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ABSTRACT

Historically, institutions of higher education focused their efforts on programs and services to support traditional students’ integration (i.e., the eighteen year old who enrolls in college immediately after graduating from high school) into the college environment. Integration into the university environment contributes to student retention. Underrepresented students, specifically community college transfer students, are left out of the retention planning process. With the increase of transfer students transitioning to four-year universities, this study explored transfer students’ integration experience within their initial six weeks of attendance at a receiving institution. This action research study implemented an E-Mentoring Program utilizing the social media platform, Facebook. Results from the mixed-methods study provided evidence that classroom connection interwoven with social rapport with peers, cognizance of new environment, and institutional and peer resources matter for integration within the first six weeks at HUC (a pseudonym). The information gained will be used to inform higher education administrators, student affairs practitioners, faculty, and staff as they develop relevant services, programs, and practices that intentionally support transfer students’ integration.
DEDICATION

I dedicate this body of work to my husband Clint.

Your love and sacrifice allowed me to complete a doctoral degree.

Because of you, another dream of mine has come true.

I love you.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many who have sacrificed, supported, endured, and prayed for me throughout my doctoral journey. Their encouragement allowed me to reach this milestone.

My children, whose life over the last three years have revolved around me. I pray that the time spent on this finished work will first and foremost inspire you too to achieve your dreams. I love you Collin and Camille; now it’s time to have fun!

My parents, whose love and belief in me my entire life provided the foundation for my self-confidence and work ethic. Watching you love, parent, work, and play hard inspired me to want to do the same. I give you the honor you rightfully deserve as my parents and for the many sacrifices you made for me throughout my life. I will always be there for you as you have been there for me. I love you Roger and Carolle Camille.


My sister in Christ who I met in this program and will forever be connected with, Dr. Paula Veach. God was intentional when he placed us in this program together. He knew you would be my friend, confidant, and partner in operating outside the boundaries. I am thankful for your obedience in being there for me, for challenging me, and for being so thoughtful and caring. I am proud to have gone through this program with you. In Dr. Maya Angelou’s words, you are a “phenomenal woman.”

To all of my family, friends, church family, ASU Sun Devils, Righteous 7 peers and faculty, and students, you all rock! Special thanks to Dr. Lisa Cahill, Dr. April Boozer, and Dr. Peter Bartanen for your patience with me and my writing. Special...
thanks to my prayer warriors: Rhoshawndra Carnes, Cynthia Pullen, Barbara Fleming, Toni Cook, Aileen Carter, Alma Barnett, and Donna Penny.

To all first-generation students, yes you can achieve a terminal degree!

To the transfer students, who inspired me to advance my research in this area and those that participated to make the study possible, thank you!

To my dissertation committee members, I am grateful and appreciative of your guidance and belief in me to make it to the finish line. Dr. Kathleen Puckett, you never took your eyes off the end goal. You knew before I did that I would finish. There was no other option. Thank you. Dr. Robert Kleinsasser, the realness of who you are and the reality of the process that you shared and guided me through was very much appreciated. Coupled with the excellent, consistent, challenging, and encouraging feedback was invaluable. It “behooves” me to say thank you for your contributions to me gaining my “credentials.” Dr. Kevin Cook, your commitment to me as an individual, professional, and now an educator with a doctorate degree is a reflection of true mentorship. Thank you for always accepting me as I am and drawing upon my strengths to move me forward. You are a blessing in my life.

To God, thank you for your son Jesus Christ. I stand firm knowing that none of this was possible or has meaning without Him. I give Jesus all the glory, honor and praise for the provisions He made for my life and the lives of all the people I speak of above and their loved ones.

Isaiah 40:31
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

| LIST OF TABLES | ................................................................. | x |
| LIST OF FIGURES | ................................................................ | xi |

## CHAPTER

1 INTRODUCTION

- Statement of the Problem ........................................................................................................... 4
- Transfer Student Experiences at a Receiving Institution ........................................................... 5
- E-Mentoring Program .................................................................................................................. 7
- Research Questions .................................................................................................................... 8

2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

- Introduction ................................................................................................................................... 9
- Tinto’s Interactionalist Theory ......................................................................................................... 9
- Defining Integration ....................................................................................................................... 12
- Defining the Transfer Student ......................................................................................................... 12
- Defining Integration of Transfer Students .................................................................................... 13
  - Barriers to Transfer Student Integration .................................................................................... 14
- Summary ....................................................................................................................................... 16

3 METHODS

- Research Design ............................................................................................................................ 17
- Participants .................................................................................................................................... 18
- Role of the Researcher .................................................................................................................. 20
- Procedures .................................................................................................................................... 20
| CHAPTER |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Instruments                      | 24 |
| Description of Data Collection Instruments | 24 |
| Facebook Posts                   | 24 |
| Interview                        | 25 |
| Mentor/Researcher Journal        | 25 |
| Archival Data                    | 26 |
| Background Survey                | 26 |
| Laanan - Transfer Students’ Questionnaire (L-TSQ©) | 27 |
| Data Analysis                    | 27 |
| Qualitative Data Analysis        | 29 |
| Quantitative Data Analysis       | 29 |
| Validating Data Analysis         | 30 |
| Summary                          | 30 |

4 DATA RESULTS ................................................................. 31

Qualitative Data Results .................................................. 31

Information ........................................................................ 31

Exposure to General Information ........................................ 34

Convenient Access to Information ...................................... 37

Support ............................................................................ 37

Academic Experience ......................................................... 42

Academic Advising ......................................................... 43

Course Offerings ............................................................. 44
5 DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS ................................................................. 65

Research Question 1: How Does Integration Occur for Transfer Students at a Receiving Institution? .......................................................... 65
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Experiences</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognizance</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 2: How Does Participation in the E-Mentoring Program Influence Transfer Students’ Sense of Integration at the Receiving University?</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional and Peer Resource</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons Learned</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for Practice</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for Research</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend the Program</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Mentor</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Local Participants</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of the Study</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Direction</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCES</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>EXAMPLE OF OUTREACH EMAIL TO PARTICIPANTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>E-MENTORING RECRUITMENT BROCHURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>JOINING THE E-MENTORING FACEBOOK GROUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>INTERVIEW PROTOCOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>MENTORING MENTEE SURVEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>LAANAN – TRANSFER STUDENTS’ QUESTIONNAIRE (L-TSQ©)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>PERMISSION TO USE INSTRUMENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Participant Demographics (N=6)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Research Study Procedure Timeline</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Data Collection Inventory</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Laanan’s Transfer Student Questionnaire – Choosing HU</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Laanan’s Transfer Student Questionnaire – Course Learning</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Laanan’s Transfer Student Questionnaire – Experiences with Faculty</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Laanan’s Transfer Student Questionnaire – General Perceptions of HUC</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Laanan’s Transfer Student Questionnaire – Adjustment Process</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Laanan’s Transfer Student Questionnaire – Satisfaction</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Data Analysis Plan</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Where to Find a Microwave on Campus</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ways of Engaging on Facebook</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Support Garnered Through the Facebook Closed Group</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Support Garnered Through the Facebook Closed Group.</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Involvement Shared on Facebook</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION

Tessa made the decision to attend a community college right after high school. The decision was influenced by her economic situation and sense of preparedness for college. While attending community college, she was employed forty hours a week which delayed her time to degree completion. Finally, upon achieving her associate’s degree, she transferred to a four-year university. Tessa’s intent was to graduate with her bachelor’s degree in hopes of pursuing a career as a physician’s assistant.

Tessa enrolled in two on-line classes her first semester at her new four-year university. When asked why she was only taking two courses and both on-line, she shared she had multiple external commitments which prevented her from attending full-time. She also felt this route would allow her to ease into the four-year university environment at a more amendable pace. While attending the four-year university, Tessa continued to work off-campus approximately 30 hours a week and enroll in another two face-to-face courses at the community college. In addition, Tessa also worked approximately eight hours a week on-campus at her new institution. Through her on-campus employment, Tessa was in the midst of administrators who worked daily to assist all students in being successful. Yet, Tessa remained quiet and focused on her two jobs and four classes. When she appeared tired, it was apparent that she worked late the night before at her off-campus job. When encouraged to work less hours, she was reluctant and revealed that her financial responsibilities impeded this option. With that insight, she was advised to consider rearranging her work schedule to create better balance between her school work and her employment. She was not advised to reduce her work hours or to lesson her academic load. In addition, specific time management schedules were
created with her to assess which plan would be ideal. She heeded the advice and rearranged her work hours to weekends, alleviating conflict during the week between her school work, classes, and employment. This was the beginning of my relationship with Tessa. Unbeknown to me at the time, Tessa considered me to be a mentor to her within her new environment: the university.

One day late in the fall semester, I asked Tessa what was going to be different for her next semester. She was very excited to share that she was finally going to take all face-to-face classes at the university. She was nervous about the full transition, but she knew this was the right course of action. With her passion to become a physician’s assistant, her science courses and labs were only offered in-person. Tessa returned to school in the spring semester and began her journey of being a full-time student while continuing to balance two jobs.

During one occasion, I invited Tessa to have a cup of coffee and to describe her overall experience thus far at the university. I was astonished to learn that despite her commitment to face-to-face classes, Tessa remained only minimally involved in her new setting. She explained that she would come to campus in time for work and classes, thereafter leaving either to go to her next job or home. When she had breaks between classes and her on-campus employment, she would sit in the library and wait for time to pass. Tessa’s focus was to achieve her degree. Attending the university was for the sole purpose of going to class and getting good grades. This was how Tessa defined what it meant to be a college student. After all, that was her mindset while attending community college.
Tessa shared with me during that same cup of coffee that she wished she could use her free time to workout at the gym on campus but she was concerned about the cost. Tessa did not realize she had already paid a recreation fee as part of her cost of attendance which gave her access. She also shared that she was not sure if the number of courses she was taking was sufficient in light of her graduation goals, thereby questioning if she could enroll in additional courses without increasing her out of pocket cost. Tessa also did not have her university identification card or know of other opportunities available to her outside of classes. She had not made friends at her new institution; she maintained her relationships with her community college friends and off-campus co-workers. When I asked Tessa why she had not made known to anyone that she had these questions, she just shrugged her shoulders and stated, “I don’t like to ask questions.” Her response indicated that there was a lack of “knowing” what more was available to her within this new place. From this initial conversation, I made it my mission to be more intentional with Tessa by providing her with information and asking direct questions each time I saw her regarding her overall collegiate experience. Certainly we addressed her preliminary inquiries, but we also made it a point to meet again, both informally and formally.

During our second formal meeting, I asked Tessa to reflect on her initial transition and what perhaps she would have done differently. She stated she would have attended Transfer Student Orientation (TSO). She knew TSO could have provided her with the fundamentals regarding what it meant to be a student at this new university and how to navigate the campus. Additionally, she said that she would have appreciated connecting with someone, like me, sooner who may have taken the time to get to know her and to
guide her at the university. My hope was that Tessa and I, as her mentor, would be able to redefine what it meant for her and to her to be at the university while reaching her ultimate goal, earning a bachelor’s degree.

**Statement of the Problem**

Tessa’s experience is not uncommon among transfer students. Others have shared frustrations about integrating to their receiving institution. These frustrations are not easily mitigated as a whole for transfer students due to the diversity of the population. Empirical studies on transfer student integration collapse all types of transfers (e.g., adult learners, military learners, community college transfers, and transitioning traditional students) thereby limiting generalizability and applicability of quintessential factors that may be found to undergird transfer student success at respective receiving institutions.

Simultaneously, the theoretical foundation for this study posits that integration (academic adjustment and social adjustment) of a student within their college environment positively contributes to their retention and persistence towards graduation. In essence, there is a dearth of research that gives voice to the transfer students’ concrete experience regarding their integration at the receiving institution. For Tessa, her off-campus work responsibility and lack of a social network impeded her integration into her new institution. This study will formally explore community college transfer students’ experiences within their first six weeks at a receiving institution and propose ways that these students can be better integrated into their receiving institution.

The impetus for addressing Tessa’s challenge stems from the increased national attention on college completion for the preservation of a democratic American society. Crellin, Kelly, and Prince (2012), Jones (2010), Kanter, Ochoa, Nassif, and Chong
(2011), and the National Commission on Higher Education Attainment (NCHEA; 2013) articulate the benefits of a college educated citizen as greater engagement in citizenry, a highly educated workforce ready to address more complex issues within the work environment, increased job productivity, better health of individuals as a result of their workplaces providing insurance, and an overall sense of happiness. Collectively public and private stakeholders advocate that access to and completion of a college degree by Americans is paramount.

Despite the well understood importance of a college education, the number of high school graduates choosing to attend a four-year college is decreasing (Handel, 2011). Like Tessa, students are choosing to first attend a community college then transfer to a four-year institution to gain their baccalaureate degree. With over 60% of students transferring from two-year to four-year institutions, the urgency for four-year institutions to understand how best to support these individuals is essential to achieving national college completion goals (Shapiro et al., 2013).

Transfer Student Experiences at a Receiving Institution

This study occurred at a multi-campus institution in the Southwest. It will be referred to as Harvest University (HU). HU is a public research university in a metropolitan setting with a total enrollment exceeding 55,000 (excluding on-line only students). HU is a single, unified institution comprising four differentiated campuses with a mission to positively impact the economic, social, cultural, and environmental health of the communities it serves.

HU campuses are situated in close proximity to ten local community colleges designed to support the economic needs of the state and urban metropolitan area by
providing degree and workforce training programs. One of HU’s strategic targets in contributing to the state’s vision for higher education is to collaborate with community colleges, focusing on transfer students’ attainment of bachelor’s degree. The specific change is a statewide 4,000 to 9,000 increase in community college transfers to earn bachelor’s degrees amongst the affiliated universities. In an effort to contribute to this goal, HU has embarked on several initiatives, including creating articulation agreements with local and out-of-state community colleges, working with faculty and staff across the university to develop systems, policies, and processes for the evaluation of transfer credits, and the reorganization of its approach to transfer admissions.

More specifically, at one of HU’s campuses, Harvest University Campus (HUC) where the action research took place and where I serve as the Associate Dean of Students, the undergraduate enrollment has averaged 3,600 annually over the last five years. Of those undergraduate students, approximately 500 annually are in-state transfer students. The majority of the transfer students transition from three local community colleges.

Tessa is a transfer student from one of the three community colleges and is currently attending HUC. She has benefited from the efforts of HU to successfully transition from the community college to HUC. Her story informs higher education practitioners that transfer students experience a gap between enrolling in classes at a receiving institution (typically completed in a one on one setting with an academic advisor and over the summer) and integrating into the receiving institution’s collegiate environment. After conducting several informational interviews with administrators associated with transfer initiatives at HU, it was apparent that HU’s efforts must focus on the transfer students’ experience beyond the transfer process. Once a transfer student,
like Tessa, matriculates at the receiving institution, there is little to no knowledge of their integration experiences at the university.
E-Mentoring Program

In an effort to better understand the phenomenon on integration within the receiving institution, new transfer students to HUC in the fall of 2014 were offered the opportunity to participate in a mentoring program, E-Mentoring Program. The program occurred during the first 6 weeks of classes aligning with the importance of early integration to the university influencing persistence (Tinto, 1987, p. 49). Benefits of mentorship to students in higher education are well established. These benefits are the outcome of simplicity and frequency of the interactions and communications between the mentors and mentees (Bierema & Merriam, 2002). With the onset of technology, the opportunity for computer based mentoring experiences is evident.

E-mentoring is defined as a “computer mediated, mutually beneficial relationship between a mentor and a protégé which provides learning, advising, encouraging, promoting, and modeling, that is often boundaryless, egalitarian, and is qualitatively different than traditional face-to-face mentoring” (Bierema & Merriam, 2002, p. 214). Utilizing Facebook as the computer mediated platform, the E-Mentoring Program was designed to support transfer students’ integration into HUC, eliminating the barrier of traditional face-to-face mentoring meetings. Participants had the opportunity to automatically affiliate with a social network. Participants had a high level administrator serve as the mentor who offered guidance and support relevant to their collegiate experience at the receiving institution, while building a sense of community through social media. The data gathered from the pilot program informs higher education administrators, student affairs practitioners, faculty, and staffs in developing relevant services, programs, and practices that intentionally support transfer students’ integration.
Research Questions

The purpose of this mixed methods action research study is to explore transfer students’ integration at one receiving institution, HUC.

The research questions for this study are:

1. How does integration occur for transfer students at a receiving institution?

2. How does participation in the E-Mentoring Program influence transfer students’ sense of integration at a receiving university?

The data from the study articulates the manner in which the participants integrated at HUC. The conclusion of the study provides valuable information for supporting transfer student success at HUC.
CHAPTER 2 – REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Tessa’s story is one of many for transfer students at HU and beyond. Therefore, this chapter presents a broad review of the relevant literature related to transfer students’ integration experiences. The chapter is organized into five sections. The first section presents the theoretical framework for the study, Tinto’s interactionalist theory (1975, 1987, 1993). The theory provides context as to why Tessa’s lack of integration is of concern to the higher education educator. The second section defines the integration constructs. The third section provides an overview of the transfer student population. The fourth section provides literature that describes transfer students’ integration experiences and associated barriers at receiving institutions. The last section summarizes the chapter.

Tinto’s Interactionalist Theory

Attaining paradigmatic status, Tinto’s interactionalist theory serves as the foundation on which higher education institutions develop student retention and persistence models. The interactionalist theory posits that students’ adjustment to college occurs through their integration into the college environment (Tinto, 1975, 1987, 1993). The integration is a result of the student first separating from their current group (e.g., family, high school peers), then undergoing a period of transition (e.g., learning the norms of new community and developing rapport with new community members), and lastly adopting the normative values and behaviors of their new environment (e.g., college environment). Tinto further asserts that there are two types of integration by which adjustment occurs: academic and social. Numerous studies using Tinto’s
interactionalist theory demonstrate positive outcomes for students who are academically and socially integrated into the collegiate environment (Astin, 1999; D’Amico, Dika, Elling, Algozzine, & Ginn, 2013; Karp, Hughes, & Gara, 2008; Laanan, 2007; Pascarella & Chapman, 1983; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Tinto, 1993, 1997).

Over the years, Tinto’s interactionalist theory has been revised and continues to evolve. Tinto stated in his earlier works that the two types of integration, academic and social, are independent of each other, denoting that students must develop through both constructs (1975). In his later revisions of the theory, he acknowledges that the integration process can be interwoven and exists to varying degrees (1993, p. 108). The work of Deil-Amen (2011) and Karp et al. (2008) on community college students support this notion as their studies find that student’s social integration is important and is interwoven through their academic integration. Deil-Amen (2011) uses the term “socio-academic” positing that these integrative moments contribute to student’s retention and persistence.

Tinto’s original work focused on the traditional 18 year old student who entered college immediately after graduating from high school and was living on campus. After the model was validated for this cohort, it was applied to various other cohorts (e.g., predominately non-residential institutions, community colleges, and non-traditional students); (Bean & Metzner, 1985; Pascarella & Chapman, 1983). One primary distinction between these three empirical studies was that academic integration was more relevant for retention of the commuting population. This skewed the perceived need of balance between academic and social integration mattering as social integration is less relevant for the commuting population.
Tinto recognizes that student pre-entry attributes (e.g., family background, skills and abilities, and prior schooling), coupled with the student’s initial commitment to the institution and commitment to graduation influence student persistence (Bean & Metzner, 1985; Berger & Lyon, 2005; Tinto, 1993). Tinto acknowledges the multiple sub-communities students may belong to that can also influence persistence (e.g., external commitments such as family, jobs, and religious affiliations). Acknowledging these sub-communities may substitute college as the primary community to which a student is affiliated. If this is indeed the case for a student, then separation from a current group may have an adverse effect on a student. In a study exploring college integration of non-traditional students, specifically soldiers attending college, the study found that the military community replaced the college community and that social integration defined by “extra-curricular activities” within the college was not a factor toward these students persistence (Wilson, Smith, Lee, & Stevenson, 2013).

Reflecting upon the evolution of Tinto’s interactionist theory coupled with the various studies mentioned thus far, exploring specifically how transfer students integrate into the receiving university environment, is warranted. It is unclear whether the current constructs of academic and social integration, as defined by Tinto, suffices for this student population. After learning more about Tessa, advising her to attend various types of extra-curricular events and activities to help her connect to HUC may have been futile. Her external commitments, as already stated, limit her ability to engage frequently, if at all, in this fashion. Simultaneously, not knowing what can be more beneficial with regard to her integration may contribute negatively to her ability to be retained and persist at HUC.
Defining Integration

Integration is inclusive of students’ academic and social adjustment within a receiving institution. Academic integration is defined as “the formal education of students. Its activities center about the classrooms and laboratories of the institution and involve various faculty and staff whose primary responsibility is the education of students” (Tinto, 1993, p. 106). In other words, academic adjustment to the university is reflected in activities connected to the classroom including formal interactions with faculty and academic staff members. Social integration is defined as “reoccurring sets of interactions among student, faculty and staff that take place largely outside the formal academic domain of the college” (Tinto, 1993, pp. 106 – 107). In other words, social adjustment is reflected through participating in activities such as clubs and organizations, living and dining on campus, and connecting to individuals such as peers, faculty, and staff informally.

Defining the Transfer Student

McCormick and Carroll (1997) define transfer as a transition between two postsecondary institutions in which the receiving institution grants academic credit to a student for the coursework completed at the initial institution (p. 1). There are multiple types of transfers: vertical, a transfer from a two-year to a four-year institution; horizontal, a transition from a two-year or four-year to another two-year or four-year institutions; reverse, a transition from a four-year to a two-year institution; and multiple, attending more than two institutions (McCormick & Carroll, 1997). In this research, transfer students are defined as individuals transitioning vertically from a two-year community college to a four-year university.
In 2005, more than half of all undergraduates enrolled in a four-year institution attended a community college (AACC, 2014). Community colleges provide open access to postsecondary institutions, preparing students for transfer to four-year institutions amongst other goals (“Students at Community Colleges,” 2014). The 2013 Signature Report on Baccalaureate Attainment by the National Student Clearinghouse Research Center reported that approximately 60% of all transfer students graduated with a bachelor’s degree in four years (Shapiro et al., 2013). The report also shared that students who completed their associate’s degree prior to transferring had higher graduation rates than students transferring without completing their associate’s degree (Shapiro et al., 2013). In addition, pre-transfer grade point average and credits accepted by the receiving institution present as strong predictors of baccalaureate completion (Crook, Chellman, and Holod, 2012; Doyle, 2006; Wang, 2009). Tessa is an example that these pre-entry indicators—possessing an associate’s degree, grade point average, and number of credits accepted—are quantitative measures that inform her probable success at a receiving institution, yet they do not tell her story. Understanding her story challenges higher education administrators, student affairs practitioners, faculty, and staff to further explore methods supporting Tessa’s persistence toward graduation post-enrollment at the receiving institution.

**Defining Integration of Transfer Students**

Studies on transfer students and their integration at receiving institutions are dominated by quantitative measures such as time to degree and grade point average (Chrystal, Gansemer-Topf, & Laanan, 2013; Davies & Casey, 1999; Laanan, 1996; Townsend & Wilson, 2006). While these studies can provide valuable information on
transfer student success, (e.g., students with associate’s degree graduate at a higher rate than those without an associate’s degree; students who transfer and attend full-time as opposed to part-time are more likely to graduate with their bachelor’s degree; or those who enter with a higher grade point average are more likely to succeed), the fact that these measures are pre-entry factors, inappropriately nullifies the other half of the equation, the student’s experience at the receiving institution (Bahr, Toth, Thirolf, and Masse, 2013). Additional variables such as gender, race, ethnicity, socio-economic status, degree aspirations and first generation status, major, and entering grade point average to date also influence the manner in which transfer students integrate within the university.

**Barriers to Transfer Student Integration**

Of the few qualitative studies that do speak of transfer student integration, a common finding impacting their social integration includes challenges with making friends. A common finding impacting their academic integration includes challenges with managing the academic rigor of the university in comparison to the community college. These findings, and others, are corroborated by both qualitative and quantitative studies described below.

Transfer students describe their social challenges at the receiving institution as having difficulty making friends, breaking into existing social groups comprised of native students (students who began their collegiate experience at the 4-year university), and adjusting to the new social climate (Bauer & Bauer, 1994; Britt & Hirt, 1999; Laanan, 2007; Townsend & Wilson, 2006, 2008). Laanan (2007) specifically focused on transfer students’ social and psychological adjustment to their receiving institution after
transferring from a community college. Results from the study indicate that students who participated in clubs and organizations experienced less difficulty in adjusting socially to their institution. Laanan (2007) also found that students who spent more time socializing with peers experienced a positive social adjustment.

Several studies found that transfer students’ social integration was woven into their academic integration (Berger & Braxton, 1998; D’Amico et al., 2013; Deil-Amen, 2011; Owens, 2010; Townsend & Wilson, 2008). Simultaneously, for some transfer students, their social integration connected to academic goals mattered more. Furthermore, D’Amico et al. (2013) focused on a transfer students’ sense of integration within the first six weeks of arriving at their receiving institution and found that social fit was not perceived as a positive predictor for integration.

Transfer students often attribute their academic challenges at the receiving institution to the higher academic standards, sense of academic preparedness, increased size of class, the age diversity of the students in the class, and the perceived lack of faculty engagement (Bauer & Bauer, 1994; Chrystal et al., 2013; Townsend & Wilson, 2006; Townsend, 2008). As a result, transfer shock is well documented in the literature regarding transfer students’ dip in grade point average their first semester at the receiving institution (Hills, 1965; Keeley, 1993).

Transfer students as mentioned earlier are inclusive of a very diverse student population. Institutions of higher education must be mindful not to perceive or address all transfer students as the same such as creating an environment where a “one size fits all” expectation is cultivated. Embedded in that diversity is the reality that “being a student” is not a salient identity (Davies & Casey, 1999; Grites, 2013; Wilson, Smith, Lee, &
Therefore, transfer students are asking for a stronger support system, beyond what exists for the traditional 18 year old within the collegiate environment. These support mechanisms include, yet are not limited to, finding scholarships, managing finances, flexibility with faculty, and recognition of responsibilities nonaffiliated with the receiving institution (Lester, Brown Leonard, & Mathias, 2013).

**Summary**

Many of the researchers highlighted in this chapter urge subsequent studies on transfer student integration in several areas. The first is that the research should use qualitative design methods to better understand the actual transfer student integration experience. A second area is to research beyond assessing transfer student success solely based on academics criteria (credit hours transferred, grade point average, and time to degree attainment). Finally they suggest that the research should focus locally as the type of transfer student, their pre-existing characteristics, and the type of receiving institution do matter (Bahr et al., 2013; Laanan, 2007; Townsend & Wilson, 2006). The value added of this study is that individuals like Tessa and her peers will garner relevant support for their integration within HUC.
CHAPTER 3 - METHODS

This chapter presents the methods and procedures that were used for this study of transfer students through the E-Mentorship Program. This chapter contains the following sections: (a) research design, (b) participants, (c) procedures, (d) instruments, (e) data analysis, and (f) summary.

Research Design

I explored integration in this action research study through a phenomenological approach. Phenomenology is defined as understanding the human lived experiences and their thoughts about those experiences regarding a phenomenon (Creswell, 2009). I implemented an e-mentoring program utilizing a social media medium, Facebook, and engaged a cohort of new transfer students within a receiving institution during the initial six weeks of the fall semester, starting in August after receiving Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval for the research study (Appendix A). Participants’ garnered support, received information about programs, services, resources, and activities, and had the opportunity to develop peer to peer and peer to mentor relationships among members of the closed Facebook group.

This study used a mixed-methods design to understand the phenomenon of integration. Qualitative and quantitative data drawn from the Facebook posts, interviews, archival data, background survey, and results of the Laanan Transfer Student Questionnaire were collected separately. The data, with the exception of the reflective journal and archival data which were used for my verification process, were analyzed; thereafter individual data sets were compared and interpreted to offer a more complete
understanding of community college transfer students’ integration at a receiving institution (Clark & Creswell, 2010).

**Participants**

The target populations for the E-Mentoring Program were full-time, undergraduate, traditional-age, upper-division transfer students from in-state community colleges to HUC. I worked through HU’s transfer admissions office to identify and retain contact information for students meeting these criteria during June and July. Each transfer student meeting the criteria and enrolled at HUC received three emails (Appendix B) and a recruitment brochure (Appendix C) via mail to their personal address inviting them to sign up as a participant.

Of the 409 students listed on the roster, 99 students met the criteria. The 99 students were invited to attend the E-Mentoring Program Launch. Thirteen students confirmed they would be present at the Launch. A reminder email was sent to the 13 individuals the day before and the day of the Launch. Two students attended the Launch.

I received an up-to-date roster of transfer student contact information from HU’s transfer admissions office in mid-August. Of the 532 students listed on the roster, 48 new students met the criteria. These 48 students were invited to attend the E-Mentoring Program Re-Launch. Three students confirmed they would be present at the Re-Launch. A reminder email was sent the day before and the day of the Re-launch to the three individuals. One student attended the Re-Launch and the other two students I met with individually.

At the end of Week One of the program, there were five participants. Therefore, a final email invitation to participate in the E-Mentoring Program was sent to 132
previously identified students who met the criteria. Students were asked to contact me if they were interested in the E-Mentoring Program, and I would set up an individual meeting with them to discuss the opportunity. One student responded to this last outreach effort. I conducted five E-Mentoring Launch sessions over the course of three weeks. Six new transfer students to HUC and I (the mentor-researcher) participated in the closed Facebook group. Demographics for the six participants are listed in Table 1.

Table 1

Participant Demographics (N=6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Affiliated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Math Affiliated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Completed Upon Entry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 credit hours</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 credit hours</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 credit hours</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry Grade-Point Average (GPA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 or Higher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data from six transfer students (five females, one male) were gathered. Half the group (50%) was European-American ethnicity, and the other half (50%) was Hispanic/Latino. Percentage of major refers to participants’ math intensity within their major regardless of college affiliation. Percentage for financial need refers to participants reported socio-economic status based on the Free Application for Federal Students Aid Form.
Role of the Researcher

I served as both mentor and researcher in this study. As a mentor, I served as a resource for the mentees. Throughout the duration of the study, I responded to their questions, comments, and concerns through the primary mode of communication, the E-Mentoring Program closed Facebook group. As researcher, I created the Facebook group, served as the administrator, and approved all membership requests.

Procedures

The first E-Mentoring Program Launch at HUC kicked off the study. I facilitated a second Launch, late August, due to the lack of participation in the initial Launch. Both Launches occurred in a multipurpose conference room within HUC. I developed highly interactive activities and provided participants with refreshments. The 30 minute to one-hour experience included:

- getting to know each other;
- garnering an understanding of the study;
- establishing expectations by all participants;
- establishing access to the Facebook group;
- reviewing confidentiality;
- completing an initial survey; and,
- addressing questions or concerns participants may have about the study or HUC.

Participants could engage via the closed Facebook group over the next six weeks. Simultaneously, as the mentor, I posted information about resources, events, activities, and services almost daily on the Facebook group page. Information shared reflected
participants’ interest as learned during the launch meetings (e.g., study abroad, Fall Welcome activities, and campus shuttle schedule) and on-going posts. Additionally, research by Grites and Farina (2012), Grites (2013), and Herman and Lewis (2004) also influenced what I posted (e.g., strategies to work effectively with faculty, career services resources, and information on how to gain scholarships and money management, and time management). The information shared throughout the six weeks was both academic and social in nature as it relates to HU and HUC. As the mentor-researcher, I also shared personal information (e.g., picture of my son wearing HU school colors, picture of a high school friend who was a visiting artist on campus, and my tardiness to campus as a result of a major storm in our city) and motivational quotes. I responded to participants’ inquiries and monitored mentee needs to offer support through affirmation and referrals to other HU resources. I also posted at the end of each week, prompts to generate dialogue and garner on-going information about the participants’ experiences. Participants were provided the opportunity to send me a private response via Facebook Messenger if they were uncomfortable sharing publically. The prompts were:

- **Week 1**: Please share one or more things you wished you knew prior to starting at HU and one or more things you were glad to learn since starting at HU;
- **Week 2**: What have you done/experienced besides going to class and joining the E-Mentoring Program at HU?
- **Week 3**: What has been the most thought-provoking experience, and if you were to give another incoming student advice about HU – what would it be based upon your experiences to date?
- Week 4: Sign up for HU Career Link, upload resume, and complete poll (embedded in Facebook group) about HU Career Link;
- Week 5: What is keeping each of you busy this week? and
- Week 6: Invitation to complete the questionnaire and participate in the interview.

The prompts evolved based on students’ reported reflections/posts the week prior.

At the conclusion of the six weeks, I thanked the participants for their engagement in the E-Mentoring Program and invited them to remain connected to me via email or phone. I assured them that they would continue to receive information from me through an existing on-campus outreach effort. After confirming that they all viewed the “thank you” post and collecting the Facebook post data, I removed participants from the group. Participants completed the Laanan Transfer Student Questionnaire within three days of the E-Mentoring Program ending. Interviews were conducted with five of the six participants within one month of the E-Mentoring Program concluding. Table 2 further details the timeline for the research study procedures.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Implementation</th>
<th>What</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>• Accessed enrolled transfer student roster for HUC from HU’s Admissions Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Recruitment of Participants</td>
<td>• Emailed (four times), called (one time) and sent one informational letter to eligible individuals inviting them to participate in the E-Mentoring Program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| August                 | E-Mentoring Program Launch/ReLaunch (1:1 meetings with interested participants) – HUC campus | • Welcomed participants to the start of the school year;  
• Introduced mentor and participants;  
• Engaged in community building activities;  
• Provided an overview of the study;  
• Shared expectations;  
• Established Facebook access for each participant to e-mentoring group;  
• Administered the background survey;  
• Answered any questions participants may have regarding the research project;  
• Answered any questions participants may have regarding HU. |
| August - October       | E-Mentoring                               | • Implemented weekly prompts;  
• Responded to mentee’s inquiries;  
• Monitored for mentee needs, and if feasible provided support through referrals. |
| October                | Laanan’s Transfer Student Questionnaire    | • Implemented questionnaire.                                             |
| October - November     | Interviews                                | • Gathered students’ perceptions of integrations through a structured on-line interview protocol |
Instruments

Six instruments were used to collect data during the study. Table 3 outlines the instruments, the persons responsible for providing the data, and the type of data that were collected.

Table 3

Data Collection Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Data</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Facebook Posts</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>50 page transcription of 6 weeks experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>5 participants yielding 5 hours and 54 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflective Journal</td>
<td>Mentor/Researcher</td>
<td>8 journal entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Archival Background Survey</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>5 minute on-line survey—26 Likert-type questions 11 demographic questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laanan’s Transfer Student Questionnaire (LTSQ&lt;sup&gt;©&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>30 minute on-line survey—74 Likert-type questions 6 open-ended questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of Data Collection Instruments

**Facebook posts.** Facebook is a social online service available through the Internet. Users must register to access the site, thereafter creating profiles and adding
other users as their “friends” in order to share and exchange information. Within Facebook, a closed group may be created, which was done for this study. Facebook was chosen for this study as it is a popular social media mechanism utilized by many and seen as more likely to already be a part of participants’ means for engagement.

I invited the participants to join the closed Facebook group at the conclusion of the E-Mentoring Launch session. The protocol for joining the Facebook group can be found in Appendix D. All participants were current users of Facebook. Posts from the closed Facebook group were collected for analysis of the phenomena at the conclusion of the six-week program.

**Interview.** Each participant received an invitation to complete the interview at the conclusion of the six-week E-Mentoring Program. Participants were offered a $10 gift card (e.g., Starbucks, McDonalds, or HU Bookstore) for volunteering their time to complete the interview. Five of the six participants completed the interview. Each interview took place in a HUC library conference room during a mutually agreed upon day and time. The interviews lasted between 44 and 71 minutes each. With permission from the participants, I audio taped interviews using a mini-recorder.

Interviews consisted of semi-structured questions adapted from Bahr et al's. (2012) interview protocol for transfer students at the University of Michigan. Semi-structured questions were used to assess participants’ overall experience related to their perceptions of integration at HUC. The interviews were transcribed for data analysis. The protocol for the interview can be found in Appendix E.

**Mentor/researcher journal.** As both the researcher and the mentor for this study, I recognize that my own reflection throughout the process influenced on-going
engagement in the program as well as informed decisions being made throughout the
study. My personal reflections were used to assist readers in understanding the study and
increasing the level of transparency of the research process (Ortlipp, 2008).

**Archival data.** Demographic data, including age, gender, first-generation status,
race, credits completed, major, financial need, and entry grade-point average were
gathered for each participant. This data were used to provide an overview of each
participant in the study.

**Background survey.** I administered the background survey at the conclusion of
the E-Mentoring Program Launch session to each participant via Google Forms. The
survey included 26 questions, 15 of which are Likert-scale (*strongly agree, agree,
disagree, and strongly disagree*) focusing on goals and commitments and student services
and 11 of which are demographic (i.e., data that cannot be collected through archival
means) focused primarily on external commitments and housing accommodations. The
survey was developed by the researcher and was loosely influenced by Tinto’s
Interactionist Model (Tinto, 1975, 1987, 1993). The complete instrument can be found in
Appendix F.

Three constructs were used in the survey: background characteristics, goals and
commitments, and student services. In background characteristics, general demographic
information was collected (i.e., Did you attend Transfer Orientation? Is transferring to
HU your first choice?). In the *goals and commitments* construct, participants answered
five questions regarding their educational goals and commitments. In the *student
services* construct, participants answered 10 questions regarding which services and
resources (academic and social) they intended to access while attending the HUC.
Laanan - Transfer Students’ Questionnaire (L-TSQ©). I administered The L-TSQ© at the conclusion of the six-week E-Mentoring Program to each participant via Google Forms. The L-TSQ© is a comprehensive instrument designed to gather demographic, social, and academic experiences of transfer students at 2- and 4- year higher education institutions for the purpose of understanding the complexity of the students' adjustment to the receiving institution (Laanan, 2004). The data collected indicate participants’ level of integration. The questionnaire consists of 133 items and is organized in four major areas, including: (1) background information, (2) community college experiences, (3) university experiences, and (4) open-ended questions. The questionnaire was modified for this study. The modified questionnaire consisted of 74 Likert-scale questions and 6 open-ended structured questions. All 80 questions were drawn from the university experiences section of the L-TSQ©. Three of the four open-ended L-TSQ© questions were utilized. The university experience sub-categories include: choosing the receiving institution, course learning, experiences with faculty, general perceptions of the receiving institution, adjustment process, and overall satisfaction with receiving institution. The complete instrument can be found in Appendix G. Permission to use the instrument in this study was sought and can be found in Appendix H.

Data Analysis

At the conclusion of the E-Mentoring Program, all the data were collected and analyzed. The analysis used an exploratory mixed-methods design in which the qualitative data was first explored and the results subsequently determined; thereafter, the quantitative data was explored and the results subsequently determined (Clark &
Interpretations and explanation of the qualitative and quantitative results are discussed in Chapter 4, and the implications and opportunities for future research are discussed in Chapter 5. Figure 1 provides an outline of the data analysis plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Data</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Analysis Procedure</th>
<th>Analysis Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>Transcripts from group social media site</td>
<td>Raw Text</td>
<td>Code data for descriptions and themes</td>
<td>Identify major categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Transcribed transcript of the recorded interview</td>
<td>Text Data</td>
<td>Code data for descriptions and themes</td>
<td>Identify major categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflective Journal</td>
<td>Researchers journal</td>
<td>Raw Data</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Quantitative | Archival Data  | Institutional databases | Numeric Data | None                        |
|              | Background Survey | Obtained at initial meeting | Numeric Data | Frequency              | Descriptive Statistics                     |
|              | Laanan Transfer Student Questionnaire | Web survey Via Google Forms | Numeric Data | Frequency              | Descriptive Statistics                     |

| Integration of the Quantitative and Qualitative Results | | | Interpretation and explanation of the quantitative and qualitative Results | Discussion Implications Future research |

*Figure 1. Data analysis plan.*
Qualitative Data Analysis

For the Facebook transcript, I utilized the approach outlined by Clark and Creswell (2010). For this approach, I: (1) prepared the data, (2) explored and coded the data, (3) developed descriptions and themes from the codes, and (4) validated the findings. The focus of the data analysis was on the experiences of participants at HUC during their first six weeks.

Transcripts of posts from the Facebook group were reviewed in chronological order. I read the transcript at least two times to denote hunches, made notes of ideas, and organized the data. The third time, through an exploratory process, I highlighted the events, activities, resources, and services used or desired to be used by participants within their first six weeks, posts initiated by participants, inquiries made by participants, any reference to their academic experiences, and noted how they engaged via the Facebook group. In organizing the data, I created codes, which lead to the development of four categories. I then looked for similar codes in both the open-ended questions from the L-TSQ© and the interviews to validate the categories.

I reviewed my reflective journal and used the information to verify the process of my study. These notes were not used to code participants’ data.

Quantitative Data Analysis

For the instruments providing numeric data, the analysis consisted of descriptive statistics in the same manner as outlined by Clark and Creswell (2010). Once the data was collected, (1) it was scored, (2) prepared for analysis, (3) analyzed, and (4) reported. All the quantitative data, with the exception of the archival data, were collected, entered into Statistical Software Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), and saved with identifying
information (i.e., random participant number). Descriptive analysis was conducted through SPSS.

Validating Data Analysis

I validated this study using a concurrent triangulation mixed-methods design. Both qualitative and quantitative data were analyzed concurrently and compared to determine the similarities, differences, or the blend as related to the research questions (Creswell, 2009).

Summary

This study garnered data from participants themselves to give voice to their personal journey towards their integration at HU within the first six weeks. The data collected informs practitioners and others how integration for participants of this study occurred, and what, if any, role the E-Mentoring Program played in relation to participants’ sense of integration.
CHAPTER 4 – DATA RESULTS

This chapter provides results of the E-Mentoring Program. First, qualitative results include Facebook posts, open-ended survey questions\(^1\), and semi-structured interviews. Second, quantitative results include a background survey and the Laanan Transfer Student Questionnaire (L-TSQ\(^{\circledast}\)) results. Third, results from mixed qualitative and quantitative data will be provided.

**Qualitative Data Results**

Participants’ responses from the qualitative collection tools have been analyzed and the results indicate the value of access to information, benefit of support within a new environment, importance of academic related interactions, and role of involvement for integration within the first six weeks at HUC.

**Access to Information**

Inquiries describe the type of posts initiated by the participants during the E-Mentoring Program via the closed Facebook group. Questions were diverse and included: “How do I get tickets to the hockey game?”, “…does anyone know how supplemental instruction works here?”, and “…do you know what time the HUC shuttle runs on Game Day?” Participants utilized the Facebook group to garner information that is relevant to them as the inquiry by Milan demonstrates, “I’m a part of the program [TRIO SSS STEM\(^2\)] and the email is inviting me to an event for tomorrow, do you know what the event is and what it’s for?” Kendall’s inquiry asked about an observation she made away from campus. She noticed many people wearing HU colors in another city,

\(^1\) All names are pseudonyms.

\(^2\) TRIO SSS STEM is a federal grant funded program striving to increase retention and graduation rates for students specifically interested in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, by providing services, opportunities and resources that enhance personal skills and academic excellence.
and asked via the Facebook group if anyone knew what was happening in that city relating to HU. Last, Reagan’s post inquired about classes being cancelled. She writes, “Hi Everyone! Are classes still happening at HU today? I’m assuming they are, but a lot of colleges are closed because of the rain. Does anyone have any info?” Skyler was the first to respond, “I can’t figure out where to officially check but I was in the fitness center at 7 am and am now in the library, so it doesn’t seem like anything’s closed!” Participants’ questions provided the mentor-researcher with greater insight on what mattered to participants at any given time. An inquiry regarding an on-campus microwave generated a conversation among several participants. See Figure 2.
Participants utilized their mentor and peers to gather additional facts about resources, services, and opportunities. The inquiries demonstrated a level of awareness by the participants about resources, services, and opportunities (more likely based on their previous experience at a community college). The E-Mentoring Program added an accessible means for additional and detailed information relevant to HUC. The Facebook
page provided participants with a one-stop shop for accessing information (e.g., resources, services, programs, activities, and general facts).

The following paragraphs present data, collected anonymously, from the open-ended questions on the L-TSQ© which expands the meaning of information through two sub-categories: exposure to general information and convenient access to information.

**Exposure to general information.** The data reflected the importance of announcements about events and activities, tips about student success, insight on various types of resources, and general information about the campus and university as the following quotes illustrate:

- “I never would have gone out of my way to find the answer to some of the questions I had, even though I really wanted to know the answers.”
- “It [E-Mentoring Program] let me know about the different opportunities I had at HU, particularly events being held here at (HUC) and at the main campus. I may not have been able to attend most of these, but I definitely liked knowing what was happening around me.”
- “The E-Mentoring program gave me announcements concerning events and activities I’m interested in but wouldn’t have known about otherwise.”

The data did not reflect a particular pattern of information that was salient to the participants. Rather, the data suggest the exposure to a variety of information contributed to participants’ integration as illustrated by these quotes:

- “It [E-Mentoring Program] provided me with a plethora of information and support which made my adjustment very smooth.”
- “It [E-Mentoring Program] helped show me resources and events at (HUC).”
• “It was extremely nice to just be in the know on what was going on around me.”

• “If I saw things around campus, I wasn't confused; I could look at the new mural or a display in the library and think ‘Oh, I heard about that!’”

**Convenient access to information.** Participants expressed the benefit of easily accessing information via the E-Mentoring Program. This value was reiterated often:

• “…there is no way of knowing what is going on at any given time. It was extremely nice to have a heads up on big events happening and to just be in the know on what was going on around me.”

• “…it’s a good way to let transfer students know what is happening on campus. Most transfers don’t live on campus, so it’s harder to get involved.”

• “…you will be informed about lots of stuff at the (HUC), and other campuses and it doesn’t require much time.”

A participant recommended the program be extended for the same reason as exemplified by this quote, “Yes I would just because I feel like it’s a convenient way of obtaining information.” Furthermore, four of the six responded affirmatively to extend the E-Mentoring Program for the duration of the fall semester. Participants were appreciative of the exposure to general information posted on Facebook and acknowledged the benefit having convenient access to the information.

Last, the category *information* also emerged from semi-structured interviews conducted between two and four weeks after the conclusion of the E-Mentoring Program. For example, Jessie used the opportunity during the interview to investigate an undergraduate research program at HUC when responding to the question, “Are you
currently working on a research project with one or more of your instructors?” Although his response to the questions was no, he persisted to inquire about a research program he heard about through his college. On two more occasions, Jessie utilized the interview to request specific details regarding accessing wristbands for the football game and the feasibility of navigating two different degree programs. For Jessie, having a mentor provided him with the opportunity to access information.

Milan, in her interview, made it clear that she is not one to ask questions or seek information on her own, although it was apparent that she was receptive to and benefited from being exposed to information. For example, she became aware of and later a member of TRIO SSS STEM as a result of hearing about the program while on a campus tour. Another example is that she engaged in a study group because individuals in her class made a public announcement about the opportunity. She attended workshops, “because you [mentor-researcher] provided me with the information....” Regarding her academic inquiries, Milan articulated her assertiveness to obtain needed information.

When accessing convenient information, Kendell’s advice for future transfer students included:

- “...definitely sign up for the flyers or to get emails to know what’s going on, because it’s nice to have the option I guess than to like not know what’s going on.”

Kendell inquired whether the E-Mentoring Program would be initiated in the future at the end of the interview. I asked her if she thought it should. Her response, “I really like it.” Kendell explained that her friends knew that she was affiliated with a program that
provided her with easy access to information. I learned that she became a resource to her peer group as a result of being involved in the E-Mentoring Program.

The E-Mentoring Program demonstrated that transfer students were interested in information about HUC. The qualitative data suggest access to information plays a role in helping participants understand and adjust to their new environment. The Facebook group became a primary resource for information that assisted participants in their adjustment. It served as a destination for and repository of information that was easily accessible by participants.

**Support**

Participants demonstrated their involvement in the Facebook group during the six weeks through viewing, “Liking,” initiating, commenting on posts, and responding to weekly prompts by mentor-researcher. Two examples are provided below (Figure 3 and Figure 4).
Figure 3. Ways of engaging on Facebook. This figure demonstrates the various types of participant involvement in the Facebook closed group: liking a post, viewing a post, commenting on the post, liking a comment within the post.
Figure 4. Support garnered through the Facebook closed group. This figure shows the interactions between participants and their demonstration of support via viewing and liking each other’s comments.
The viewing, “Liking,” initiating, commenting on posts and responding to weekly prompts on Facebook demonstrate that the E-Mentoring Program provided participants with support as seen in Figure 4. Participants said:

- “Just knowing that there were people I could turn to with my questions was a huge stress relief.”
- “Hearing other people discuss what cool and interesting things they were checking out on campus also made me want to go out and explore more of HUC and HU in general.”
- “…it was nice to have an ‘excuse’ to talk to someone and ease into the social aspect of life at HU.”
- “It makes the transition process so much easier, and takes a load of stress off incoming transfer students.”
- “Also it helped you realize that you aren’t the only transfer student who is struggling like you are.”

Participants’ conversation around a Facebook inquiry on supplemental instruction demonstrates support within the group as it led to influencing a participant to consider using the resource. See Figure 5.
Figure 5. Support garnered through the Facebook closed group. This figure demonstrates the peer to peer interaction and its influence on participant’s openness to new opportunities.

Participants also said:

- “...being a part of the program made me feel like I was actually a part of something at HU.”
• “It gives transfer students their own little community to be a part of for information about the campus”

Not all participants favored using Facebook as a platform for the experience. Armani commented, “I personally am not a huge fan of Facebook, so making sure to check the E-Mentoring Program group Facebook page was a bit of a hassle. However, I love knowing that there is someone looking out for me.”

The data presented demonstrate there was a level of support provided by the E-Mentoring Program. Participants’ interactions, albeit via social media, fostered connections to the mentor-researcher and peers. The Facebook group provided a platform by which participants recognized that they were not the only ones having similar experiences at HU. Furthermore, having a mentor presence in the Facebook group provided a level of reassurance that “someone” at HU was invested in participants’ success.

**Academic Experience**

Participants recognize engagement in the academic learning process as important for their integration and success at HUC. Academic related experiences included, but were not limited to working with academic advisors to develop the right academic plan, faculty interactions, classmate interactions, and use of academic resources.

Academic experiences were shown to be important early in the semester. Prompted by the mentor-researcher, participants reflected on their first three weeks and posted their advice for future transfer students within the Facebook group. Upon review of the Facebook thread, I summarized the conversation with this post, “People matter…Snacks matter…Academic resources matter… Good Stuff!” Attentiveness to
the academic experience, specifically academic resources, faculty, and classmates, was a common theme throughout the thread. Academic related comments included:

- “…really get to know what opportunities are available in terms of academic success.”
- “…talk to the people in your classes…It’s really beneficial to exchange numbers and emails with a few people in the class.”
- “…take full advantage of their classes and use their professors to learn as much as possible.”
- “…don’t be afraid of your teachers. They really do want to help you.”
- “Also don't be afraid to ask questions in class, whether it be one on one or in a tutoring session; each minute is valuable.”

Additionally, participants provided advice to future transfer students on the questionnaire. They reiterated at week six, “take class seriously,” “talk to teachers whenever you can,” “take advantage of tutoring sessions,” and “make an effort to meet friends (classmates) and professors.” One participant stated, “get into the groove of University curriculum.”

**Academic advising.** Participants’ indicated the importance of academic advising for their smooth transition to HUC. “Proper academic advising definitely helped me in the transferring process.” Participants articulated that academic advisors, both at their community college and at HUC, were critical to their adjustment. The academic advisor assisted participants in selecting appropriate courses. Ironically, upon completion of course selection prior to the start of classes, participants did not meet their academic advisor within the first six weeks at HUC.
Course offerings. Further reiteration of academics being salient is Jessie’s expressed disappointment in the limited course offerings for his major at HUC. Although Jessie chose HUC, Jessie will take his spring courses at another HU location. This issue changed his perception of HUC. Jessie’s intent was to complete his degree at HUC, yet the lack of upper-division course offerings impeded this goal which required him to take courses at another HU location.

Faculty interactions. Participants spoke of their interactions with faculty during the interviews. Faculty interactions appear relevant in influencing their perception of integration at HUC. Participants identified the following qualities in faculty that make them more approachable:

- responsiveness
- interest in students' future goals
- engaging teaching style
- down to earth
- provide feedback
- available before and after class.

Kendell shared, “She’s [one of her professors] very friendly without it being like she’s trying too hard. She just knows us, her students so well.” Participants, also admitted, when they did not engage with faculty, it was due to their own lack of motivation.

Peer classroom interaction. The academic experience includes classroom interactions with classmates. Based on the interview, participants’ averaged a “3” on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being not important to 5 being important) when rating the importance of having friends at HUC. Yet, when participants socialized, the motive was academic
success. Milan expressed it the best when she said, “I would say a 3. It's like, it matters, but then it doesn't matter. It matters on the academic level, not the social level.” Similar to Milan, Skyler reiterated the importance of the interaction with classmates. She stated, “…we're able to cooperate to help each other plan things for each class, and we're able to help each other, or we're able to put stuff together so that we have one big project.” For these participants, the classroom interaction has not yet led to non-academic socialization.

The data emphasize the importance of the academic experience. Relationships with faculty, classmates, and academic advisors appear to be critical. In addition, awareness and utilization of academic resources also contribute to students’ adjustment at HUC.

**Involvement**

Students have an opportunity to engage within the college environment in various ways. In addition to experiences within the classroom, opportunities outside of the classroom also exist. These opportunities span a spectrum from academic related experiences (e.g., lectures, academic support services) to social experiences (e.g., student organizations, athletic events, guest speakers, comedy shows, recreational activities, workshops, fairs, etc.).

Participants shared their involvement experiences after the first two weeks at HUC in the Facebook group. Similar to participants’ diverse inquiries for information, their involvement experiences were diverse. Exercising at the gym and passing time at the library were two experiences mentioned by several participants. Participants attended athletic events, specifically football and desired to attend hockey games. Another three
participants spoke of their involvement with tutoring and study groups, both peer led as well as via supplemental instruction. One student shared they became affiliated with TRIO SSS STEM. Another participant highlighted the fact that they used the intercampus shuttle to experience eating at the café on another campus affiliated with HU. One participant mentioned attending a specific event on campus, Spa Night, and others shared they were still exploring the campus. Participants articulated a broad range of involvement experiences, both academic and non-academic in nature. Engagement in the university’s spirit and pride activities, wellness activities, and passive social activities (e.g., library and café) was prominent.

Involvement experiences shared at Week 2 were a good indicator of participants’ overall involvement within the first six weeks. Figure 6 shows 34 involvement opportunities posted on the Facebook group during the first six weeks. Twenty-three posts received “likes,” from which the mentor-teacher gleaned participants’ diverse interests.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement Experiences Receiving one or more “Likes” by participants</th>
<th>Involvement Experiences Receiving zero “Likes” by participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall welcome concert</td>
<td>Human size LIFE game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s new student welcome</td>
<td>Vote for concert genre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement fair and Student Government welcome back barbecue</td>
<td>Away football game viewing party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Fair</td>
<td>Student orientation leadership opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Home Football Game</td>
<td>9/11 Memorial event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellness festival</td>
<td>Rally for respect (students against domestic violence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spa Night</td>
<td>Play: “By the Way, Meet Vera Stark”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship workshop</td>
<td>Student Government open forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry/Open mic night</td>
<td>Book Club meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Heritage Month opening celebration</td>
<td>Community Service experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Development and Leadership Boot Camp</td>
<td>Women’s Soccer Game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Home Football Game</td>
<td>Recreation Center free trial of workout classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Katz lecture on domestic violence</td>
<td>Joy Harjo and Wiona Laduke lectures on book “Crazy Brave” and TED Talk: Seeds of our ancestors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banned Book week</td>
<td>Hispanic Heritage Month Mural Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Awareness week activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Misconduct and the University panel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 6. Involvement shared on Facebook.*

**First six week involvement experiences.** During the interviews, participants shared actual involvements within their first six weeks at HUC. It included the following:

Jessie’s involvement in a student organization; Milan’s involvement in academic support
services (e.g., supplemental instruction, study groups, and academic success program) and campus workshops on financial aid, wellness, and involvement; Skyler’s involvement included a student organization and attendance at Spa Night; Kendell hoped to get involved in several student organizations as well as attend football and hockey games; and Armani attended the homecoming carnival. Jessie admits, like several other participants, involvement contributes to knowing more people on campus.

**Barriers to involvement.** Participants’ posts revealed their interest in involvement at a receiving institution. Participants involved themselves in opportunities that: (a) aligned with their academic pursuits; (b) interested them; (c) required minimal time commitment, (d) continued involvement from community college; or (5) presented with a networking opportunity. Simultaneously, the Facebook posts demonstrated barriers such as employment that inhibited participants’ ability to engage as these examples reflect:

- In response to a post about attending the President’s welcome to new students at another HU campus, Kendell posted, “I’m going to talk to my friends tonight about going…but what happens at the [HU] welcome?”
- Milan posted, “Darn, I work at 6 so count me out” to an invitation to attend an event on another HU campus that teaches new students all the football in-game traditions while providing free food and meeting the athletes.
- Reagan posted, “I wish I could be there. Let me know how it is!” to a post about a Friday evening poetry and open mic night on campus.
- Milan posted, “I’ll be in Colorado that weekend otherwise I would have loved to have attended the event” regarding an invitation to attend a Saturday half-
day career development and leadership boot camp workshop designed specifically for juniors.

- Kendell posted, “Do you know what time the [HUC] shuttle runs on Game Day?” after posting the flyer for a Thursday night football game.

- Skyler posted, “Do you happen to know if it will be recorded? He’s one of my favorite activists but I’ll be working that night,” to a post about a fall lecture on domestic violence and sexual abuse.

Three limitations impeding participants’ ability to engage as noted above include work responsibilities, personal commitments, and lack of detailed information (which is a recurring concern for participants).

**Time management and transportation.** Participants, during the interview, also noted time management and transportation as hindrances to their ability to engage in various activities of interest. Jessie shared, “…the only reason I don’t want to go [football game] is because it takes up my whole day.” Milan also noted, “Yeah, I haven’t had time to look it [a student organization of interest] up.” Skylar made the next two comments:

- “Yeah, I feel like I could make a lot of events if I did have my own car, just because public transportation takes really long, and sometimes I literally cannot make it to a place…”

- “Whereas here [in comparison to her community college experience] everything seems to be at night so it’s hard for me to stay late all day.”

And Kendell added:

- “It’s just hard getting there [hockey game] just driving here and taking a shuttle there because I don’t have the [parking] pass for there.”
Participants do not lack interest in being involved within their receiving institution, yet the limitations of time due to work responsibilities or non-HU commitments coupled with transportation were inhibiting factors. Furthermore, participants also acknowledged intersection of time and transportation as an inhibiting factor associated with opportunities for involvement existing at multiple HU locations.

**Quantitative Data Results**

The previous section presented qualitative findings related to the E-Mentoring Program. This section presents results from quantitative data, the background survey, and the Laanan Transfer Student Questionnaire (L-TSQ©).

**Background Survey**

HUC was the first choice institution for participants. Participants were 100% confident in their success at HU, including their intent to receive a 3.0 grade-point average their first semester, to enroll in their second semester, and to graduate with a bachelor’s degree. Services such as tutoring, library, dining, writing, and recreation were most important to participants when considering their needs at HUC.

All six participants are employed off-campus. Four participants worked between 11 and 20 hours a week, and two participants worked 21 to 30 hours a week. Admittedly, their work responsibilities consumed much of their time. Participants also all lived off-campus with three of them living more than 15 miles away from HUC. One participant solely relied on public transportation and similar to another participant, the commute time is a minimum of 1 hour each way. Three of the six participants are involved in non-university affiliated clubs and organizations. One participant shared the following regarding her involvement in the community where she lives, “I volunteer a lot at the
churches there, so I volunteer at events, I teach classes, so I'm well-known in that community.” None of the participants were responsible for dependents, and three had significant others. Work responsibilities and personal commitments (e.g., significant others, community services) are salient aspects of the participants’ life experiences.

**Results from the Laanan Transfer Student Questionnaire**

**Choosing HU.** Participants were asked to rate the level of importance of factors that influenced their decision to attend HU and these results are displayed in Table 4. The HU recruiter and HU’s national ranking were the most influential where 100% of participants indicated *very important* or *important*. HU’s affordable tuition, HU’s graduates’ success in top graduate/professional schools, family influence, HU’s size and reputation for social activities were also rated high among participants. The influences of HU’s academic reputation, academic counselor from transferring institution, friend’s recommendations, post graduate job placement, location, and cost were all rated as having the least influence.
### Table 4

**Laanan’s Transfer Student Questionnaire – Choosing HU**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choosing HU</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. HU has a very good academic reputation.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. HU has affordable tuition.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Academic counselor(s) at my previous college advised me.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A friend suggested attending.</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. An HU Representative recruited me.</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. HU’s graduates gain admission to top graduate/professional schools.</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. HU’s graduates get good jobs.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. HU’s ranking in national magazines.</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Parents recommended that I attend HU.</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My brother(s)/sister(s) attended HU.</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Convenience and location.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Size of HU.</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. HU has a very good reputation for its social activities.</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Cost of HU.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Course learning.** Participants remained engaged in their learning process as indicated in Table 5. Participants took detailed notes in class, thought critically about the work they were doing by trying to connect facts and ideas, as well as considering the
practical application of the material they were learning in class. At week six, 83.3% of the participants engaged in experiences that integrated ideas from various sources and engaged peers in learning the course material.

Table 5

Laanan’s Transfer Student Questionnaire – Course Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Learning</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Took detailed notes in class.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in class discussions.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tried to see how different facts and ideas fit together.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thought about practical applications of the material.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked on a paper or project where I had to integrate ideas from various sources.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tried to explain the material to another student or friend.</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experiences with faculty. Participants’ experiences with faculty were intentional as the results in Table 6 demonstrate. About 83% of participants indicated they occasionally or often felt comfortable approaching faculty outside of class and 66.6% visited informally and briefly with instructors after class. When engaged with faculty, 83.3% of participants indicated the interactions were primarily to ask for information related to course work. Within the first six weeks, the interactions focused on adjustment.
to faculty and the course work and less about broader academic experiences (e.g.,
research papers, career plans, and criticism about work).

Table 6

Laanan’s Transfer Student Questionnaire – Experiences with Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences with Faculty</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visited faculty and sought their advice on class projects such as writing assignments and research papers.</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt comfortable approaching faculty outside of class.</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked my instructor for information related to a course I was taking (grades, make-up work, assignments, etc.).</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited informally and briefly with an instructor after class.</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed my career plans and ambitions with a faculty member.</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked my instructor for comments and criticism about my work.</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General perceptions of HUC.** Overall, participants had a positive perception of
HUC. Their experiences to date as shared in Table 7, show they recommend HUC to
future transfer students as well as choose HUC for themselves again if they had to do it
all over again. About 83% of participants disagree strongly or disagree somewhat with
the idea that peers or faculty underestimated their abilities at HUC. This aligns with
83.3% of participants’ disagreement with HUC having a stigma associated with
community college transfers. All participants agree somewhat and strongly agree that faculty were easy to approach and accessible to students, and 83.3% of participants believe their professors were invested in their academic development and their courses were of interest and worthwhile. Furthermore, 100% agree somewhat or strongly agree that student services are responsive and that HUC was an intellectually stimulating and often exciting place to be. Interestingly, 100% of participants agree somewhat or strongly agree that if students expected to benefit from what HUC had to offer, they had to take initiative. Simultaneously, 83.3% of participants also felt as though students were more concerned about "getting the grade" instead of learning the material. Participants were split between disagreeing and agreeing on the difficulty in learning the “red tape,” and their overall impression on students fitting in at HUC, but they agreed more that students were not treated like a number.
### Table 7

**Laanan’s Transfer Student Questionnaire – General Perceptions of HUC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Perceptions of HU</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree Somewhat</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty are easy to approach.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty tend to be accessible to students.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was difficult learning the &quot;red tape&quot; when I started.</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I am a &quot;community college transfer,&quot; most students tend to underestimate my abilities.</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I am a &quot;community college transfer,&quot; most faculty tend to underestimate my abilities.</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a stigma at HUC among students for having started at a community college.</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally, students are more concerned about &quot;getting the grade&quot; instead of learning the material.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many students feel like they do not &quot;fit in&quot; on campus.</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors are strongly interested in the academic development of undergraduates.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most students are treated like a &quot;number&quot;.</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student services are responsive to student needs.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If students expect to benefit from what HUC has to offer, they have to take initiative.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel the courses I am taking have been interesting and worthwhile.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUC is an intellectually stimulating and often exciting place to be.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend to other transfer students to come to HUC.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I could start over again, I would still go to HUC.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
 Adjustment process. Participants’ opinions were split about the adjustment academically and socially to HUC as indicated in Table 8. Half agreed that the adjustment was easy and the other half disagreed. About 67% of the participants did not identify as being alienated when they transferred to HUC, and 83.3% indicated they met many people and made as many friends as they would like at HUC. Participants were split with regard to their comfort with making friends with transfer versus non-transfer students. Four out of the six participants indicated that their level of stress had increased since enrolling at HUC as well as experienced a dip in their grades, but they were not necessarily overwhelmed by the size of the student body, intimidated by large classes, or lost around campus. All six participants still felt comfortable spending time with friends that they had made while enrolled at their community colleges; however, 67.7% of the participants also felt it was easy to make new friends at HUC, and 83.3% of the participants disagreed strongly or disagreed somewhat with being involved with social activities at HUC. Only one of the participants responded strongly agree to a sense of competition between/among students at HUC that was not found in community colleges.
Table 8

*Laanan’s Transfer Student Questionnaire – Adjustment Process*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjustment Process</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree Somewhat</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjusting to the academic standards or expectation has been easy.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusting to the social environment has been easy.</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often feel (felt) overwhelmed by the size of the student body.</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upon transferring I felt alienated at HUC.</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very involved with social activities at HUC.</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am meeting many people and making as many friends as I would like at HUC.</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The large classes intimidate me.</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy to find my way around campus.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My level of stress increased when I started HU.</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I experienced a dip in grades during my first six weeks.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy to make friends at HUC.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel comfortable spending time with friends that I made at the community college I attended.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel more comfortable making friends with transfer students than non-transfers.</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a sense of competition between/among students at HUC that is not found in community colleges.</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Satisfaction.** Participants demonstrated a high degree of satisfaction, all indicating *satisfied* or *very satisfied*, with their overall experience at HUC as shown in Table 9. Participants’ highest levels of satisfaction were in their decision to attend HU, overall quality of instruction, academic advising, courses in major, amount of contact
with faculty, and class size. One-third of the participants reported a degree of
dissatisfaction with their sense of belonging on campus, financial aid services,
interactions with other students, and ethnic and racial diversity of faculty. Interestingly,
50% of participants reported being dissatisfied with the sense of community on campus.
Participants rated several career/leadership related items as not applicable: career
counseling and advising, opportunities for community service, and job placement
services for students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of belonging at HUC</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to transfer to HUC</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of instruction</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of community on campus</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic advising</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career counseling and advising</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses in your major field</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid services</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of contact with faculty</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for community service</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job placement services for students</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with other students</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic/racial diversity of faculty</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership opportunities</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall experiences</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Triangulation of Qualitative and Quantitative Data

Participants’ responses from the qualitative and quantitative tools have been integrated and analyzed. The results indicate three themes: classroom connections, cognizant of new environment, and institutional and peer resources matters for integration within the first six weeks at HUC.

Classroom Connections

The theme of classroom connections emerged when I compared the data collected from the Facebook posts, background survey results, interview results, and the L-TSQ© questionnaire results. Participants communicated the importance of building rapport with faculty and peers in the classroom via the Facebook posts as early as week three in the context of what advice they would offer future transfer students. Participants reiterated the importance of in-class connections (e.g., exchanging contact information with peers and asking questions of classmates and faculty and meeting with professors) six weeks later via the open-ended questions on the L-TSQ©. Participants self-reported through the interviews and the L-TSQ© Likert questions, that their faculty were approachable and accessible, perhaps a contributing factor that influenced their consistent recommendation to engage faculty. Although the E-Mentoring Program operated outside of the classroom, this idea of peer to peer connections under the umbrella of classroom connection was evident through Kendell’s invitation to Skyler to attend a group study session for a class they both attend. This interaction was the only visible example via the Facebook posts of the participants attempting to engage with each other outside the E-Mentoring Program; the example reinforces the potential idea of peer connections related to classroom activities.
Interestingly, participants shared through both their background survey and the L-TSQ© their motivation to attend HU was driven by the desire to gain the bachelor’s degree. Furthermore, participants demonstrated an above average rating for their engagement in the classroom through actions like taking detailed notes, collapsing new ideas, and identifying the materials learned as being practical. Understanding participants’ motivation and goals provided context for the classroom connections theme threaded through both the qualitative and quantitative data. Ironically, this also aligns with why the more reputable attributes of HU are less important (66.7% or more) to the participants (e.g., very good academic reputation, affordable tuition, graduates gain admission to top graduate schools, graduates get good jobs, cost of attendance). This is why more practical aspects were found to be more important (66.7% or more) to the participants (e.g., recruited by an HU representative and siblings attended). Participants did identify with the national ranking of HU in magazines, the size of HU, and HU’s reputation for its social activities as also being important in their decision making to attend HU. Also interesting is that half of the participants stated the adjustment to the academic standard or expectations has been easy.

Cognizant of New Environment

Second, the theme of being cognizant within the new environment emerged when I compared the data collected from Facebook posts, interviews, and L-TSQ© questionnaire results. Participants asked few yet quite varied questions through the program (e.g., location of services on campus and information about sports). The individualized questions surfaced again through the interview, as when Jessie asked about a research program at HUC as well as how to access athletic events. In addition,
participants’ responses to Facebook posts about events, activities, services, and resources varied. Some engaged on Facebook via “Liking” posts or adding a comment (e.g., Time Management post), yet for the most part, participants were consumers of the information. Coupling this data with the data collected from the L-TSQ© open-ended questions where participants shared that the E-Mentoring Program provided knowledge about different activities and events that they are interested in, “but wouldn’t have known about otherwise,” suggests the benefit of being in the “know” brought clarity as to what was occurring. Participants articulated that there was so much more to know at the receiving institution in comparison to their community college, and being part of the E-Mentoring Program provided an intentional resource for knowing what is happening around them. Information about what opportunities existed was easily accessible through faculty at the community college, whereas within a receiving institution, participants felt as though they needed to search for information about opportunities. Paradoxically, as indicated in responses to the L-TSQ© Likert-questions, participants were split as to whether or not adjusting to the social environment has been easy. Despite the exposure to activities, events, and opportunities via the E-Mentoring Program, only one participant identified as being involved in social activities and half indicated that the social adjustment has been easy at HUC. More likely this is as a result of barriers expressed by participants (e.g., employment, transportation, and non-HU affiliated commitments).

**Institutional and Peer Resource**

Third, interactions between mentor-researcher and participants and participants among themselves via Facebook posts were analyzed and compared with the data collected from the interview, background survey, and L-TSQ© questionnaire. This
comparison indicates the participants felt supported by being involved in the E-
Mentoring Program, and their membership alleviated some of the stress affiliated with
being in a new environment. Something as simple as being pointed in the right direction
with regard to accessing a service or finding a resource on campus was meaningful.
Participants expressed appreciation for not needing to discover to whom they should ask
a question, rather, through the program, they knew that the mentor could address all their
inquiries, regardless of how diverse. Participants also expressed their appreciation for the
community reminding them that others are having a similar experience, and they are not
alone. Participants acknowledge benefiting from reading each other’s thoughts,
questions, interests, struggles, experiences, and ideas. When they were asked whether the
program should exist in the future, they all responded yes. All but one participant also
recommended that the program extend through the end of the semester. Other attributes
of integration were absent, however. The participants did not connect the support they
self-reported as a member of the program to gaining a sense of belonging or community
at HUC. Half of the participants specifically indicated they were dissatisfied with the
sense of community on campus and one-third indicated that they were dissatisfied with
their sense of belonging. Yet, participants also indicated that they are still connected to
their community college friends. Overall, the sense of support identified by the
participants may be an influential factor with regard to their satisfaction with transferring
to HUC and overall experience at HUC.
CHAPTER 5 – DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

This chapter presents the discussion of findings, lessons learned, implications for practice and research, limitations of the study, recommendations for future direction, and conclusion. The phenomenon of integration was explored through responding to the following two research questions:

1. How does integration occur for transfer students at a receiving institution?

2. How does participation in the E-Mentoring Program influence transfer students’ sense of integration at the receiving institution.

Integration at HUC for the participants included connections in the classroom which was interwoven with social integration, cognizance of their new environment (e.g., resources, services, opportunities, activities, programs, and events), and institutional and peer resources. Overall, the E-Mentoring Program was viewed as worthwhile by the participants. The program appeared to serve as a conduit for an intentional connection to a mentor, peers, and information. The combined results of the Facebook posts, background survey, interviews, and L-TSQ© questionnaire indicate that the E-Mentoring Program did contribute to students’ sense of integration at HUC.

Research Question 1: How Does Integration Occur for Transfer Students at a Receiving Institution?

Transfer students in this study integrated through their experiences in the classroom, e.g., peer and faculty connections, study sessions, group projects. These experiences likewise accounted for the manner in which they were socially integrated. Pre-HUC relationships (e.g., family, friends, co-workers, and community college peers)
continued to be intact thereby minimizing the desire for creating a social network beyond the classroom.

**Classroom Experiences**

This study demonstrated the importance of classroom experiences for transfer students at a receiving institution. For these participants, the primary motivation for attending HUC was to gain a bachelor’s degree. Therefore, their academic connection, via their classroom experiences, was important for their integration. Participants were appreciative of the faculty interactions they had at HUC. They were surprised by how accessible and approachable their professors were within the university environment. The interactions with faculty, coupled with group work, dialogue with peers and study groups served as primary factors for integration. This study’s finding aligns with the research of D’Amico et al. (2013), Karp et al. (2008), Townsend and Wilson (2008), and Wilson et al. (2013) stating academic activities serves as the primary mode of integration for transfer students.

Classroom experiences were the prominent means for social engagement. Participants’ social integration within HUC derived from the peer connections they made in the classroom. The finding demonstrates the importance of connecting within and through the classroom for academic and social integration, and is congruent with the literature on transfer student integration at a receiving institution or within a community college (D’Amico et al., 2013; Deil-Amen, 2011; Karp et al., 2008; Tinto, 1993; Townsend & Wilson, 2006, 2008; Townsend, 2008). Furthermore, this finding is consistent with Tinto's (1993) later work on integration focused on interconnectedness of his two primary integration constructs: academic and social. Deil-Amen's (2011) concept
of “socio-academic” integration reiterates the synthesis of the two constructs operating as one for community college students. The findings from this study reaffirm the blending of these two constructs for community college students who have transferred to a four-year institution.

Participants’ integration at HUC did not include separating from family and current peer group, i.e., non-HUC affiliated peers. Rather, they remained connected to their existing friends, family, and community. They were comfortable with the number of people they were meeting, yet it was not a priority for them to create a social network while at HUC. This finding is different from previous studies indicating that social integration, more specifically making friends, was necessary for community college students integration at a receiving institution (Britt & Hirt, 1999; Laanan, 2007; Townsend, 2008; Townsend & Wilson, 2006). The difference between this study and the literature may be attributed to the fact that participants in the study at HUC were all local transfer students. They entered the receiving institution already having a social network and support through family, high school and community peers. For the one participant in the study who indicated she wanted friends at HUC, her commute time and work responsibilities accounted for the difficulty in achieving this desire.

**Cognizance**

Transfer students in this study integrated through their raised awareness of resources, services, events, activities, and programs available to them within their new environment. Participants learned the norms of their new community through the opportunities shared with them. The information gained coupled with their interest and needs, informed decisions on how they were going to engage. Although Tinto’s
interactionalist theory does posit that student adjustment into college is inclusive of adopting new norms of their new community (Tinto, 1975, 1987, 1993), this finding is original to the body of literature on transfer students’ integration within a receiving institution. Furthermore, Tinto (1993) states that integration, from a sociological perspective “…looks to the social and intellectual context of the institution, its formal and informal interactional environment, as playing a central role in the longitudinal process of individual departure” (p. 113). Even so, research studies on transfer students have yet to document the importance of students being cognizant of their new environment. Participants in this study demonstrated an appreciation for “just knowing” what was in their new environment; something as simple as having broader context for a message on a campus lawn sign made a difference for them.

Research Question 2: How Does Participation in the E-Mentoring Program Influence Transfer Students’ Sense of Integration at the Receiving University?

The results of this study indicate the E-Mentoring Program influenced transfer students’ sense of integration by connecting them to an institutional resource and to their new environment throughout their first six weeks.

Institutional and Peer Resource

The study demonstrated the benefit of the E-Mentoring Program connecting students to a mentor who had institutional knowledge and could provide proactive guidance to participants in a timely fashion. The mentor, as the participants voiced, delivered support directly through the multiple posts on services, resources, information, activities, and events via the online social media platform. Indirectly, participants also voiced the support gained by way of the mentor’s presence within the Facebook closed
group. Although the intent of mentorship was two way communication between mentor and mentee (Bierema & Merriam, 2002), in this study, the communication was primarily one way, from the mentor to the mentees, yet it appears to have met their needs within the first six weeks as they were learning about their environment.

The study demonstrated the feasibility of the E-Mentoring Program connecting students to each other. Participants found support in reading peer responses to prompts through the six week program. One participant summarized this finding best, “Just knowing that there were people I could turn to with my questions was a huge stress relief.” This finding is supported by the research of Davies and Casey (1999) and Deil-Amen (2011). Both of these studies found that integration for community college students was related to individual interactions with peers, faculty, or staff as a means of minimizing feelings of isolation or being lost within their new environment. Even though Deil-Amen's (2011) research is on the integration of students within the community college environment, application can be transferred into a new collegiate environment for similar students. Furthermore, Laanan (2007) and Tinto's (1993) research support the importance of peer to peer interactions. Hence, the exposure of participants lived experiences within the receiving institution via their sharing in the closed Facebook group helped participants relate to other transfer students.

**Awareness**

A recurring theme within the study is the value added of knowing the services, programs, activities, events, etc., in participant’s new environment. This finding is the outcome of the E-Mentoring Program’s design to provide guidance and support to participants while promoting opportunities available to them within their receiving
institution. The closed Facebook group established a boundaryless mechanism for constant information to flow to and from participants. Participants spoke to the ease of accessing information that broadened their knowledge of opportunities available to them through the E-Mentoring Program. Through the E-Mentoring Program, participants felt connected to something at HUC.

**Lessons Learned**

Prior to the start of this study, my voice was buried beneath the voices of experts in the field, decades of literature, societal perceptions, and organizational climate. Through this lens, the combination of these elements suggested all students matter and first time students to the collegiate environment were priority. Traditional first time freshman were deemed as needing intentional strategies of support to integrate and be successful within the university environment. As a result, what I came to learn, know, and accept as a practitioner for the last 18 years, is that time, effort, and energy is to be spent on integrating the traditional eighteen year old freshmen into the four-year university environment. Simultaneously, students from community colleges were entering the same four-year university environment and I provided minimal intentional effort towards their integration. My ability to bring my voice to the forefront about the differentiation in attention was a result of the action research process: identify the issue, learn the context, understand the background noise (e.g., experts, literature, societal, and organizational culture), then attempt to change what was known to see if it made a difference. The action research process provided context for rationale to voice my concerns regarding transfer student success, specifically their integration within the university environment. As a result, I was empowered to use my voice to influence
change for transfer students within my sphere of influence. Action research provided a vehicle by which I, a practitioner-researcher, utilized the knowledge gained to strengthen my advocacy on behalf of students, specifically transfer students.

At the core of advocacy for students are students themselves. Through this process, the voices of the students influenced me to take action on behalf of transfer students, immediately. For example, I maintained my advocacy for retaining an in-person welcome event for transfer students at HUC. Other HU locations shifted to an online only experience. Supporting a welcome program allows greater opportunity for a transfer student to connect with a peer or administrator earlier in their transition. It also exposes transfer students to multiple resources and services prior to their first day at the receiving institution. Another example is my advocacy for upper-division course offerings at HUC. This effort was a direct result of Jessie’s disappointment with the lack of upper-division courses offered for his major at HUC, thereby requiring him to take courses at another HU location during spring semester. The shift to another HU location required him to once again be re-integrated into the new environment. Lastly, I am working with colleagues to foster the development of upper-class professional student organizations tied to academic programs. These three examples reveal opportunities I seized to influence change through my advocacy based on first hand contact with students. As a result of this study, I recommitted myself to always seek student insight on programs, services, resources, and activities being discussed in support of student success.
Implications for Practice

This study provides two main implications for practice: (1) faculty awareness of their classroom dynamics with regard to transfer student integration, and (2) connecting transfer students to their environment—fostering a culture of intentionality and outreach.

Classroom connections supported participants’ success at HUC. Furthermore, while transfer students are interested in socializing, the manner in which social integration occurs is primarily through the classroom activities. Therefore, an opportunity exists to engage faculty in a dialogue concerning classroom experiences for transfer students. Embedded in the dialogue would be advocacy for continual faculty to student (already deemed as positive) and peer to peer interactions, including study groups, projects, and group work (inside and outside the classroom). In addition, a recommendation to faculty would be to promote, advise, and engage student participation in professional student organizations in support of furthering their academic experiences beyond the classroom. This level of intentionality in the classroom aligns with the research on “socio-academic” integration for transfer students (Deil-Amen, 2011; Karp et al., 2008).

HU transitioned to online orientation experiences for transfer students. Different from the E-Mentoring Program, the online orientation experience lacks an option for a personal interface with an administrator or peers engaged in the same experience. As a result, the opportunity for a connection between a transfer student and their new environment through this mechanism is limited. The E-Mentoring Program demonstrated participants feeling supported and less stressed because they could associate with a person who was “looking out” for them. Therefore, a recommendation for practice based
on the findings from this study is to implement a “live chat group” option within the online orientation program. Furthermore, the “live chat group” could be extended for the duration of the first academic year. The Dean of Students Office, in collaboration with an academic representative, can be a resource to respond to inquiries, comments, and questions brought forth through the “live chat room,” providing ongoing support for participants. The “live chat room” can also serve as a vehicle to share relevant information with participants. Incorporating this practice reduces challenges with the recruitment of participants as experienced with the E-Mentoring Program. Also, the potential of more individuals engaged further diversifies the information requested and shared.

Further fostering a culture of intentionality, implementing a survey to transfer students prior to their arrival at the receiving institution could garner their interests and involvement while at the community college. With this information, connecting the student with similar resources and services could be made available within their first six weeks within a receiving institution. Incorporating this change in practice can raise practitioner’s knowledge and awareness of what is deemed “relevant” information for each new transfer student.

**Implications for Research**

The results of this study suggest areas of further research, notably, (a) collaboration with community college and HU transfer admissions advisors to recruit participants in an E-Mentoring Program; (b) extend the mentoring experience through the semester; (c) consider adding peer mentors, and (d) include non-local transfer students in the E-Mentoring Program.
Recruitment

Implementing a second cycle of this action research study, I would collaborate with both community college transfer advisors as well as HU transfer advisors to recruit participants for the E-Mentoring Program. Partnering with individuals who may already have rapport with the population for whom the innovation was designed to support could increase participation in the program overall.

Extend the Program

The data suggest that within the first six weeks, participants are still adjusting to their new environment. Therefore, unlike freshman for whom the literature suggests that integration within the first six weeks is critical, for a transfer student it may need to be longer. Hence extending the length of the program may prove to be beneficial to participants and inform with greater detail how integration occurs for transfers at the receiving institution.

Peer Mentor

In preparation for the study, I spoke to several current transfer students at HU. The insight they were able to provide as I developed the E-Mentoring Program was invaluable. They allowed me to think critically about the community college culture that transfer students inherently bring into the receiving institution environment, the multiple salient non-academic responsibilities, the challenges with financial aid and transfer credits, and the motivation driving their transfer to HUC. The information gained coupled with the experience affirmed the benefit of incorporating a peer mentor for future cycles. In addition to the peer mentor being a current student, as an individual who also transferred into HUC, they can more readily relate to the realities of the transfer
experiences. I anticipate participants would engage more freely with the peer mentor who they can identify with as oppose to an administrator. Furthermore, the peer mentor could have initiated frank conversation around the realities of being a student at HUC based on their own personal experiences.

**Non-Local Participants**

This action research study targeted in-state, traditional age community college transfer students. It was apparent through the study that participants’ need to engage socially was limited as a result of already having a strong local support network. According to Bahr et al. (2013), narrowing the type of transfer student the study is researching is wise. However, for the purposes of building community and greater peer-to-peer interaction expanding the study to include all traditional age community college transfer students from in and out of state would have enhanced the study’s findings and generalizability.

**Limitations**

The action-research study presented two critical limitations: (1) number of participants and (2) duration of the study.

**Participation**

Through the recruitment process, six transfer students engaged in the E-Mentoring Program, and five of the six completed the interview. These factors limited the generalizability of the results. Furthermore, a small number of participants hindered the ability for this study to analyze the quantitative data beyond descriptive analysis. Last, the small number of participants also limited the opportunity for a community to have further developed within the online environment.
**Duration of the Study**

The research study took place over the first six weeks of the academic semester. Participants’ non-academic commitments influenced participation in HU-related activities and events. Therefore, participants’ limited time to engage within the first six weeks in the HU environment in a more active fashion lessened participants’ possible breadth and depth of articulation of how integration occurs for them. Furthermore, if the program duration was for a longer period of time, e.g., fall academic semester, then I think the results of the LTSQ would be different, particularly for questions relating to participants’ sense of community or sense of belonging at HUC.

**Future Direction**

These six students suggest the classroom experience is critical for integration. Furthermore, the data support social integration occurs via academic experiences. Last, transfer students’ awareness of what exists within the receiving institution support their integration. The E-Mentoring Program provided a vehicle by which data could be collected to reach these assertions.

Future research could include the development of an innovation for faculty who enroll transfer students in their courses. The intervention could be a training to raise awareness regarding how the classroom contributes to the integration of transfer students. Additionally, strategies can be explored and shared regarding how to increase peer to peer interaction and peer to faculty interaction within the classroom. Last, embedded in the intervention could be the mechanisms for communicating HUC events, resources, services, programs, and activities via faculty.
Second, future research on the role of online presence outside of the classroom should be explored. A study of this kind can inform the potential effectiveness of developing a chat room or other forms of online experiences as related to a student’s degree of integration within a receiving institution.

Third, the study demonstrated the importance of participants being cognizant of their new environment as part of their integration experience. Future research to understand this factor further for transfer students is warranted.

**Conclusion**

Integration into a university environment is understood as being critical toward a student’s retention and persistence toward graduation (Astin, 1999; D’Amico et al., 2013; Karp et al., 2008; Laanan, 2007; Pascarella & Chapman, 1983; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Tinto, 1987, 1993). The six week E-Mentoring Program provided participants in this study with an intentional point of connection to their receiving institution. In and of itself, it was not sufficient to influence student’s sense of community or belonging to HUC; yet it did reveal how integration happens for these participants. Although not an intervention focused specifically on the academic integration construct, it was evident through the study that academic experiences are critical for integration. Moreover, the study revealed that social experiences are desired, but through academic experiences aligning with academic success. The literature speaks to the importance of academic integration for a transfer student’s success at a receiving institution (Bean & Metzner, 1985; Pascarella & Chapman, 1983; Tinto, 1993). The importance of academic integration derives from the motivation to complete the baccalaureate degree, as the data
from this study show. Embedded in the need to achieve academically, is also the desire to connect in relevant ways with peers and within the receiving institution.

New to the literature is transfer students’ cognizance of the new environment. Although a passive means of engaging, this research study demonstrated that it was important for participants to be aware of resources, services, programs, activities, and events at a receiving institution. The knowledge of these opportunities contributed to their integration at HUC. As a practitioner, raising the intentionality of awareness for this population of students is necessary. Furthermore, mentorship in general to students in higher education is beneficial, and this study reaffirms the benefits (e.g., guidance, support, advice, encouragement).

Research on transfer students within a four-year institution is complicated. The transfer student population is diverse; therefore, future research studies on this population need to continue to be targeted. Implications of combining various types of transfers study (e.g., traditional aged and post traditional age, transfer from community college and transfer from four year institutions) within one research study will limit the generalizability of data and perpetuates the lack of understanding that exists for this increased population in four year institutions. Future studies on traditional aged transfers from community college are ideal in light of the current national dialogue on college attainment and socio-economic challenges facing many in America.

Tessa, introduced in Chapter One was a transfer student from a local community college who did not know what resources or opportunities were available to her at her receiving institution. After completing two academic semesters, Tessa dropped out of HUC despite pre-entry indicators of her probable success at HU—entry grade point
average, motivation to achieve her degree, and willingness to make the necessary
sacrifices to reach her goal. Reflecting on earlier conversations with Tessa, she wanted
someone to connect with earlier in her experience at the receiving institution as well as
desiring knowledge of the opportunities, resources, and services that were available to her
in her new environment. The findings from this study indicate the E-Mentoring Program
may have provided that connection Tessa was seeking in support of her success at HUC.
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APPENDIX A

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL
Dear Kathleen Puckett:

On 6/9/2014 the ASU IRB reviewed the following protocol:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Review:</th>
<th>Initial Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Transfer Student Integration Experiences: A Study of Their Initial Six Weeks at a Receiving Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator:</td>
<td>Kathleen Puckett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB ID:</td>
<td>STUDY000001092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category of review:</td>
<td>(7)(b) Social science methods, (5) Data, documents, records, or specimens, (7)(a) Behavioral research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Title:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant ID:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The IRB approved the protocol from 6/5/2014 to 6/4/2015 inclusive. Three weeks before 6/4/2015 you are to submit a completed “FORM: Continuing Review (HRP-212)” and required attachments to request continuing approval or closure.

If continuing review approval is not granted before the expiration date of 6/4/2015 approval of this protocol expires on that date. When consent is appropriate, you must use final, watermarked versions available under the “Documents” tab in ERA-IRB.

In conducting this protocol you are required to follow the requirements listed in the INVESTIGATOR MANUAL (HRP-103).

Sincerely,

IRB Administrator

cc: Cassandra Aska
    Cassandra Aska
APPENDIX B

EXAMPLE OF OUTREACH EMAIL TO PARTICIPANTS
Welcome to the Sun Devil Family and the first day of classes! As a student transferring into Arizona State University, you have the benefit of being invited to be a part of the E-Mentoring Program. Program participation is voluntary; however, as a member of this group, you will have access to the many benefits below:

- On-line mentoring provided to you via a private Facebook Page.
- Mentorship by the Associate Dean of Students who is also the researcher for this project, Cassandra Aska;
- Automatic connection to a peer social network;
- Knowledge of resources and services in a timely manner; and
- A chance to influence future experiences of transfer students at ASU’s West campus.

The mentoring program is designed to build social network and assist transfer students in connecting to ASU’s West campus. The E-Mentoring Program is part of a research project intended to learn of transfer students experience from community college to ASU’s West campus during their first six weeks.

Please, reply to this email to confirm your willingness to attend the session below:

Monday, August 25, 2014
Arizona State University
University Center Building, Room 302
5:30 PM – 6:30 PM
Light refreshments will be provided.

If you have a question, please contact Cassandra directly:

Cassandra Aska, E-Mentor
cassandra.aska@asu.edu
602.543.8128

Once again, welcome to ASU!

Respectfully,

Cassandra Aska
Arizona State University
EdD in Leadership and Innovation
CONNECT FOR SUCCESS!

E-Mentoring Program

In light of your transfer to ASU’s West campus, you may be interested in participating in the E-Mentoring Program.

WHAT IS IN IT FOR YOU?

Forum for information,
Encouragement,
Nurtured academic aspirations,
Social network,
Connecting to ASU’s West campus, and MORE.

WHY BOTHER WITH THIS OPPORTUNITY?
As a doctoral student, I want to learn of your experience as a transfer student to ASU’s West campus! What I learn from you may have a direct impact on how programs and services for transfer students are developed in the future.

You are on your journey for success – let me support while learning more about your needs once you arrive. Your participation is voluntary!

More Information on Back!
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If you are interested in participating, contact Cassandra directly by 5pm on Monday, August 11, 2013 at:

Cassandra Aska, E-Mentor
cassandra.aska@asu.edu
602.543.8128

If you choose to participate, here is how the program will work:

1. You will be asked to participate in a 2 hour E-Mentoring Program Launch which will take place on Wednesday, August 13, 2014 from 5:30pm to 7:30pm at ASU’s West campus. (REFRESHMENTS PROVIDED!)
   a. At the Launch, you will be asked to:
      i. Provide me with permission to access your archival data
      ii. Complete a short background survey
      iii. Sign on to the E-Mentoring Facebook closed group
2. For the next six weeks, you will be asked to utilize the E-Mentoring Facebook group to:
   a. Ask questions
   b. Share your success and challenges each week
   c. Respond to polling questions/prompts
   d. Seek support or provide support from mentor/peers
3. At the conclusion of the six weeks, you will be asked to complete a 30 minute questionnaire about your overall experience at ASU’s West campus.
4. Last, you may be asked to participate in a more in depth collection of information concerning your experiences via a 1 hour interview. I would like to audio record the interview with your permission. You will be able to let me know if you do not want the interview to be recorded; you also can change your mind after the interview starts, just let me know.

All of your thoughts and experiences that you share through Facebook, google forms, and audio recordings will be collected by Cassandra Aska, a doctoral student working on the research project. The E-Mentoring Program will begin on August 13, 2014 and conclude October 3, 2014. Completion of questionnaire will take place the Week of October 6th and interviews will take place the latter half of October through the beginning of November.

All information obtained in this study is strictly confidential. The results of this research study may be used in reports, presentations, and publications, but the researcher will not identify you. In order to maintain confidentiality of your records, Cassandra Aska will keep all research materials locked and names of participants will not be shared when reporting. For the closed Facebook group posts it may not be possible to guarantee confidentiality of the information shared in that setting. It may be possible that others will know what you have reported. For audio recordings of the interviews, the material will be destroyed in five years. In the meantime they will be transferred to an electronic file and stored on a secured server.

Your participation is strictly voluntary. More for you through the E-Mentoring Program:

- Mentorship by the Associate Dean of Students who is also the researcher for this project, Cassandra Aska;
- Automatic connection to a peer social network;
- Knowledge of resources and services in a timely manner; and
- A chance to influence future experiences of transfer students at ASU’s West campus.

Once again, welcome to ASU!
Cassandra Aska
APPENDIX D

JOINING THE E-MENTORING FACEBOOK GROUP
Joining the Facebook group is simple. Follow these steps and connect with your mentor and peers for the E-Mentoring Program. (Participants will be asked to join the group during the E-Mentoring Program Launch.)

STEP 1: Log on to Facebook through your own account.

STEP 2: Search for our group: E-Mentoring at West

STEP 3: Click on the “Ask to Join” button.

I will receive your request and “Accept” you into the group. From there on, post comments, pictures, announcements, questions, and more in support of being successful and building rapport within our community.

If you have any problems joining the group, please let me know via email at cassandra.aska@asu.edu or call me at 602.543.8128.
Introduction and getting settled: Today’s interview will last one hour, but you’re free to leave at any time if you feel uncomfortable, since the interview is voluntary. Also, if you don’t feel comfortable answering any of the questions, you may decide not to answer and we’ll go on to the next questions. Do you have any questions before we begin?

Part I [about 5 minutes]

To start off, I have a few background questions that I’d like to ask. These will probably just have short answers, but feel free to elaborate on any of your answers if you would like to do so.

1. Are you the first to attend college in your family?
   a. IF YES: how does your family feel about you going to college?
   b. IF NO: how far have your other immediate family members gone with their college education?

2. Are you currently employed?
   a. IF YES: tell me about your job.
   b. IF NO: are you looking for a job now?
      i. Are you looking for an on-campus job or a job that is off campus?

3. What is your housing situation this semester? Where do you live?
   a. [If it is not self-evident, ask if it is on-campus or off-campus]
   b. Do you live with anyone else? Family? Roommates?
   c. IF OFF-CAMPUS: how do you get to campus for your classes?
      i. How is that mode of transport working out for you this semester?
      ii. If student drives self to campus: how is that working out for you in terms of parking, getting to your classes, and so on?
d. IF ON-CAMPUS: have you found living on-campus to be a positive experience for you? Why or why not?

How many, if any, classes are you taking at any of the other campuses?

**Part II [about 15 minutes]**

Okay, thanks for your answers to those questions. That’s really helpful for me to get to know your background a little bit? Next, I’d like to ask you some questions about your experiences. There’s no right or wrong answer to any of these questions that I am about to ask.

4. First, please tell me briefly about your journey from the first college that you attended to the Arizona State University.
   a. PROMPT: What was your major at your community college? And is this the same major you are continuing at ASU?
   b. PROMPT: If major is different, why?
   c. PROMPT: Where you a part of any special programs at your community college which guided/supported your transition to ASU? If yes, tell me more about the program.

Now I’m going to ask you about your perceptions of and experiences with, your instructors here at the West campus.

**Integration & Involvement**

5. Thinking about your instructors here at the ASU’s West campus, generally speaking how approachable and willing to help do you perceive your instructors to be?
   a. Describe for me a recent experience that you think illustrates this well.

6. How accessible to you would you say your instructors are?
   a. PROMPT: How easy or difficult is it to gain access to your instructors when you need to talk with them about something?
   b. Describe for me a recent experience that you think illustrates this well.
7. Since arriving here, have you had any interactions with your instructions OUTSIDE of class, such as attending instructors’ office hours or talking with instructors after class?
   a. How often in a typical week would you say that you interact with one or more of your instructors OUTSIDE of class?
   b. Tell me about one of your recent experiences interacting with one of your instructors OUTSIDE of class.
      i. In this experience that you are describing, what sorts of things did you discuss with your instructor?
   c. Are you currently working on a research project with one or more of your instructors here at the ASU’s West campus?
      i. IF YES: Can you tell me about what you were doing on that project?
      ii. IF YES: what was the experience like for you?
      iii. IF YES: In what ways was the experience helpful to you?

8. Thinking more generally about your classes here at ASU’s West campus, in what ways would you say that they instruction in your classes works well for you?
   a. In what ways would you say that it does NOT work well?
   b. What sorts of interactions do you have with your instructors DURING class?
   c. What sorts of interactions for you have with fellow students DURING class?
   d. Is the instruction here at the ASU’s West campus similar to or different from what you experiences at your community college?
      i. In what ways is it [similar or different]?
      ii. Are the assignments in your classes here at the ASU West campus similar or different from your assignments in your classes at the community college that you attended?
         1. In what ways are they [similar or different]?
9. I asked previously about your interactions with your instructors outside of class. What sorts of interactions do you typically have with your instructors DURING class?
   a. How do you feel about the level of interaction that you have with your instructors DURING class?
   b. What sorts of interaction do you have with fellow students DURING class?

Let’s talk a bit more about your peers and fellow students here at ASU’s West campus.

10. To what extent have you been able to make connections with other students in your classes here?
   a. Has connecting with other students in your classes been helpful to you academically or, perhaps, in other ways?
      i. IF YES: How so?
      ii. IF NOT: Why do you say so?
   b. What do you think would improve your opportunities to connect with other students in your classes?

11. Are you involved in any study groups with fellow classmates or other students here at the ASU’s West campus?
   a. IF YES: how did you become involved in these groups?
   b. IF NO: is that by choice?
      i. If it has been difficult: what do you think have been the main obstacles that you have faced with respect to finding, joining, or forming a study group?

12. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest, how important is it to you make friends here at ASU’s West campus, or to connect with others here with whom you share similar interests or activities?
   a. Prompt for an explanation of the student’s rating.

13. Other than study groups, are you currently participant in any student groups, clubs, programs, or extracurricular activities here at ASU’s West campus?
   a. If so, in what group/clubs/activities/programs are you involved?
b. How did you become involved in group X [repeat for group Y, group Z, etc.]

c. What interested you about group X [repeat for group Y, group Z, etc.]

d. Has participating in group X been helpful for you to become connected socially to other student her at ASU’s West campus [repeat for group Y, group Z, etc.]? If so, how?

e. Are there any other particular groups, clubs, activities, programs in which you would like to be involved but have not done so yet?

14. Since arriving here at ASU West campus, what social experiences outside of classes have you had?

   a. PROMPT: Football game, workshop, banned books display, etc.

15. Since arriving here at the ASU West campus, how many times have you met with an academic advisor?

   a. When was your most recent meeting with an academic advisor?

   b. Can you tell me a bit about this more recent meeting, the kinds of things that you discussed, and so on?

   c. How easy or difficult was it to schedule that meeting?

   d. To what extent was the meeting helpful to you?

   e. Were you able to get all of your questions answered at this meeting?

   i. IF NO: With what questions was your advisor unable to help?

16. Since arriving at ASU, what if any changes in yourself have you observed?

   a. PROMPT: has being at ASU as oppose to your community college changed you in some new way?
PART IV [About 25 minutes]

Shifting gears again for a moment…

Adjustment

17. Since arriving here at ASU’s West campus, what sorts of changes or adjustments have you made in terms of studying for your classes, preparing for exams, and so on?
   a. Completing assignments
   b. Interacting with your instructors
   c. Interaction with your classmates

18. Since arriving here at ASU’s West campus, what sorts of changes or adjustments have you made in terms of meeting new people and creating a social network?
   a. Meeting new people in the classroom
   b. Meeting new people outside of the classroom
   c. Other?

Perceived Fit:

19. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest, how well do you feel that you fit here at the ASU’s West campus?
   a. Prompt for explanation or rating
   b. In what ways do you feel that you fit WELL here?
   c. In what ways do you feel that you do NOT fit well here?
   d. IF LESS THAN 5: What do you think would help you feel more a part of the ASU’s West campus?

Self-Efficacy:

20. How well-equipped do you feel concerning your ability to succeed here at ASU’s West campus?
   a. Prompt for explanation
b. Is there anything in particular about your experience here that you feel particularly WELL-equipped to handle?

c. Is there anything in particular that you feel particular UNequipped or NOT well-equipped, to handle?

**Transfer Shock:**

21. To what extent do you think that your level of effort in your classes here is reflected in your academic performance, such as your grades and other feedback from your instructors?

   a. Prompt for explanation.

**Perceived Fit:**

22. In you had to describe the “typical” [emphasize quotations] student in one of your classes this semester, how would you describe him or her?

   a. To what extent, and in what ways, do you perceive yourself to be similar or different from the other students in your classes this semester.

**Stigma:**

23. Do you think that students who transfer here from a community college are perceived any differently here from students who begin their college attendance at ASU’s West campus?

   a. IF YES: in what ways do you think community college transfer students are perceived differently?

   b. IF YES: what has led you to believe that community college transfer students are perceived differently?

      i. Prompt: comments of behaviors of fellow students, of faculty, or of staff.

**Adjustment**

24. If you were to offer advice to a student at a community college who was about to end roll at ASU’s West campus, what would you tell him or her?
Congruence of expectations and perceptions:

25. Thinking back to before you began attending the ASU’s West campus, to what extent are things here at ASU’s West campus similar to or different from, what you imagined?

26. Since you began your studies here at ASU’s West campus, what has been the single biggest surprise?

Concluding questions:

27. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest, how satisfied are you with your decisions to transfer to ASU’s West campus?
   a. Prompt for student’s explanation of rating.

28. Is there anything that you would like to add, or anything that you think should be clarifies?

CLOSING: Thank you so much for talking with me. If you have questions about the study you leave today, please feel free to email or call me.
E-Mentoring Mentee Survey

Dear Sun Devil,

I am a doctoral student under the direction of Dr. Kathleen Puckett in the Mary Lou Fulton Teacher's College at Arizona State University (ASU). I am conducting a research study exploring transfer students' experiences at ASU's West campus.

I am inviting your participation, which will involve completing the questionnaire consisting of 24 questions of which 13 are demographic questions. The survey will take no more than 5 minutes of your time. Your responses to the questionnaire will be used to better understand your expectations upon arriving at ASU.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time, there will be no penalty. There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts to your participation.

Please include your Participant Unique ID#. This will allow the researcher to match the data collected throughout the duration of the study. Your name will not be associated with the answers. Your responses will be confidential. The results of this study may be used in reports, presentations, or publications and no identifiable information will be provided.

If you have any questions concerning the research study, please contact me at: 602.543.8128. If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board, through the ASU Office of Research Integrity and Assurance, at (480) 965-6788.

Thank you,
Cassandra Aska

* Required

1. Participant Unique ID#: *

---------------------------------------------

Goals & Commitments

The questions in this section are about your educational goals and commitment.

2. I am confident about my academic abilities to succeed at ASU.

Mark only one oval.

☐ Strongly agree
☐ Agree
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly disagree
3. I intend to achieve a 3.0 gpa or higher this semester.
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ Strongly agree
   ☐ Agree
   ☐ Disagree
   ☐ Strongly disagree

4. I intend to enroll in classes at ASU next semester.
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ Strongly agree
   ☐ Agree
   ☐ Disagree
   ☐ Strongly disagree

5. I intend to graduate from ASU with my Bachelor’s degree.
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ Strongly agree
   ☐ Agree
   ☐ Disagree
   ☐ Strongly disagree

6. I intend to continue my education beyond my Bachelor’s (i.e. Master’s, Doctorate, Juris, Medical, other)
   This does not need to be at ASU.
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ Strongly agree
   ☐ Agree
   ☐ Disagree
   ☐ Strongly disagree

Student Services
The questions in this section are about what services and resources you intend to access while attending ASU.

I expect to utilize the following services:
7. Tutoring (individual or group)  
*Mark only one oval.*  
☐ Strongly agree  
☐ Agree  
☐ Disagree  
☐ Strongly Agree

8. Writing Center  
*Mark only one oval.*  
☐ Strongly agree  
☐ Agree  
☐ Disagree  
☐ Strongly Agree

9. Library  
*Mark only one oval.*  
☐ Strongly agree  
☐ Agree  
☐ Disagree  
☐ Strongly Agree

10. Fitness Center  
*Mark only one oval.*  
☐ Strongly agree  
☐ Agree  
☐ Disagree  
☐ Strongly disagree

11. Health Services  
*Mark only one oval.*  
☐ Strongly agree  
☐ Agree  
☐ Disagree  
☐ Strongly disagree
12. **Dining Services**
   *Mark only one oval.*
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

**External Commitments**
The questions in this section are about commitments you have in addition to attending ASU.

13. **Are you currently employed?**
   *Mark only one oval.*
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

14. **If you work, where do you work?**
   *Mark only one oval.*
   - [ ] I work on campus
   - [ ] I work off-campus
   - [ ] I work both on and off-campus
   - [ ] I do not work

15. **If you work, how many hours in total do you work a week?**
   *Mark only one oval.*
   - [ ] 1 - 10 hours
   - [ ] 11 - 20 hours
   - [ ] 21 - 30 hours
   - [ ] 31 - 40 hours
   - [ ] 40+ hours
   - [ ] I do not work

16. **Do you have a significant other?**
   *Mark only one oval.*
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
17. Are you responsible for dependents (children, parents, other)?
Mark only one oval.
☐ Yes
☐ No

18. Are you involved in any non-ASU affiliated clubs/organizations (religious, hobbies, volunteerism)?
Mark only one oval.
☐ Yes
☐ No

**Housing Accommodations**
The questions in this section are about your living situation.

19. Did you have to relocate in order to attend ASU?
Mark only one oval.
☐ Yes
☐ No

20. What is your housing situation?
Mark only one oval.
☐ I live on-campus
☐ I live off campus with parents/family members
☐ I live off campus with friends/others (significant other, dependents)
☐ I live off campus alone

21. How far from campus do you live?
Mark only one oval.
☐ 0 - 14 miles
☐ 15 - 29 miles
☐ 30 or more miles

**General Questions**

The questions in this section are general questions.
22. **ASU was my number 1 choice to transfer too.**  
*Mark only one oval.*  
- [ ] Strongly Agree  
- [ ] Agree  
- [ ] Disagree  
- [ ] Strongly Disagree  

23. **What is the most important reason for attending ASU?**  
*Mark only one oval.*  
- [ ] Obtain a bachelor’s degree  
- [ ] Skills for new job or occupation  
- [ ] Graduate or professional school  
- [ ] Satisfy a personal interest (cultural, social)  

24. **I attended Transfer Student Orientation on May 16th or June 17th.**  
*Mark only one oval.*  
- [ ] Yes  
- [ ] No  

25. **Helpfulness of Transfer Student Orientation Program.**  
*Mark only one oval.*  
- [ ] Very Helpful  
- [ ] Somewhat Helpful  
- [ ] Somewhat Unhelpful  
- [ ] Very Unhelpful
APPENDIX G

LAANAN – TRANSFER STUDENTS’ QUESTIONNAIRE (L-TSQ©)
E-Mentoring Mentee Questionnaire

Dear Sun Devil,

I am a doctoral student under the direction of Dr. Kathleen Puckett in the Mary Lou Fulton Teacher’s College at Arizona State University (ASU). I am conducting a research study exploring transfer students’ experiences at ASU’s West campus.

I am inviting your participation, which will involve completing the questionnaire consisting of 80 questions. The survey will take no more than 30 minutes of your time. Your responses to the questionnaire will be used to better understand your experiences within the first six weeks at ASU’s West campus.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time, there will be no penalty. There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts to your participation.

Please include your Participant Unique ID#. This will allow the researcher to match the data collected throughout the duration of the study. Your name will not be associated with the answers. Your responses will be confidential. The results of this study may be used in reports, presentations, or publications and no identifiable information will be provided.

If you have any questions concerning the research study, please contact me at: 602.543.8128. If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board, through the ASU Office of Research Integrity and Assurance, at (480) 965-6788.

Thank you,

Cassandra Aska

* Required

1. Participant Unique ID#: *

Choosing ASU
Listed below are 15 reasons that might have influenced your decision to attend ASU. How important was each reason in your decision to come here?

2. ASU has a very good academic reputation.

Mark only one oval.

☐ Very Important
☐ Important
☐ Somewhat Important
☐ Not Important
3. **ASU has a very good reputation for its social activities.**  
   *Mark only one oval.*  
   - [ ] Very Important  
   - [ ] Important  
   - [ ] Somewhat Important  
   - [ ] Not Important

4. **I was offered financial assistance.**  
   *Mark only one oval.*  
   - [ ] Very Important  
   - [ ] Important  
   - [ ] Somewhat Important  
   - [ ] Not Important

5. **ASU has affordable tuition.**  
   *Mark only one oval.*  
   - [ ] Very Important  
   - [ ] Important  
   - [ ] Somewhat Important  
   - [ ] Not Important

6. **Academic counselor(s) at my previous college advised me.**  
   *Mark only one oval.*  
   - [ ] Very Important  
   - [ ] Important  
   - [ ] Somewhat Important  
   - [ ] Not Important

7. **A friend suggested attending.**  
   *Mark only one oval.*  
   - [ ] Very Important  
   - [ ] Important  
   - [ ] Somewhat Important  
   - [ ] Not Important
8. An ASU Representative recruited me.
Mark only one oval.
☐ Very Important
☐ Important
☐ Somewhat Important
☐ Not Important

9. ASU's graduates gain admission to top graduate/professional schools.
Mark only one oval.
☐ Very Important
☐ Important
☐ Somewhat Important
☐ Not Important

10. ASU's graduates get good jobs.
Mark only one oval.
☐ Very Important
☐ Important
☐ Somewhat Important
☐ Not Important

11. ASU's ranking in national magazines.
Mark only one oval.
☐ Very Important
☐ Important
☐ Somewhat Important
☐ Not Important

12. Parents recommended that I attend ASU.
Mark only one oval.
☐ Very Important
☐ Important
☐ Somewhat Important
☐ Not Important
13. My brother(s)/sister(s) attended ASU.
   Mark only one oval.
   - Very Important
   - Important
   - Somewhat Important
   - Not Important

14. Convenience and location.
   Mark only one oval.
   - Very Important
   - Important
   - Somewhat Important
   - Not Important

15. Size of ASU.
   Mark only one oval.
   - Very Important
   - Important
   - Somewhat Important
   - Not Important

16. Cost of ASU.
   Mark only one oval.
   - Very Important
   - Important
   - Somewhat Important
   - Not Important

Course Learning
During the past six-weeks at ASU, about how often did you do each of the following six actions?

17. Took detailed notes in class.
   Mark only one oval.
   - Very Often
   - Often
   - Occasionally
   - Never
18. Participated in class discussions.
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ Very Often
   ☐ Often
   ☐ Occasionally
   ☐ Never

19. Tried to see how different facts and ideas fit together.
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ Very Often
   ☐ Often
   ☐ Occasionally
   ☐ Never

20. Thought about practical applications of the material.
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ Very Often
   ☐ Often
   ☐ Occasionally
   ☐ Never

21. Worked on a paper or project where I had to integrate ideas from various sources.
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ Very Often
   ☐ Often
   ☐ Occasionally
   ☐ Never

22. Tried to explain the material to another student or friend.
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ Very Often
   ☐ Often
   ☐ Occasionally
   ☐ Never

Experience With Faculty
During the past six-weeks at ASU, about how often did you do each of the following six actions?
23. Visited faculty and sought their advise on class projects such as writing assignments and research papers.
   *Mark only one oval.*
   - Never
   - Occasionally
   - Often
   - Very Often

24. Felt comfortable approaching faculty outside of class.
   *Mark only one oval.*
   - Never
   - Occasionally
   - Often
   - Very Often

25. Asked my instructor for information related to a course I was taking (grades, make-up work, assignments, etc.).
   *Mark only one oval.*
   - Never
   - Occasionally
   - Often
   - Very Often

26. Visited informally and briefly with an instructor after class.
   *Mark only one oval.*
   - Never
   - Occasionally
   - Often
   - Very Often

27. Discussed my career plans and ambitions with a faculty member.
   *Mark only one oval.*
   - Never
   - Occasionally
   - Often
   - Very Often
28. Asked my instructor for comments and criticism about my work.
   Mark only one oval.
   - Never
   - Occasionally
   - Often
   - Very Often

General Perceptions of ASU's West Campus
The following 16 statements are about your general perceptions, adjustment process, and opinion of your overall satisfaction at ASU. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree.

29. Faculty are easy to approach.
   Mark only one oval.
   - Agree Strongly
   - Agree Somewhat
   - Disagree Somewhat
   - Disagree Strongly

30. Faculty tend to be accessible to students.
    Mark only one oval.
    - Agree Strongly
    - Agree Somewhat
    - Disagree Somewhat
    - Disagree Strongly

31. It was difficult learning the "red tape" when I started.
    Mark only one oval.
    - Agree Strongly
    - Agree Somewhat
    - Disagree Somewhat
    - Disagree Strongly

32. Because I am a "community college transfer," most students tend to underestimate my abilities.
    Mark only one oval.
    - Agree Strongly
    - Agree Somewhat
    - Disagree Somewhat
    - Disagree Strongly
33. Because I am a "community college transfer," most faculty tend to underestimate my abilities.
Mark only one oval.
- Agree Strongly
- Agree Somewhat
- Disagree Somewhat
- Disagree Strongly

34. There is a stigma at ASU's West campus among students for having started at a community college.
Mark only one oval.
- Agree Strongly
- Agree Somewhat
- Disagree Somewhat
- Disagree Strongly

35. Generally, students are more concerned about "getting the grade" instead of learning the material.
Mark only one oval.
- Agree Strongly
- Agree Somewhat
- Disagree Somewhat
- Disagree Strongly

36. Many students feel like they do not "fit in" on campus.
Mark only one oval.
- Agree Strongly
- Agree Somewhat
- Disagree Somewhat
- Disagree Strongly

37. Professors are strongly interested in the academic development of undergraduates.
Mark only one oval.
- Agree Strongly
- Agree Somewhat
- Disagree Somewhat
- Disagree Strongly
38. Most students are treated like a "number".
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ Agree Strongly
   ☐ Agree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Strongly

39. Student services are responsive to student needs.
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ Agree Strongly
   ☐ Agree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Strongly

40. If students expect to benefit from what ASU's West campus has to offer, they have to take initiative.
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ Agree Strongly
   ☐ Agree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Strongly

41. I feel the courses I am taking have been interesting and worthwhile.
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ Agree Strongly
   ☐ Agree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Strongly

42. ASU's West campus is an intellectually stimulating and often exciting place to be.
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ Agree Strongly
   ☐ Agree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Strongly
43. I would recommend to other transfer students to come to ASU’s West campus.
   
   Mark only one oval.
   
   ☐ Agree Strongly
   ☐ Agree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Strongly

44. If I could start over again, I would still go to ASU’s West campus.
   
   Mark only one oval.
   
   ☐ Agree Strongly
   ☐ Agree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Strongly

Adjustment Process
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following 14 statements.

45. Adjusting to the academic standards or expectation has been easy.
   
   Mark only one oval.
   
   ☐ Agree Strongly
   ☐ Agree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Strongly

46. Adjusting to the social environment has been easy.
   
   Mark only one oval.
   
   ☐ Agree Strongly
   ☐ Agree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Strongly

47. I often feel (felt) overwhelmed by the size of the student body.
   
   Mark only one oval.
   
   ☐ Agree Strongly
   ☐ Agree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Strongly
48. Upon transferring I felt alienated at ASU's West campus.
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ Agree Strongly
   ☐ Agree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Strongly

49. I am very involved with social activities at ASU's West campus.
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ Agree Strongly
   ☐ Agree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Strongly

50. I am meeting many people and making as many friends as I would like at ASU's West campus.
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ Agree Strongly
   ☐ Agree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Strongly

51. The large classes intimidate me.
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ Agree Strongly
   ☐ Agree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Strongly

52. It is easy to find my way around campus.
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ Agree Strongly
   ☐ Agree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Strongly
53. My level of stress increased when I started ASU.
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ Agree Strongly
   ☐ Agree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Strongly

54. I experienced a dip in grades during my first six weeks.
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ Agree Strongly
   ☐ Agree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Strongly

55. It is easy to make friends at ASU's West campus.
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ Agree Strongly
   ☐ Agree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Strongly

56. I feel comfortable spending time with friends that I made at the community college I attended.
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ Agree Strongly
   ☐ Agree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Strongly

57. I feel more comfortable making friends with transfer students than non-transfers.
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ Agree Strongly
   ☐ Agree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Somewhat
   ☐ Disagree Strongly
58. There is a sense of competition between/among students at ASU's west campus that is not found in community colleges.
   Mark only one oval.
   
   ○ Agree Strongly
   ○ Agree Somewhat
   ○ Disagree Somewhat
   ○ Disagree Strongly

ASU's West Campus Satisfaction
Please rate your satisfaction with each of the 17 aspects of campus life listed below.

59. Sense of belonging at ASU's West campus.
   Mark only one oval.
   
   ○ Very Satisfied
   ○ Satisfied
   ○ Dissatisfied
   ○ Very Dissatisfied
   ○ Not Applicable

60. Decision to transfer to ASU's West campus.
   Mark only one oval.
   
   ○ Very Satisfied
   ○ Satisfied
   ○ Dissatisfied
   ○ Very Dissatisfied
   ○ Not Applicable

61. Overall quality of instruction.
   Mark only one oval.
   
   ○ Very Satisfied
   ○ Satisfied
   ○ Dissatisfied
   ○ Very Dissatisfied
   ○ Not Applicable
62. Sense of community on campus.
   Mark only one oval.
   - Very Satisfied
   - Satisfied
   - Dissatisfied
   - Very Dissatisfied
   - Not Applicable

63. Academic Advising.
   Mark only one oval.
   - Very Satisfied
   - Satisfied
   - Dissatisfied
   - Very Dissatisfied
   - Not Applicable

64. Career Counseling and Advising.
   Mark only one oval.
   - Very Satisfied
   - Satisfied
   - Dissatisfied
   - Very Dissatisfied
   - Not Applicable

65. Student Housing.
   Mark only one oval.
   - Very Satisfied
   - Satisfied
   - Dissatisfied
   - Very Dissatisfied
   - Not Applicable
66. **Courses in your major field.**
   *Mark only one oval.*
   - Very Satisfied
   - Satisfied
   - Dissatisfied
   - Very Dissatisfied
   - Not Applicable

67. **Financial Aid Services.**
   *Mark only one oval.*
   - Very Satisfied
   - Satisfied
   - Dissatisfied
   - Very Dissatisfied
   - Not Applicable

68. **Amount of contact with faculty.**
   *Mark only one oval.*
   - Very Satisfied
   - Satisfied
   - Dissatisfied
   - Very Dissatisfied
   - Not Applicable

69. **Opportunities for community service.**
   *Mark only one oval.*
   - Very Satisfied
   - Satisfied
   - Dissatisfied
   - Very Dissatisfied
   - Not Applicable
70. **Job placement services for students.**  
   *Mark only one oval.*  
   - Very Satisfied  
   - Satisfied  
   - Dissatisfied  
   - Very Dissatisfied  
   - Not Applicable

71. **Class size.**  
   *Mark only one oval.*  
   - Very Satisfied  
   - Satisfied  
   - Dissatisfied  
   - Very Dissatisfied  
   - Not Applicable

72. **Interaction with other students.**  
   *Mark only one oval.*  
   - Very Satisfied  
   - Satisfied  
   - Dissatisfied  
   - Very Dissatisfied  
   - Not Applicable

73. **Ethnic/racial diversity of faculty.**  
   *Mark only one oval.*  
   - Very Satisfied  
   - Satisfied  
   - Dissatisfied  
   - Very Dissatisfied  
   - Not Applicable
74. **Leadership opportunities.**
   *Mark only one oval.*
   - [ ] Very Satisfied
   - [ ] Satisfied
   - [ ] Dissatisfied
   - [ ] Very Dissatisfied
   - [ ] Not Applicable

75. **Overall experiences.**
   *Mark only one oval.*
   - [ ] Very Satisfied
   - [ ] Satisfied
   - [ ] Dissatisfied
   - [ ] Very Dissatisfied
   - [ ] Not Applicable

**Conclusion**
Thank you in advance for providing as much detail as possible when answering these last six questions.

76. **What role, if any, did the E-Mentoring Program play in your adjustment to ASU’s West campus?** *

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

77. **Would you recommend the E-Mentoring Program for future transfer students? Why or why not?** *

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
78. Would you recommend extending the E-Mentoring Program for the duration of the fall semester? Why or why not? *

79. What factors helped you adjust to ASU? Please explain what factors contributed to your successful transfer (or unsuccessful transfer) to ASU? *

80. If you could give some advice to community college students who will be transferring to ASU, what advice would you give them? *

81. What have we not asked that you would like us to know about your experiences at ASU?
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