1	78.6
Stephen F. Austin State University (4188)	1	.1	78.6
Stillman College (0044)	1	.1	78.7
Suffolk University (1920)	1	.1	78.8
Sunway University College (MY32)	1	.1	78.9
Suny A & T College at Canton (2912)	1	.1	79.0
Tarrant County Jr Coll-Northeast Campus (4193)	1	.1	79.1
Technical College of the Lowcountry (6114)	1	.1	79.2
Texas A&M Univ Corpus Christi (4045)	1	.1	79.3
Texas A&M University (4198)	3	.3	79.5
Texas Christian University (4206)	2	.2	79.7
Texas State University - San Marcos (4178)	3	.3	79.9
Texas Tech University (4220)	5	.4	80.4
The Art Institute of Atlanta (0859)	1	.1	80.5
The Savannah College of Art & Design (0855)	1	.1	80.6
Thomas Aquinas College (0425)	1	.1	80.6
Tianjin univ of trad chinese medicine (QC82)	1	.1	80.7
Tidewater Community College-Norfolk Cmps (4408)	1	.1	80.8
Trinity University (4226)	1	.1	80.9
Tulane University of Louisiana (1614)	11	1.0	81.9

Transfer Institution	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Tuskegee Institute (0050)	1	.1	81.9
Tyler Junior College (4228)	1	.1	82.0
U S Air Force Academy (0530)	1	.1	82.1
U S Naval Academy (1742)	1	.1	82.2
UCSI University (MY37)	1	.1	82.3
Union University (4020)	1	.1	82.4
Univ of North Carolina at Charlotte (3163)	1	.1	82.5
Univ of Southern Mississippi (2218)	11	1.0	83.4
Univ of Wisconsin Madison (4656)	2	.2	83.6
Universidad Latina De Costa Rica (CS14)	1	.1	83.7
University of Alabama (0052)	6	.5	84.2
University of Arizona (0096)	1	.1	84.3
University of Arkansas (0144)	3	.3	84.5
University of Central Oklahoma (3390)	1	.1	84.6
University of Colorado (0532)	1	.1	84.7
University of Florida (0758)	2	.2	84.9
University of Georgia (0872)	2	.2	85.1
University of Houston (4236)	6	.5	85.6
University of Kansas (1470)	1	.1	85.7
University of Kentucky (1554)	1	.1	85.8
University of Louisiana-Lafayette (1612)	42	3.6	89.4
University of Louisiana-Monroe (1598)	11	1.0	90.4
University of Manitoba (CA02)	1	.1	90.5
University of Maryland University Coll (MD05)	1	.1	90.5
University of Maryland-Eastern Shore (1752)	1	.1	90.6
University of Massachusetts, Amherst (1924)	1	.1	90.7
University of Memphis (3992)	2	.2	90.9
University of Mississippi (Ole Miss) (2250)	2	.2	91.1
University of Missouri-Kansas City (2380)	1	.1	91.1
University of Mobile(Mobile College) (0029)	1	.1	91.2
University of Nevada-Las Vegas (2496)	2	.2	91.4
University of New Orleans (1591)	40	3.5	94.9
University of North Florida (0711)	1	.1	95.0
University of North Georgia (6067)	1	.1	95.1
University of Oklahoma (3442)	2	.2	95.2
University of Pennsylvania (3732)	1	.1	95.3
University of Phoenix (0087)	2	.2	95.5
University of Pittsburgh (3734)	1	.1	95.6
University of Puerto Rico Arecibo (PR04)	2	.2	95.7
University of Puerto Rico Mayaguez (9901)	1	.1	95.8
University of Puerto Rico-Arecibo (9916)	1	.1	95.9
University of South Alabama (0059)	2	.2	96.1

Transfer Institution	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
University of South Carolina (3880)	1	.1	96.2
University of South Florida (0761)	1	.1	96.3
University of Southern California (0470)	2	.2	96.4
University of St Thomas (4238)	1	.1	96.5
University of Tennessee (4026)	2	.2	96.7
University of Texas at Arlington (4200)	2	.2	96.9
University of Texas at Austin (4240)	3	.3	97.1
University of Texas at San Antonio (4239)	1	.1	97.2
University of West Georgia (0878)	1	.1	97.3
Valdosta State College (0874)	1	.1	97.4
Valencia College (0736)	1	.1	97.5
Vanderbilt University (4036)	1	.1	97.6
Villanova University (3744)	1	.1	97.7
Wake Forest University (3168)	1	.1	97.7
Weatherford College (4248)	1	.1	97.8
Webster University (2388)	1	.1	97.9
West Hills College (0226)	1	.1	98.0
West Texas A&M (State) University (4250)	1	.1	98.1
West Virginia University (4540)	2	.2	98.3
Western Governors University (WG01)	2	.2	98.4
Western Michigan University (2066)	2	.2	98.6
Wharton County Junior College (4252)	1	.1	98.7
William Carey University (2254)	4	.3	99.0
Xavier University (1618)	11	1.0	100.0
Total	1152	100.0	

APPENDIX D: INDIVIDUAL HOME STATE FOR STUDENTS WHO WERE ADMITTED  
AND DID NOT ENROLL

Home State	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
AL	6	1.0	1.0
AO	1	.2	1.2
AR	2	.3	1.5
AZ	2	.3	1.8
BF	1	.2	2.0
BH	1	.2	2.2
CA	55	9.2	11.3
CB	1	.2	11.5
CH	5	.8	12.3
CO	3	.5	12.8
CS	1	.2	13.0
CT	1	.2	13.1
DE	1	.2	13.3
ES	3	.5	13.8
FL	22	3.7	17.5
GA	13	2.2	19.6
HO	1	.2	19.8
IA	1	.2	20.0
ID	2	.3	20.3
IL	13	2.2	22.5
IN	2	.3	22.8
JO	1	.2	23.0
KS (Korea)	2	.3	23.3
KY	2	.3	23.6
LA	222	36.9	60.6
MA	6	1.0	61.6
MD	13	2.2	63.7
MI	4	.7	64.4
MN	3	.5	64.9
MO	6	1.0	65.9
MS	19	3.2	69.1
MY	2	.3	69.4
NC	10	1.7	71.0
NH	2	.3	71.4
NI	3	.5	71.9

Home State	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
NJ	8	1.3	73.2
NP	1	.2	73.4
NU	1	.2	73.5
NV	1	.2	73.7
NY	15	2.5	76.2
OH	1	.2	76.4
OK	1	.2	76.5
OR	1	.2	76.7
PA	6	1.0	77.7
PM	2	.3	78.0
RI	1	.2	78.2
RP	1	.2	78.4
RS	2	.3	78.7
SA	3	.5	79.2
SC	2	.3	79.5
TH	1	.2	79.7
TN	7	1.2	80.9
TX	97	16.1	97.0
UT	2	.3	97.3
VA	11	1.8	99.2
VM	1	.2	99.3
WA	3	.5	99.8
WI	1	.2	100.0
Total	601	100.0	

APPENDIX E: TRANSFER INSTITUTIONS ATTENDED BY STUDENTS WHO WERE  
ADMITTED AND DID NOT ENROLL

Transfer Institution	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Alabama A & M University (0002)	1	.2	.2
Albertus Magnus College (0549)	1	.2	.3
Anne Arundel Community College (1678)	2	.3	.7
Antelope Valley College (0160)	1	.2	.8
Appalachian State University (3062)	1	.2	1.0
Arkansas State University @ Jonesboro (0116)	2	.3	1.3
Ashford University (1342)	1	.2	1.5
Auburn University (0011)	2	.3	1.8
Austin Community College (4059)	3	.5	2.3
Ave Maria College-Nicaragua Campus (NU10)	1	.2	2.5
Ball State University (1176)	1	.2	2.7
Barry University (Barry College) (0718)	2	.3	3.0
Baton Rouge Community College (1603)	28	4.7	7.7
Baylor University (4062)	3	.5	8.2
Belhaven College (2180)	1	.2	8.3
Benedict College (3834)	1	.2	8.5
Blinn College-Brenham (4068)	7	1.2	9.7
Bossier Parish Community College (1573)	3	.5	10.1
Brevard Community College (0769)	2	.3	10.5
Brigham Young University - Idaho (0926)	1	.2	10.6
Brigham Young University (4266)	1	.2	10.8
Brookdale Community College (2553)	1	.2	11.0
Brookhaven College (4053)	1	.2	11.1
Burlington County College (2543)	1	.2	11.3
California State College Stanislaus (0435)	1	.2	11.5
California State Univ-Dominguez Hills (0203)	2	.3	11.8
California State University Chico (0212)	3	.5	12.3
California State University Fullerton (0355)	1	.2	12.5
California State University Long Beach (0302)	1	.2	12.6
California State University Northridge (0400)	1	.2	12.8
Cazenovia College (2696)	1	.2	13.0
CEBU Normal University (RP74)	1	.2	13.1
Centenary College of Louisiana (1576)	1	.2	13.3
Central Piedmont Community College (3081)	1	.2	13.5

Transfer Institution	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Central Texas College (4081)	3	.5	14.0
Chabot College (0207)	2	.3	14.3
Chattanooga State The Coll on the River (4041)	1	.2	14.5
City College of San Francisco (0220)	1	.2	14.6
City University of New York (2950)	1	.2	14.8
Clark College (4448)	1	.2	15.0
College of Lake County (1005)	3	.5	15.5
College of Southern Idaho (0915)	1	.2	15.6
College of Southern Maryland (1685)	1	.2	15.8
Collin College (4046)	1	.2	16.0
Colorado Mountain Coll-Glenwood Campus (0501)	1	.2	16.1
Columbia College (2276)	1	.2	16.3
Columbus Technical College (5309)	1	.2	16.5
Community College of the Air Force (CCAF)	1	.2	16.6
Crafton Hills College (0275)	1	.2	16.8
Cuesta College (0415)	1	.2	17.0
Cuny-Borough of Manhattan Comm College (2679)	1	.2	17.1
Cuny-Kingsborough Community College (2785)	1	.2	17.3
Cuyamaca College (0217)	1	.2	17.5
Dallas Baptist College (4080)	1	.2	17.6
Dallas Institute of Funeral Service (4077)	1	.2	17.8
Daqing Petroleum College (CX04)	1	.2	18.0
De Anza College (0253)	2	.3	18.3
Dean College (1816)	1	.2	18.5
Delaware County Community College (3542)	1	.2	18.6
Delgado Community College (1577)	11	1.8	20.5
Des Moines Area Community College-Ankeny (1272)	1	.2	20.6
Diablo Valley College (0254)	1	.2	20.8
Dillard University (1578)	1	.2	21.0
Eastern Illinois University (1016)	1	.2	21.1
Eastfield College (4085)	1	.2	21.3
Edison Community College (0727)	1	.2	21.5
El Camino College (0260)	1	.2	21.6
El Centro College (4079)	1	.2	21.8
Elon College (3096)	1	.2	22.0
Embry Riddle Aerontl Univ(Daytona Beach) (0725)	1	.2	22.1

Transfer Institution	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Emory University (0810)	1	.2	22.3
Faulkner State Community College (0035)	1	.2	22.5
Feather River College (0267)	1	.2	22.6
Ferghana State Univ (UZ08)	1	.2	22.8
Flagler College (0772)	1	.2	23.0
Florida Gulf Coast University (0733)	1	.2	23.1
Florida State College at Jacksonville (0717)	2	.3	23.5
Florida State University (0734)	1	.2	23.6
Foothill College (0263)	1	.2	23.8
Framingham State College (1904)	1	.2	24.0
Francis-Marion College (3856)	1	.2	24.1
Fresno City College (0264)	1	.2	24.3
Frostburg State College (1714)	1	.2	24.5
G.C.E. Advanced Levels (GCEA)	1	.2	24.6
Gainesville State College (0815)	1	.2	24.8
Georgia Gwinnett College (5478)	1	.2	25.0
Georgia Highlands College (0879)	1	.2	25.1
Georgia Perimeter College(Dekalb College (0806)	2	.3	25.5
Georgia Southern University (0830)	1	.2	25.6
Georgia State University (0826)	1	.2	25.8
Grand Rapids Community College (2004)	1	.2	26.0
Grossmont College (0279)	1	.2	26.1
Guilford Technical Community College (5134)	1	.2	26.3
Gulf Coast State College (0738)	1	.2	26.5
Hampton University (4358)	1	.2	26.6
Hanover College (1200)	1	.2	26.8
Harford Community College (1700)	1	.2	27.0
Harvard University (1840)	1	.2	27.1
Hendrix College (0128)	1	.2	27.3
Hesser College (2503)	1	.2	27.5
High Point College (3108)	1	.2	27.6
Hinds Comm College - Utica Campus (2223)	1	.2	27.8
Hinds Community College-Raymond Campus (2198)	1	.2	28.0
Hinds Community College, Rankin Campus (2262)	1	.2	28.1
Holmes Community College (2200)	3	.5	28.6
Hoseo University (KS89)	1	.2	28.8

Transfer Institution	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Houston Community College System (4105)	11	1.8	30.6
Howard College at Big Spring (4100)	2	.3	30.9
Howard Community College (1703)	1	.2	31.1
Illinois Central College (1035)	1	.2	31.3
Inst Americano De Educacion Superior (ES06)	3	.5	31.8
Inti College (MY21)	1	.2	31.9
Iowa Western Comm College-Council Bluffs (1327)	1	.2	32.1
James Madison University (4370)	1	.2	32.3
Jefferson State Junior College (0047)	1	.2	32.4
Johnson & Wales University (0767)	1	.2	32.6
Jones County Junior College (2206)	1	.2	32.8
Kilgore College (4112)	2	.3	33.1
Kirkwood Community College (1275)	1	.2	33.3
Lackawanna Junior College (3605)	1	.2	33.4
Lamar University (4114)	2	.3	33.8
Liaoning University (CH82)	1	.2	33.9
Lindenwood University @ St. Charles (2324)	1	.2	34.1
Lone Star College - Cyfair (4786)	4	.7	34.8
Lone Star College - Montgomery (4262)	4	.7	35.4
Lone Star College - North Harris (4139)	3	.5	35.9
Lone Star College - Tomball (4261)	2	.3	36.3
Long Beach City College (0300)	1	.2	36.4
Louisiana College (1586)	4	.7	37.1
Louisiana Delta Community College (1655)	2	.3	37.4
Louisiana State University-Alexandria (1589)	4	.7	38.1
Louisiana State University-Eunice (1587)	1	.2	38.3
Louisiana State University-Shreveport (1593)	3	.5	38.8
Louisiana Tech University (1588)	8	1.3	40.1
Loyola University (1592)	3	.5	40.6
Marion Military Institute (0026)	5	.8	41.4
Marquette University (4610)	1	.2	41.6
Marywood College (3626)	1	.2	41.8
McNeese State University (1594)	1	.2	41.9
Mesa Community College (0093)	1	.2	42.1
Methodist University (3127)	1	.2	42.3
Middle Tennessee State University (3994)	2	.3	42.6

Transfer Institution	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Middlesex County College (2573)	1	.2	42.8
Midlands Technical Coll-Beltline Campus (3869)	1	.2	42.9
Millikin University (1080)	1	.2	43.1
Millsaps College (2212)	1	.2	43.3
Miracosta College (0352)	1	.2	43.4
Miss Gulf Coast Cc(Jackson County) (2203)	2	.3	43.8
Miss Gulf Coast Cc(Jefferson Davis) (2205)	1	.2	43.9
Mississippi College (2214)	1	.2	44.1
Mississippi State University (2220)	3	.5	44.6
Monroe Community College (2821)	1	.2	44.8
Montgomery College-Rockville Campus (1723)	4	.7	45.4
Moorpark College (0335)	2	.3	45.8
Morehouse College (0792)	1	.2	45.9
Morgan State University (1722)	2	.3	46.3
Mountain View College (4089)	1	.2	46.4
Muffles Junior College (BH04)	1	.2	46.6
New Mexico Military Institute (2644)	4	.7	47.3
Nicholls State University (1580)	6	1.0	48.3
North Carolina Wesleyan College (3135)	1	.2	48.4
North Central Texas College (4094)	1	.2	48.6
North Lake College (4141)	2	.3	48.9
Northern Arizona University (0086)	1	.2	49.1
Northern Virginia Community College (4381)	2	.3	49.4
Northwest Mississippi Junior College (2228)	1	.2	49.6
Northwest Vista College (4126)	1	.2	49.8
Northwestern State Univ of Louisiana (1600)	3	.5	50.2
Novosibirsk State Acad Arch & Art (UR51)	1	.2	50.4
Oakland Community College (2043)	1	.2	50.6
Oakton Community College (1104)	1	.2	50.7
Ohlone College (0265)	1	.2	50.9
Olabisi Onabanjo Univ (Ogun State) (NI30)	1	.2	51.1
Onondaga Community College (2847)	3	.5	51.6
Orange Coast College (0354)	1	.2	51.7
Oregon State University (3482)	1	.2	51.9
Other College Attended-Need Transcript (9998)	1	.2	52.1
Our Lady of the Lake College (1621)	4	.7	52.7

Transfer Institution	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Ozarks Technical Community College (2335)	1	.2	52.9
Pace University-Westchester (2855)	1	.2	53.1
Palomar College (0366)	1	.2	53.2
Peninsula College (4472)	1	.2	53.4
Pennsylvania State University (3656)	1	.2	53.6
Piedmont Virginia Community College (4384)	1	.2	53.7
Pima Community College (0101)	1	.2	53.9
Portland Community College (3489)	2	.3	54.2
Purdue University (1230)	1	.2	54.4
Quinnipiac University (0582)	1	.2	54.6
Reedley College (8085)	1	.2	54.7
Rhodes College (Southwstn at Memphis) (4008)	1	.2	54.9
Richland College (4153)	1	.2	55.1
River Parishes Community College (1607)	5	.8	55.9
Riverland Community College (2082)	1	.2	56.1
Riverside City College (0378)	2	.3	56.4
Rochester Institute of Technology (2870)	1	.2	56.6
Rockhurst University (2342)	1	.2	56.7
Rutgers State Univ-Rutgers College (2592)	1	.2	56.9
Saddleback College (0383)	1	.2	57.1
Salem State College (1910)	1	.2	57.2
Sam Houston State University (4162)	3	.5	57.7
San Diego Mesa College (0337)	1	.2	57.9
San Jacinto College-Central (4167)	2	.3	58.2
San Jacinto College-South Campus (4154)	2	.3	58.6
Santa Barbara City College (0418)	1	.2	58.7
Santa Fe College (0778)	2	.3	59.1
Santa Monica College (0420)	3	.5	59.6
Santa Rosa Junior College (0422)	1	.2	59.7
Schreiner College (4168)	1	.2	59.9
Service Record-Army (SERA)	5	.8	60.7
Service Record-Marine Corp (SERM)	5	.8	61.6
Service Record-Navy (SERN)	6	1.0	62.6
Sierra College (0429)	1	.2	62.7
South Florida Junior College (0759)	2	.3	63.1
South Louisiana Community College (1615)	2	.3	63.4

Transfer Institution	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
South University - Tampa (5734)	1	.2	63.6
Southeastern Louisiana University (1608)	18	3.0	66.6
Southern Arkansas University (0142)	1	.2	66.7
Southern Methodist University (4174)	2	.3	67.1
Southern New Hampshire University (2514)	1	.2	67.2
Southern University-Baton Rouge (1610)	3	.5	67.7
Southside Virginia Community College (4337)	1	.2	67.9
Southwest Mississippi Junior College (2242)	1	.2	68.1
Southwest Petroleum College (CX05)	1	.2	68.2
Spring Hill College (0042)	1	.2	68.4
St Ambrose College (1352)	1	.2	68.6
St Louis Comm Coll at Forest Park (2299)	1	.2	68.7
St Louis Comm Coll at Meramec (2328)	1	.2	68.9
St Petersburg College (0752)	1	.2	69.1
Stephen F. Austin State University (4188)	2	.3	69.4
Strayer University (0694)	1	.2	69.6
Suffolk County Community College (2965)	1	.2	69.7
Suny A & T College at Farmingdale (2918)	1	.2	69.9
Suny at Albany (2926)	1	.2	70.0
Sweet Briar College (4406)	1	.2	70.2
Tarrant County Jr Coll-Northeast Campus (4193)	1	.2	70.4
Tarrant County Jr Coll-Northwest Campus (4195)	2	.3	70.7
Tennessee State University - Main Campus (4010)	1	.2	70.9
Tennessee Technological University (4012)	1	.2	71.0
Texas A&M Commerce (4088)	1	.2	71.2
Texas A&M Univ Corpus Christi (4045)	1	.2	71.4
Texas A&M University (4198)	1	.2	71.5
Texas Christian University (4206)	1	.2	71.7
Texas Lutheran University (4214)	1	.2	71.9
Texas State University - San Marcos (4178)	2	.3	72.2
Texas Tech University (4220)	3	.5	72.7
The Polytechnic Ibadan (NI34)	1	.2	72.9
Tidewater Community College (4353)	1	.2	73.0
Towson University (1718)	1	.2	73.2
Tri-State University (1250)	1	.2	73.4
Trinity Vall Community College (4098)	1	.2	73.5

Transfer Institution	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Triton College (1151)	1	.2	73.7
Troy University (0048)	1	.2	73.9
Tsinghua University (CH59)	1	.2	74.0
Tulane University of Louisiana (1614)	11	1.8	75.9
Tyler Junior College (4228)	2	.3	76.2
U of Texas-Brownsville (4218)	1	.2	76.4
Univ of North Carolina at Charlotte (3163)	2	.3	76.7
Univ of North Carolina at Wilmington (3174)	1	.2	76.9
Univ of Southern Mississippi (2218)	5	.8	77.7
Univ Tech MARA (INTEC) (MY38)	1	.2	77.9
Universidad De Costa Rica (CS01)	1	.2	78.0
Universidad Tecnologica De Panama (PN04)	1	.2	78.2
Universitatea De Stat Din Moldova (MD02)	1	.2	78.4
University of Ado-Ekiti (NI33)	1	.2	78.5
University of Alabama (0052)	1	.2	78.7
University of Alaska - Anchorage (0137)	1	.2	78.9
University of California-Berkeley (0444)	1	.2	79.0
University of California-Santa Barbara (0452)	1	.2	79.2
University of Central Florida (0735)	1	.2	79.4
University of Central Missouri (2272)	1	.2	79.5
University of Cincinnati (3340)	1	.2	79.7
University of Colorado (0532)	3	.5	80.2
University of Copenhagen (DA03)	1	.2	80.4
University of Delaware (0634)	1	.2	80.5
University of Florida (0758)	1	.2	80.7
University of Houston (4236)	6	1.0	81.7
University of Houston-Clear Lake City (4171)	1	.2	81.9
University of Louisiana-Lafayette (1612)	9	1.5	83.4
University of Louisiana-Monroe (1598)	4	.7	84.0
University of Louisville (1556)	2	.3	84.4
University of Maryland University Coll (MD05)	1	.2	84.5
University of Massachusetts/Dartmouth (1906)	1	.2	84.7
University of Memphis (3992)	2	.3	85.0
University of Michigan-Ann Arbor (2062)	1	.2	85.2
University of Minnesota-Twin Cities-Minn (2156)	2	.3	85.5
University of Mississippi (Ole Miss) (2250)	1	.2	85.7

Transfer Institution	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
University of Missouri-St Louis (2383)	1	.2	85.9
University of New Haven (0576)	2	.3	86.2
University of New Orleans (1591)	11	1.8	88.0
University of North Texas (4136)	1	.2	88.2
University of Oklahoma (3442)	2	.3	88.5
University of Phoenix (0087)	1	.2	88.7
University of South Alabama (0059)	1	.2	88.9
University of South Carolina (3880)	1	.2	89.0
University of St Thomas (4238)	1	.2	89.2
University of Technology, Malaysia (MY11)	1	.2	89.4
University of Tennessee (4026)	2	.3	89.7
University of Texas at Austin (4240)	2	.3	90.0
University of Texas at Dallas (4243)	1	.2	90.2
University of Texas at San Antonio (4239)	5	.8	91.0
University of Texas at Tyler (4231)	2	.3	91.3
University of the Incarnate Word (4106)	1	.2	91.5
University of Tulsa (3444)	1	.2	91.7
University of Utah (4274)	1	.2	91.8
University of Washington (4484)	1	.2	92.0
University of West Georgia (0878)	2	.3	92.3
University of Wyoming (5006)	1	.2	92.5
Utah Valley University (4278)	1	.2	92.7
Valencia College (0736)	3	.5	93.2
Valley Forge Military Junior College (3740)	2	.3	93.5
Ventura College (0476)	1	.2	93.7
Virginia State University (4424)	1	.2	93.8
Virginia Tech (4420)	3	.5	94.3
Virginia Western Community College (4351)	1	.2	94.5
Vista College (0174)	1	.2	94.7
Volunteer State Community College (4037)	1	.2	94.8
Wagner College (2984)	1	.2	95.0
Wake Technical College (3177)	2	.3	95.3
Washington and Lee University (4430)	1	.2	95.5
Washtenaw Community College (2067)	1	.2	95.7
Waubonsee Community College (1159)	1	.2	95.8
Weatherford College (4248)	1	.2	96.0

Transfer Institution	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Wentworth Military Academy (2390)	2	.3	96.3
West Valley College (0479)	1	.2	96.5
West Virginia University (4540)	1	.2	96.7
Western Governors University (WG01)	1	.2	96.8
Western Michigan University (2066)	1	.2	97.0
Western Texas College (4172)	1	.2	97.2
Wheelock College (1934)	1	.2	97.3
William Rainey Harper College (1163)	2	.3	97.7
Willmar Community College (2161)	1	.2	97.8
Wor-Wic Tech Community College (1760)	1	.2	98.0
Xavier University (1618)	11	1.8	99.8
Yavapai Community College (0098)	1	.2	100.0
Total	601	100.0	

## VITA

Barrett Linam was raised by the two best parents, H. Maurice Linam and Marsha Beth Luneau Linam. He was born in the fantastic year for red wine, at least in the Rhone Valley, of 1985. He is the younger brother of one, Justin Linam, who happens to be one of the best persons to ever exist. In May 2003, he graduated from West Monroe High School. He attended Louisiana Scholars' College at Northwestern State University for two years and transferred to Louisiana State University his junior year and graduated with a bachelor of science in psychology in May 2007. He then attended Louisiana State University where he graduated with a master of social work which he completed in May 2009.

His internships included working with the inmates at Louisiana State Penitentiary at Angola where he counseled inmates from the behavioral unit and death row. He also worked with patients at the Baton Rouge General Hospital at both the Mid-City and Bluebonnet locations. He has appreciatively and most likely been one of the longest tenured graduate assistants in North American history. He has worked as a graduate assistant for the Office of Undergraduate Admissions since May 2007.