

## INTRODUCTION

### Context

With retention literature telling us that the first year of college is crucial to college success, it is important that we know more about our first year students, their transition to college, and the reasons why they stay or leave (Upcraft, Gardner, et al., 1990). As students enter college, they are faced with many changes: a new environment, new challenges, new roles, and more. They often leave the familiar surroundings and their support system when they enter college. This survey looked at students' first-quarter experience and their **transition to college**. Transition refers to the process of adjusting to college socially and academically. It is the process of acclimating to the new environment and learning to live independently. It includes meeting people and making new friends, learning about campus and the available resources, establishing academic and career goals, and understanding what it means to be part of the Ohio State community.

Furthermore, freshmen success has been defined as developing academic and intellectual competence, establishing and maintaining interpersonal relationships, developing an identity, deciding on a career and life-style, maintaining personal health and wellness, and developing an integrated philosophy of life. Factors that contribute to success include establishing close friendships (especially in the first month), participating in orientation, living in the residence halls, belonging to student organizations, involvement in social and cultural activities, using facilities, and using academic support services (Upcraft, Gardner et al., 1990). An important part of making the transition to college is "getting connected." Getting connected refers to the process of identifying oneself as a member of the OSU community, getting involved with campus life, and meeting fellow students as well as faculty and staff members. To feel connected is to feel a part of the university. Chaskes (1996) views the first-year experience as a process of resocialization to a new cultural environment including the processes of "language" acquisition, and internalization of academic and social norms, and understanding the values and expectations of the college environment. As such, students face a type of culture shock as they adjust to the new environment.

In order to assist students in their transition to college, the University provides a number of services and programs. Among them are Summer Orientation, Welcome Week, and Family Weekend. Goals of these programs are 1) to help students succeed academically by articulating academic requirements and demands, making them aware of academic support services and assisting students in establishing study habits; 2) to help students with their personal adjustment to college by making them aware of developmental issues, providing involvement opportunities, establishing ways to get connected to the university; and 3) to help families understand academic and personal adjustments that their children must make and how to support them in these adjustments. Overall, these programs strive to build a sense of community, a class identity, school spirit, and pride in the institution (Upcraft, 1984).

## **Purpose of the Study**

The Student Transition survey was conducted in order to identify factors that aid and impede students' successful transition to college. The questionnaire contained a series of questions to assess respondents' attitudes toward their first quarter attendance at Ohio State. Students were asked about the level of helpfulness of programs designed to ease the transition to college (including Summer Orientation, Welcome Week and Family Weekend), their concerns about attending Ohio State, their experiences with negative incidents on or around campus, and their self-evaluation of how they are doing with personal and academic-related competencies. Students who did not return to Ohio State for winter quarter were also asked about their reasons for not returning to Ohio State and what their future plans were. All respondents were also asked personal and family demographic questions.

By learning more about the experiences of OSU students and their transition to college, we can better inform our practice. We are also able to examine how various subgroups may experience Ohio State as first-year students including differences based on residence, gender, ethnicity/race, and grade point average.

## **Study Methodology**

The Student Transition survey is based on telephone interviews conducted February 8 to February 28, 2000 with 689 randomly sampled students who were new first-quarter freshmen during autumn quarter, 1999. The Student Transition survey was conducted by the OSU College of Social and Behavioral Sciences' Center for Survey Research for the OSU Division of Student Affairs. Student Affairs drafted the instrument and conducted all analyses.

For this survey, students were randomly selected from a database of all new first-quarter students at the Columbus campus as of fall quarter, 1999, which was provided by the Office of the University Registrar. All interviewing was completed from the OSU Center for Survey Research. A total of 1,249 students were randomly selected for this survey. In many cases, viable telephone numbers were called upwards of 10 times to try to reach a respondent at a time that was convenient for her or him to be interviewed. Of these, 1,188 were presumed to reach a household with an eligible respondent. From these households, interviews were completed in 58% of the cases. Among those households in which an interviewer actually spoke with the eligible respondent, interviews were completed in 91% of the cases. Of the 689 completed interviews, 102 were students who did not return to Ohio State for winter quarter and 587 were students who returned to OSU.

## Description of the Population and the Sample

In autumn quarter of 1999, there were 5963 new students at the Columbus campus of The Ohio State University. They were equally divided between men and women and averaged 14.5 credits during their first quarter earning an average GPA of 2.76. Ethnically, 9.4% were African American, 0.5% American Indian/Alaskan Native, 6.0% Asian/Pacific Islander, 2.4% Hispanic/Latino(a), 1.9% race unknown, and 79.8% Caucasian/white. In addition, 84.9% were from Ohio.

Returning students were over-sampled according to race/ethnic group. Among 587 returning students interviewed, there were 155 African American students, 15 American Indian or Alaskan native students, 132 Asian or Pacific Islander students, 80 Hispanic students, 201 Caucasian students, and 4 students of unknown race or ethnic group. In theory, in 19 cases of 20, the results for this weighted sample of returning new fall quarter freshmen will differ due to sampling error by no more than 3.8 percentage points in either direction from what would have been obtained by interviewing all returning new fall quarter freshmen at Ohio State.

Because students of color had a higher chance of selection than other members of the population, appropriate compensatory weighting was required in order to generate accurate population statistics for the combined or total sample. As such, mathematical corrections have been made when talking of the total sample and other appropriate times in order to bring the percentage of different racial/ethnic groups to represent the percentage in the population (Fowler, 1993). Except when making comparisons based on ethnicity/race, the data presented on returning students are based on a weighted sample.

In addition, students who did not return for winter quarter were also over-sampled. Non-returners were determined by those students who did not pay fees or register for classes for winter quarter. A total of 102 non-returning students were interviewed. Over-sampling by race or ethnic group was not possible for the non-returning students because of the small size of the group. In addition, when comparing the non-returning and returning students, comparisons are based on unweighted means.

### **Limitations**

In addition to being unable to talk about student subgroups among the non-returning students, this survey has a number of limitations. First, there was some difficulty in identifying and contacting students who “dropped out” or “stopped out” for winter quarter. Hence, the sample may not be representative of the population of students who did not return for winter quarter. Second, in some of the comparison groups, such as on-campus and off-campus students, the group size varies considerably. These imbalances may influence the findings. Third, all surveys are subject to potential sources of imprecision and bias which may be associated with the question wording and/or ordering, the response rate, and the quality of the interviewers, for example, and which could lead to somewhat different results from the present findings.

## **FINDINGS**

The findings from the survey are organized in the following sections: Demographics, Overview – General Impressions and Making the Transition, Who was Most Helpful in Students’ Transition to College, Concerns, Obstacles, Personal and Academic Related Competencies, and Non-Returning Students. Separate reports are available on the three programs: Summer Orientation, Welcome Week, and Family Weekend.

Among returning students, comparisons are made based on residence (off-campus students include students who commute and live in apartments or houses off campus), gender, race/ethnicity, and GPA. Such comparisons are not possible with the non-returning students because of the small size of the group.

## Demographics

### Returning Students

Of the 587 respondents who returned to Ohio State for winter quarter, the weighted sample has the following characteristics:

- 99.9% of the sample were between the ages of 17 and 19.
- 53.6% were men, and 46.4% were women.
- They averaged 14.0 credits earned autumn quarter with a GPA of 2.74. Just under 20% earned under a 2.0.
- Racially, the composition was as follows: 9.1% African American, .4% American Indian/Alaskan Native, 6.2% Asian/Pacific Islander, 2.3% Hispanic/Latino(a), 81.3% white/Caucasian, and 0.7% race unknown.
- 77.7% were from Ohio and 88.3% lived on campus.
- 70.5% were not employed; 13.3% worked part-time on campus, and 13.8% worked part-time off campus. Only 2% worked full-time.

When looking at differences by race, the weighting is removed. In this case, the sample was as follows:

- 26.4% African American (n=155), 2.6% American Indian/Alaskan Native (n=15), 22.5% Asian/Pacific Islander (n=132), 13.6% Hispanic/Latino(a) (n=80), 34.2% white/Caucasian (n=201), and 0.7% race unknown (n=4).

### Non-Returning Students

Of the 102 respondents who did not return to Ohio State for winter quarter:

- 97.1% of the sample were between the ages of 17 and 19.
- 52% were men, and 50% were women.
- They averaged 7.95 credits earned autumn quarter with a GPA of 2.56. Over 26% earned under a 2.0.
- Racially, the composition was as follows: 4.9% African American, 2.0% American Indian/Alaska Native, 2.9% Asian/Pacific Islander, 2.9% Hispanic/Latino(a), 87.3% white/Caucasian.
- 47.1% were from Ohio and 65.7% lived on campus (25.5% lived with parents)
- 54.9% were not employed; 8.8% worked part-time on campus, and 29.4% worked part-time off campus. 6.9% worked full-time.

Thus, the non-returning students were more likely to be older than 19, tended to enroll for and/or complete less credit hours autumn quarter, and earned slightly lower grades than returning student. In addition, they were less likely to be from Ohio, and if they were from Ohio, they were more likely to live at home. They were more likely to work -- and more likely to work off-campus and full-time -- than were the returning students.

## Overview – General Impressions

The Overview sections examine students’ general impressions of their transition to college, their satisfaction with Ohio State, and their overall impressions of Summer Orientation, Welcome Week, and Family Weekend.

When examining the data, note that the scores are based on scales running from one to four or five, where one is the most positive response (i.e. “very satisfied,” “very connected”).

***The lower the mean or average score, the better the experience.*** In the tables below, the numerical value of each response is indicated beside the response option.

### Non-Returning Students Compared to Returning Students

Overall, non-returning students were significantly less satisfied with their experience at OSU as demonstrated in their responses to the four questions presented in Tables 1.0 to 1.3.

- Almost 30% of non-returning students expressed dissatisfaction with their experience at OSU compared to only 3.2% of students enrolled winter quarter. The non-returning students averaged 2.72 compared to 1.59 for returning students. (Table 1.0)
- Similarly, as a group, the non-returning students were much more likely to respond that their experience at OSU did not meet their expectations (32.4% compared to 4.8% of returning students). (Table 1.1)
- Students who did not return were also less connected to the university with only 43.1% reporting some level of connection to OSU compared to 76.3% of returning students. (Table 1.2)
- Lastly, non-returning students were also significantly less likely to report that if they had it to do over again, they would enroll at OSU. Over 45% reported that it was not likely compared to only 7.9% of returning students. (Table 1.3)

**Table 1.0: Overall, how satisfied are you/were you with your experience at OSU: Non-returners compared to Returners**

Responses (unweighted)	Non-returners n=101	All Returners n=587
Very Satisfied (1)	7.8	51.1
Somewhat satisfied (2)	47.1	42.4
Neither satisfied or unsatisfied (3)	14.7	3.2
Somewhat unsatisfied (4)	23.5	2.7
Very unsatisfied (5)	5.9	0.5
<b>Average</b>	<b>**2.72</b>	<b>1.59</b>

\*\* Statistically significant at the 95% level from the non-weighted returners (some at 99%)

**Table 1.1: Overall, how well has/did OSU met your expectations: Non-returners compared to Returners**

Responses (unweighted)	Non-returners n=101	All Returners n=587
Much better than you expected (1)	2.9	6.8
Better than you expected (2)	13.7	33.9
About what you expected (3)	50.0	54.5
Worse than you expected (4)	31.4	4.3
Much worse than you expected (5)	1.0	0.5
<b>Average</b>	<b>**3.14</b>	<b>2.58</b>

**Table 1.2: Overall, how connected to the OSU community do/did you feel: Non-returners compared to Returners**

Responses (unweighted)	Non-returners n=102	All Returners n=587
Very connected (1)	7.8	17.0
Somewhat connected (2)	35.3	59.3
Only a little connected (3)	33.3	18.1
Not connected at all (4)	23.5	5.3
<b>Average</b>	<b>**2.73</b>	<b>2.12</b>

**Table 1.3: If you had to do it over again, would you enroll here: Non-returners compared to Returners**

Responses (unweighted)	Non-returners n=102	All Returners n=587
Definitely yes (1)	15.7	53.6
Probably yes (2)	39.2	38.5
Probably not (3)	34.3	6.0
Definitely not (4)	10.8	1.9
<b>Average</b>	<b>**2.40</b>	<b>1.56</b>

\*\* Statistically significant at the 95% level from the non-weighted returners (some at 99%)

### Comparisons among Returning Students

This section presents comparisons among returning students on their overall impressions of Ohio State. The results focus on differences based on GPA and race/ethnicity. Because there were no significant differences between men and women, those data are not presented. Significant differences between students living on campus and students living off campus are noted when they occur.

### *Impressions of All Returning Students and Differences Based on GPA*

#### *Satisfaction*

Examining the overall responses of returning students and the responses based on GPA we find the following (see Table 2.0):

- Over 90% of returning students report being satisfied with their experiences at Ohio State.
- GPA also did not appear to influence first year students' satisfaction with Ohio State. Over 92% of students with a GPA of lower than a 2.0 reported being satisfied with their experience compared to 93% of students with a 3.0 or better.
- Off-campus students were significantly less satisfied with their experience at OSU than on-campus students were, with mean scores of 1.69 and 1.49 respectively. (Data not shown)

**Table 2.0: Overall, how satisfied are you with your experience at OSU: Returners and Comparisons by GPA**

Responses by GPA (weighted)	All Returners n=587	Less than 2.0 n=115	Between 2.0 & 2.9 n=196	3.0 or better n=276
Very Satisfied (1)	57.0	59.2	46.8	63.3
Somewhat satisfied (2)	37.8	33.4	51.8	29.8
Neither satisfied or unsatisfied (3)	2.3	6.7	0.7	1.6
Somewhat unsatisfied (4)	2.7	0.7	0.5	5.0
Very unsatisfied (5)	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.2
<b>Average</b>	<b>1.51</b>	<b>1.49</b>	<b>1.56</b>	<b>1.49</b>

## *Expectations*

Students were asked how well OSU was doing in meeting their expectations. (See Table 2.1)

- Over 46% of all returning students responded that OSU had exceeded their expectations, and another 50% said that their experience had been about what they expected.
- There were no noticeable differences in how students rated OSU in its ability to meet their expectations based on GPA. Only 0.5% of students with less than a 2.0 responded that OSU did not meet their expectations, compared to 2.7% of those with between a 2.0 and a 2.9 and to 4.3% of those with a 3.0 or better.

**Table 2.1: Overall, how well has OSU met your expectations: Returners and Comparisons by GPA**

Responses (weighted)	All Returners n=587	Less than 2.0 n=115	Between 2.0 & 2.9 N=196	3.0 or better n=276
Much better than you expected (1)	6.8	4.8	6.7	7.7
Better than you expected (2)	39.4	41.0	41.4	37.4
About what you expected (3)	50.7	53.7	49.2	50.5
Worse than you expected (4)	2.5	0.5	2.5	3.3
Much worse than you expected (5)	0.5	0.0	0.2	1.0
<b>Average</b>	<b>2.50</b>	<b>2.50</b>	<b>2.48</b>	<b>2.52</b>

## *Connectedness*

Students also rated their level of connectedness to the OSU community. (See Table 2.2)

- After one quarter at Ohio State, only 18.6% of returning students reported feeling “very connected.” Another 17.1% reported being “only a little connected” or being “not connected at all.” This group of students may be at risk if the connection was not made during their second or third quarter at Ohio State.
- Again, there appeared to be little difference with regard to GPA and connectedness to campus. If anything, students with a lower GPA indicated being better connected to the university with 23.4% reporting that they were “very connected” compared to over 17% for students in the other two GPA categories.
- Off-campus students, with an average score of 2.40, reported being significantly less connected to the OSU community than on-campus students did, with an average score of 1.97. (Data not shown)

**Table 2.2: Overall, how connected to the OSU community do you feel: Returners and Comparisons by GPA**

Responses (weighted)	All Returners n=587	Less than 2.0 n=115	Between 2.0 & 2.9 n=196	3.0 or better n=276
Very connected (1)	18.6	23.4	17.1	17.7
Somewhat connected (2)	64.2	57.5	63.9	67.3
Only a little connected (3)	13.4	15.7	14.5	11.7
Not connected at all (4)	3.7	3.4	4.6	3.3
<b>Average</b>	<b>2.02</b>	<b>1.99</b>	<b>2.06</b>	<b>2.00</b>

*Enroll at OSU Again*

Students were asked if they had to do it over again, would they enroll at OSU. (See Table 2.3)

- Of all returning students, 94% responded that they would definitely or probably enroll at Ohio State again if they had to do it all over again.
- Interestingly, students with lower GPA's were significantly more likely to enroll at Ohio State again if they had to do it all over again than students with a 3.0 or better were. Students with less than a 2.0 had an average score of 1.29 and students with between a 2.0 and 2.9 averaged 1.40 compared to 1.54 for students with a 3.0 or better.

**Table 2.3: If you had to do it over again, would you enroll here: Returners and Comparisons by GPA**

Responses (weighted)	All Returners n=587	Less than 2.0 n=115	Between 2.0 & 2.9 n=196	3.0 or better n=276
Definitely yes (1)	62.7	73.2	65.5	56.4
Probably yes (2)	31.3	24.8	29.0	35.7
Probably not (3)	4.7	1.4	5.2	5.6
Definitely not (4)	1.3	0.6	0.3	2.3
<b>Average</b>	<b>1.45</b>	<b>*1.29</b>	<b>*1.40</b>	<b>1.54</b>

\* Statistically significant at the 95% level in comparison to students with a 3.0 or better.

*Impressions by Race/Ethnicity*

Examining race or ethnicity demonstrates that students of color may experience Ohio State differently than Caucasian students do.

*Satisfaction*

Table 3.0 presents the findings by race/ethnicity when students were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with Ohio State. (See Table 3.0)

- African American students reported being significantly less satisfied with Ohio State than Caucasian students did. Only 37.4% of African American students reported being “very satisfied” compared to almost 60% of Caucasian students.
- In addition, African American students were also significantly less satisfied with their experience at Ohio State than both Asian American and Hispanic/Latino

students were. The mean score for African American students was 1.79 compared to 1.54 and 1.56 for Asian American and Hispanic/Latino students respectively.

- Asian American and Hispanic/Latino students reported similar levels of satisfaction and were not significantly different from what Caucasian students reported.

**Table 3.0: Overall, how satisfied are you with your experience at OSU: Returners and Comparisons by GPA**

Responses (unweighted)	African American n=155	Asian Americans n=132	Hispanic/ Latino n=80	Caucasians n=201
Very Satisfied (1)	37.4	53.0	53.8	59.7
Somewhat satisfied (2)	54.2	40.9	40.0	35.8
Neither satisfied or unsatisfied (3)	2.6	5.3	2.5	2.0
Somewhat unsatisfied (4)	3.9	0.8	3.8	2.5
Very unsatisfied (5)	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Average</b>	<b>*1.79</b>	<b>♦1.54</b>	<b>▫1.56</b>	<b>1.47</b>

\* Statistically significant at the 95% level in comparison to Caucasian students.

♦ Statistically significant at the 95% level comparing African Americans and Asian Americans

▫ Statistically significant at the 95% level comparing African Americans and Hispanic/Latinos

### *Expectations*

Similar trends were found when looking at differences by race regarding how well OSU has done in meeting students' expectations. (See Table 3.1)

- African American students were significantly less likely to have their expectations met than Caucasian students were. Only 30.4% of African American students reported that OSU had exceeded their expectations, compared to 48.8% of Caucasian students.
- Also consistent with levels of satisfaction, African American students (average score of 2.77) were also less likely to report that OSU had exceeded their expectations than Asian American and Hispanic/Latino students (both averaging 2.54).

**Table 3.1: Overall, how well has OSU met your expectations: By Race**

Responses (unweighted)	African American n=155	Asian Americans n=132	Hispanic/ Latino n=80	Caucasians n=201
Much better than you expected (1)	5.2	6.8	10.0	7.0
Better than you expected (2)	25.2	35.6	28.8	41.8
About what you expected (3)	58.7	54.5	58.8	49.3
Worse than you expected (4)	9.7	3.0	2.5	1.5
Much worse than you expected (5)	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.5
<b>Average</b>	<b>*2.77</b>	<b>♦2.54</b>	<b>▫2.54</b>	<b>2.47</b>

\* Statistically significant at the 95% level in comparison to Caucasian students.

♦ Statistically significant at the 95% level comparing African Americans and Asian Americans

▫ Statistically significant at the 95% level comparing African Americans and Hispanic/Latinos

### Connectedness

For African American, Asian American, and Hispanic/Latino students, it appears to be more difficult to connect at OSU than for Caucasian students. (See Table 3.2)

- African American students exhibited the least connection at OSU with 10.4% reporting that they were “not connected at all,” compared to 3.0% of Caucasian students; the average for the group was significantly lower than for Caucasian students (2.28 compared to 1.98).
- Asian American students also reported significantly less connection with an average score of 2.14 than Caucasian students reported with an average score of 1.98.

**Table 3.2: Overall, how connected to the OSU community do you feel: By Race**

Responses (unweighted)	African American n=155	Asian Americans n=132	Hispanic/Latino n=80	Caucasians n=201
Very connected (1)	15.6	14.4	18.8	19.4
Somewhat connected (2)	51.3	61.4	53.8	66.2
Only a little connected (3)	22.7	20.5	23.8	11.4
Not connected at all (4)	10.4	3.8	3.8	3.0
<b>Average</b>	<b>*2.28</b>	<b>*2.14</b>	<b>2.12</b>	<b>1.98</b>

\* Statistically significant at the 95% level in comparison to Caucasian students.

### Enroll at OSU Again

Differences by race/ethnicity also existed when students’ were asked if they had to do it over again, would they enroll at OSU. (See Table 3.3)

- Hispanic/Latino and Caucasian students reported very similar results when asked if they would enroll at OSU again if they had it to do all over again, with mean scores of 1.38 and 1.39 respectively.
- African American students again showed the greatest difference with scores indicating that they would be the significantly less likely to chose OSU again than the other three groups of students. Only 36.1% reported that they would definitely enroll at OSU again, compared to 46.2% of Asian American students, 69.6% of Hispanic/Latino students, and 67.2% of Caucasian students.
- In addition, Asian American students were significantly less likely to select OSU again compared to Hispanic/Latino and Caucasian students. However, the main difference was in the percentage of students who responded that the definitely would enroll at OSU again. Asian American students were not any more likely to respond that they probably or definitely wouldn’t enroll at OSU again than Hispanic and Caucasian students were.

**Table 3.3: If you had to do it over again, would you enroll here: By Race**

Responses (unweighted)	African American n=155	Asian Americans N=132	Hispanic/Latino n=80	Caucasians n=201
Definitely yes (1)	36.1	46.2	69.6	67.2
Probably yes (2)	47.7	49.2	25.3	27.9
Probably not (3)	11.6	4.6	2.5	4.0
Definitely not (4)	4.5	0.0	2.5	1.0
<b>Average</b>	<b>*♦1.85</b>	<b>*■1.58</b>	<b>□1.38</b>	<b>1.39</b>

- \* Statistically significant at the 95% level in comparison to Caucasian students.
- Statistically significant at the 95% level comparing Asian Americans and Hispanic/Latinos
- ♦ Statistically significant at the 95% level comparing African Americans and Asian Americans
- Statistically significant at the 95% level comparing African Americans and Hispanic/Latinos

## Overview - Making the Transition

Directly related to the general impressions presented above are the overall impressions of students' transition to college. Included in this section are responses to four questions:

“Overall how smooth was your transition to college?”

“Overall, how helpful was the Summer Orientation program for your transition to college?”\*

“Overall, how helpful were the Welcome Week activities for your transition to college?”\*

“Overall, how helpful were the Family Weekend activities for your transition to college?”\*

For each question, (except for Family Weekend), differences based on returning status, GPA and race/ethnicity are provided. Because of the limited number of respondents who attended Family Weekend, we are unable to provide meaningful analyses by student subgroups. Furthermore, for questions regarding the three programs, frequencies and average scores represent those students who attended the programs. The percentage of attendees is also provided.

*\* More extensive reports on the three program areas are also available.*

### Non-Returning Students Compared to Returning Students

Not surprisingly, non-returning students reported having a more difficult time making the transition to college. Generally, they found the University's programs like Summer Orientation as less helpful than returning students. (See Tables 4.0-4.3)

- Only 15.7% reported a “very smooth” transition compared to 30.2% of returning students, and 20.6% reported either a “very rough” or “somewhat rough” transition compared to only 8.3% of returning students. (Table 4.0)
- On average, non-returning students had a significantly more difficult transition than returning students did, with average scores of 2.70 and 2.18 respectively. (Table 4.0)
- Non-returning students also reported that Summer Orientation was less helpful than returning students reported, with an average score of 2.22 compared to returning students' score of 2.01. (Table 4.1)
- Over 50% of non-returning students did not attend Welcome Week events compared to 29.3% of returning students. (Table 4.2)
- There were no noticeable differences between returning and non-returning students and their attendance of Family Weekend events or how helpful the event's activities were in their transition. Over 24% of each group reported that Family Weekend was “not at all helpful” for their transition to College. (Table 4.3)

**Table 4.0: Overall, how smooth was your transition to college: Non-returners compared to Returners**

Responses (unweighted)	Non- returners n=102	All Returners n=587
Very Smooth (1)	15.7	30.2
Somewhat smooth (2)	25.5	32.5
Had its ups and downs (3)	38.2	29.0
Somewhat rough (4)	14.7	6.3
Very rough (5)	5.9	2.0
<b>Average</b>	<b>**2.70</b>	<b>2.18</b>

**Table 4.2: Overall, how well helpful were the Welcome Week activities for your transition to college: Non-returners compared to Returners**

Responses (unweighted)	Non- returners n=102	All Returners n=587
Very helpful (1)	30.0	38.8
Somewhat helpful (2)	38.0	39.8
Only a little helpful (3)	30.0	17.5
Not at all helpful (4)	2.0	3.9
<b>Average for those who attended</b>	<b>2.04</b>	<b>1.86</b>
Did not attend	51.0	29.3

**Table 4.1: Overall, how well helpful was the Summer Orientation program for your transition to college: Non-returners compared to Returners**

Responses (unweighted)	Non- returners n=102	All Returners n=587
Very helpful (1)	21.6	30.3
Somewhat helpful (2)	44.3	43.5
Only a little helpful (3)	24.7	21.5
Not at all helpful (4)	9.3	4.8
<b>Average for those who attended</b>	<b>**2.22</b>	<b>2.01</b>
Did not attend	4.9	3.2

**Table 4.3: Overall, how helpful were the Family Weekend activities for your transition to college: Non-returners compared to Returners**

Responses	Non- returners n=102	All Returners n=587
Very helpful (1)	18.2	19.0
Somewhat helpful (2)	45.5	35.8
Only a little helpful (3)	9.1	20.9
Not at all helpful (4)	27.3	24.3
<b>Average for those who attended</b>	<b>2.45</b>	<b>2.51</b>
Did not attend	89.2	91.8

\*\* Statistically significant at the 95% level from the unweighted returners (some at 99%)

### Comparisons among Returning Students

Examining three of the questions about transition, differences based on GPA and race/ethnicity are provided below. When significant differences were found between men and women or between students living on campus as compared to those living off campus, these are noted, although the data are not presented in tables. Consistent with the data presented above, for questions regarding Summer Orientation and Welcome Week, the frequencies and average scores represent those students who attended the programs. The percentage of attendees is also provided.

Because of the limited number of respondents who attended Family Weekend, we are unable to provide analyses based on subgroups for this question. Please refer to Table 4.3 for data on Family Weekend and refer to the individual program report on the event.

## *Impressions of All Returning Students and Differences Based on GPA*

### *Smooth Transition*

Students were asked to rate how smooth their transition to college was. (See Table 5.0)

- Overall, returning students reported a “somewhat smooth” transition to college with an average score of 2.07. Over 69% of returning students reported either a “very smooth” or “somewhat smooth” transition.
- Students with less than a 2.0 seemed to have a slightly more difficult transition to college with 12.3% responding that it was rough (compared to 7.5% of students with between a 2.0 and a 2.9 and 6.2% of students with a 3.0 or better).
- However, there were no significant differences based on GPA.

**Table 5.0: Overall, how smooth was your transition to college: Returners and Comparisons by GPA**

Responses (weighted)	All Returners n=587	Less than 2.0 n=115	Between 2.0 & 2.9 n=196	3.0 or better n=276
Very Smooth (1)	32.9	28.5	36.7	32.0
Somewhat smooth (2)	36.4	40.0	39.5	32.7
Had its ups and downs (3)	22.9	19.2	16.3	29.1
Somewhat rough (4)	6.2	9.6	5.8	5.1
Very rough (5)	1.6	2.7	1.7	1.1
<b>Average</b>	<b>2.07</b>	<b>2.18</b>	<b>1.96</b>	<b>2.11</b>

### *Summer Orientation*

Students were also asked to rate the overall helpfulness of Summer Orientation for their transition to college. (See Table 5.1)

- Overall, returning students reported that Summer Orientation was somewhat helpful for their transition to college with an average score of 2.06 and with 72.8% responding that Orientation was either “very helpful” or “somewhat helpful.”
- Interestingly, students with between a 2.0 and a 2.9 found Orientation significantly more helpful than students with less than a 2.0 and noticeably more helpful than students with a 3.0 or better.
- Also, women reported that Orientation was significantly more helpful for their transition than men did (averages of 1.98 and 2.14 respectively). (Data not presented)

**Table 5.1: Overall, how well helpful was the Summer Orientation program for your transition to college: Returners and Comparisons by GPA**

Responses (weighted)	All Returners n=587	Less than 2.0 n=115	Between 2.0 & 2.9 n=196	3.0 or better n=276
Very helpful (1)	25.7	22.8	27.6	25.5
Somewhat helpful (2)	47.1	37.7	51.2	48.3
Only a little helpful (3)	22.3	35.1	20.3	18.6
Not at all helpful (4)	4.9	4.4	1.0	7.6
<b>Average for those who attended</b>	<b>2.06</b>	<b>2.21</b>	<b>▲ 1.94</b>	<b>2.09</b>
Did not attend	1.5	0.8	2.6	0.9

▲ Statistically significant at the 95% level comparing a GPA of less than a 2.0 to a GPA of a 2.0 to a 2.9

## Welcome Week

In addition, students were asked to rate the overall helpfulness of Welcome Week activities for their transition to college. (See Table 5.2)

- Of returning students who attended Welcome Week activities, 71.4% found them helpful, with an average score of 1.99.
- Just over 70% of returning students attended Welcome Week activities.
- Among those students who attended activities, there were no noticeable differences across GPA.
- However, students with a lower GPA were less likely to have attended Welcome Week events than those students with a higher GPA. Over 35% of students with under a 2.0 did not attend activities compared to almost 30% of students with between a 2.0 and a 2.9 and over 26% of students with a 3.0 or better.
- In addition, off-campus students were much less likely to attend Welcome Week activities with 78.8% reporting that they did not attend compared to 22.7% of on-campus students. Moreover, off-campus students who did attend events found them significantly less helpful than on-campus students (average scores of 2.42 compared to 1.97). (Data not presented.)

**Table 5.2: Overall, how well helpful were the Welcome Week activities for your transition to college: Returners and Comparisons by GPA**

Responses (weighted)	All Returners n=587	Less than 2.0 n=115	Between 2.0 & 2.9 n=196	3.0 or better n=276
Very helpful (1)	33.9	39.8	31.5	33.3
Somewhat helpful (2)	37.5	34.2	41.8	35.7
Only a little helpful (3)	24.5	21.5	23.0	26.6
Not at all helpful (4)	4.2	4.5	3.7	4.4
<b>Average for those who attended</b>	<b>1.99</b>	<b>1.91</b>	<b>1.99</b>	<b>2.02</b>
Did not attend	29.3	35.4	29.3	26.6

## *Impressions by Race/Ethnicity*

### *Smooth Transition*

Comparable to the general impressions findings, differences by race/ethnicity were found when students' responded to the question regarding the smoothness of their transition to college. (See Table 6.0)

- Asian American and Caucasian students reported having similar transitions with mean scores of 2.02 and 2.03 respectively.
- African American and Hispanic/Latino students reported significantly more difficult transitions than both Asian American and Caucasian students reported.
- Almost 50% of African American students responded that their transition "had its ups and downs," was "somewhat rough," or was "very rough" compared to 41.3% of Hispanic/Latino students, 33.3% of Asian American students and 27.9% of Caucasian students.

**Table 6.0: Overall, how smooth was your transition to college: By Race**

Responses (unweighted)	African American n=155	Asian Americans n=132	Hispanic/Latino n=80	Caucasians n=201
Very Smooth (1)	25.2	38.6	18.8	33.8
Somewhat smooth (2)	25.2	28.0	40.0	38.3
Had its ups and downs (3)	38.1	28.0	33.8	20.4
Somewhat rough (4)	9.0	3.0	5.0	6.0
Very rough (5)	2.6	2.3	2.5	1.5
<b>Average</b>	<b>*♦ 2.39</b>	<b>▪ 2.02</b>	<b>*2.33</b>	<b>2.03</b>

- \* Statistically significant at the 95% level in comparison to Caucasian students.
- Statistically significant at the 95% level comparing Asian Americans and Hispanic/Latinos
- ♦ Statistically significant at the 95% level comparing African Americans and Asian Americans

### *Summer Orientation*

Interestingly, Orientation appears to have been more helpful for students of color than for Caucasian students. (See Table 6.1)

- Fewer Caucasian students (24%) reported that Orientation was “very helpful” than Asian American students (31.3%), African American students (32.9%), and Hispanic/Latino students (42.1%) did.
- Similarly, Hispanic/Latino students found Orientation significantly more helpful than Caucasian students did. However, they were also noticeably less likely to attend Orientation with 5% saying they didn’t attend compared to 0.5% of Caucasian students.

**Table 6.1: Overall, how well helpful was the Summer Orientation program for your transition to college: By Race**

Responses (unweighted)	African American n=155	Asian Americans n=132	Hispanic/Latino n=80	Caucasians n=201
Very helpful (1)	32.9	31.3	42.1	24.0
Somewhat helpful (2)	41.6	42.2	35.5	48.5
Only a little helpful (3)	20.8	21.9	18.4	22.5
Not at all helpful (4)	4.7	4.7	3.9	5.0
<b>Average for those who attended</b>	<b>1.97</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>*1.84</b>	<b>2.08</b>
Did not attend	3.9	3.0	5.0	0.5

- \* Statistically significant at the 95% level in comparison to Caucasian students.

## Welcome Week

Students of color also found Welcome Week to be more helpful for their transition to college. (See Table 6.2)

- Students of all racial/ethnic groups were equally likely to attend Welcome Week events.
- Of those who attended, African American, Asian American, and Hispanic/Latino students reported that Welcome Week activities were more helpful than Caucasian students did. Furthermore, there were significant differences between Asian American and Caucasian students and between Hispanic/Latino and Caucasian students.

**Table 6.2: Overall, how well helpful were the Welcome Week activities for your transition to college: By Race**

Responses (unweighted)	African American n=155	Asian Americans n=132	Hispanic/Latino n=80	Caucasians n=201
Very helpful (1)	41.4	40.4	50.0	32.2
Somewhat helpful (2)	41.4	42.6	39.3	36.4
Only a little helpful (3)	10.8	14.9	8.9	27.3
Not at all helpful (4)	6.3	2.1	1.8	4.2
<b>Average for those who attended</b>	<b>1.82</b>	<b>*1.79</b>	<b>*1.63</b>	<b>2.03</b>
Did not attend	28.4	28.8	30.0	28.9

\* Statistically significant at the 95% level in comparison to Caucasian students.

## Who was Most Helpful in Students' Transition to College

By identifying who helped students the most in their transition to college, we can learn more about the transition process and how we may better serve students. (See Table 7.0)

- Over 60% of returning and non-returning students responded that a friend or a family member was most helpful for them.
- However, returning students were more likely to respond that a friend was most helpful (35%) than were non-returning students (26.7%). In addition, another 18 students responded that a roommate or boy/girlfriend was most helpful.
- Non-returning students favored a family member at 35.6% compared to 30.4% of returning students.
- Almost 9% of both returning and non-returning students reported that a residence hall staff member was most helpful in their transition.
- In addition, 7% of returning students and 12.9% of non-returning students reported that no one was particularly helpful in their transition.
- Lastly, almost 7% of non-returning students and almost 9% of returning students responded that "some other person" was most helpful. (See below for details)

**Table 7.0 Who was most helpful in your transition?**

Responses	Non-returners (n=101)	Returners (weighted) (n=542)
Friend or fellow student	26.7	35.0
Family member	35.6	30.4
Some other person	6.9	8.9
RA or residence hall staff person	8.9	8.7
Academic Advisor	4.0	5.7
Faculty member	3.0	2.7
Teaching Associate (TA)	1.0	1.0
Student advocacy Staff member	1.0	0.5
No one was helpful	12.9	7.0

Of those people who named “some other person” as being most helpful in their transition, the following responses were given:

- High school guidance counselor/teacher (13)
- Myself/God (11)
- Roommates/floor mates (a more specific response than “friend”) (12)
- Boyfriend/girlfriend (6)

Others talked specifically of people associated with special programs or areas of involvement on campus such as:

- Fraternity
- ROTC
- YSP coordinators (2)
- The Mount Leadership Program advisor
- People in the Honor’s college
- Minority Advising program
- Coach

## **Concerns**

Students were asked about their concerns about college and Ohio State before arriving on campus and what concerns they still had at the time of the survey. These questions were asked in an open-ended format with pre-coded response options for the interviewers, as provided in Table 8.0. In addition to those options, many students cited other concerns. These responses are summarized below. Responses to these two questions provide targeted areas to be addressed through programs such as Summer Orientation and Welcome Week and through academic advising and UVC classes.

### Before Arriving at Ohio State

Students expressed the following concerns before arriving at Ohio State (See Table 8.0):

- For returning students, their primary concerns before arriving at Ohio State were getting good grades (15.2%), being prepared for college classes (14.3%), finding their way around campus (13.1%), making friends (11.1%), and being away from home (10.2%).
- For students who did not return to Ohio State for winter quarter, their top concerns were finding their way around campus (16.6%), getting good grades (12.8%), being away from home (12.7%), being prepared for college classes (10.8%), and financial concerns (10.8%).

- While there are some similarities between what returning and non-returning students reported, noticeable differences include that only 1% of non-returning students reported that making friends was a concern for them compared to 11.1% of returning students, and 10.8% of non-returning students responded that they were concerned about finances and only 2.8% of returning students reported the same. These differences may reflect where students were at the time of the survey as much as the concerns they recalled having before arriving at Ohio State.
- Furthermore, the most frequently cited “other concern” regarded the size of the institution and the size of classes. Other concerns noted include faculty and academic concerns and campus life concerns. (See below for details)

**Table 8.0: Thinking back to before you arrived at Ohio State, what were some of your concerns about Ohio State and going to college? & Now that you are/were a student at Ohio State, what were some of your concerns about Ohio State and going to college?**  
(multiple responses, will not equal 100%)

Responses	Non-returners (n=102)		Returners (weighted) (n=587)	
	Before	After	Before	After
Getting good grades	15.2	24.3	12.8	5.8
Being prepared for college classes	14.3	7.0	10.8	5.9
Finding your way around campus	13.1	0.1	16.6	5.9
Making friends	11.1	0.9	1.0	2.0
Being away from home	10.2	2.2	12.7	0
Getting along with roommates	6.6	0.5	4.9	3.0
Fitting in	5.9	1.0	3.0	3.9
Learning about the social scene	2.9	1.6	3.0	2.0
Financial concerns	2.8	5.0	10.8	6.9
Knowing where to go or who to talk to for questions	2.6	1.8	0	4.0
Choosing a major	2.5	8.2	4.9	2.9
Finding a job	0	2.2	1.0	0
Other (see below)	52.3	35.1	61.8	42.2
No Concerns		16.1		20.6

### *Other Responses*

When examining the “other” responses students provided to the question, “*Thinking back to before you arrived at Ohio State, what were some of your concerns about Ohio State and going to college?*” The following themes were found.

#### *Size*

The most common response given for both returning and non-returning students pertained to the size of the school and class size. Of the returning students, 123, or 20.9%, commented on the size of the school and/or the size of the classes. Similarly, 35, or 34.3%, of non-returning students commented on institutional size. Related to general institutional size comments included the following:

- Size of school or campus, too big
- The size was intimidating
- Population of the campus
- Too big to accommodate each individual student’s needs
- Size of school, impersonal nature of it
- Just being a statistic or a number
- Being forgotten or lost in the crowd

Others (20 or almost 5 %) talked more specifically about classroom size. These comments included:

- Classroom size
- That I was going to have 500 kids in one class
- Teacher to student ratio
- If classes were going to be too large

### *Faculty and Academic Concerns*

Related to the size of the institution, 13 students talked about concerns related to connecting with or getting in contact with faculty. Comments included:

- Getting in touch with faculty
- Teacher attention/availability
- Having close contact with professors
- Getting help from professors who might be too busy
- No contact with teachers/professors

Some students (47 or 6.8%) spoke of academic concerns such as:

- Scheduling and getting the classes that I need
- Knowing what classes to take
- The difficulty of classes and adjusting to the amount of work
- The quality of teaching and the ranking of the programs
- Having a good academic advisor
- Concerned with being on quarters instead of semesters
- Doing well is major or getting into a specific program
- Work ethic – getting used to studying without supervisions

### *Campus Life Related Concerns*

Other areas of concern for students prior to entering Ohio State focused on campus life.

Nineteen students (2.8%) cited concerns about their living arrangements:

- Availability of housing
- Living in the dorm, dorm life and conditions
- Living off campus
- Cafeteria food

Safety was also a concern for eight students; students mentioned violence, fear of crimes, safety on campus, and property getting stolen.

Related to campus climate, a number of students (6) mentioned concerns related to diversity such as:

- The diversity compared to my hometown
- Concerned about racist people
- Not diverse enough
- Way too different from home
- Concerned about being a minority

A few students were concerned with getting involved on campus. For example:

- How hard it would be to balance school with varsity football
- Getting involved in clubs or organizations (4)
- Concerned about cheerleading

Lastly, two students talked of issues regarding drugs and alcohol.

- Worried about the party scene, did not want to be involved in drinking and partying
- Concerned about being around all the drugs and alcohol

### *Other Areas of Concern*

Students also talked about general concerns such as:

- Starting over
- Belonging
- Getting adjusted to college life and a new environment
- Time management skills
- Getting connected
- Not knowing anybody
- The whole transition
- Leaving family and friends
- Succeeding
- Parking
- Fitting classes around work and kids

### After One Quarter at Ohio State

Turning to concerns students had after one quarter at Ohio State, we find noticeable changes. (See Table 8.0 above)

- Overall, returning students' concerns were minimized after completing a quarter at the University. They were less concerned about finding their way around campus, making friends, being away from home, getting along with roommates, and fitting in. In addition, 16.1% of returning students reported having no concerns.
- Two areas that returning students mentioned more frequently after being on campus were getting good grades (24.3% after compared to 15.2% before) and financial concerns (5.0% after compared to 2.8% before).
- For non-returning students, their concerns were reduced across the board with the exception of "fitting in" which increased slightly. The lack of concerns expressed (including 20.6% who reported having no concerns at the time of the survey) are probably reflective of them leaving Ohio State rather than signs of successful transition.
- In addition, the "other concerns" expressed after attending OSU for a quarter qualitatively shifted to more academic related concerns and to personal challenges such as time management. (See below for details)

### *Other Responses*

Other concerns cited by students after enrollment include academic concerns, personal concerns, size, and campus life related concerns.

### *Academic Concerns*

Over 12% of all respondents expressed concern about academic related matters. Two areas of concern that emerged after students had completed a quarter at Ohio State focused on scheduling and getting into the degree granting unit of their preference or choosing a major. Thirty-two students (seven non-returning students) spoke about difficulties with scheduling.

For example:

- Getting the classes for my major
- Being able to get all my classes
- Scheduling is a big problem
- Getting into the classes that you need
- Scheduling is unfair for student who are not in the honors program
- To get into classes; freshmen don't get priority so I always get on the waitlist

Others (12 returning students and two non-returning) talked about concerns regarding getting into a specific college or choosing a major.

- Getting into the college of choice
- Getting into the college as soon as possible
- Getting into the college of business
- Picking the right major. I don't know what I want to do
- Getting into the major you want
- Changing his major, might put him behind but not happy with his major right now

A third area of academic concerns regarded the quality of instruction, especially teaching assistants and contact with instructors. Twenty-one students commented on these concerns; eight of them were non-returning students.

- Concerned with the language of TA's
- Foreign TA's; sometimes TA's are hard to understand
- Unhelpful TA's
- Having teachers from other countries making it hard to get good grades
- TA's thinking they were better than their students
- Getting fair professors and TA's
- Getting bad professors
- Faculty availability
- Help outside of classroom is not available enough
- Extra help for classes
- Professors lack involvement with students
- Teacher-student relationships, feels important for helping him succeed
- The fact that some teachers are hard to reach
- Getting to know my professors
- Felt alienated from faculty

In addition to these academic concerns, another six students talked about difficulties with advising.

- Getting in contact with advisors (3)
- UVC isn't helpful at all, and the advisors aren't helpful
- Accessibility of advisors
- Didn't have enough information to schedule classes. Advisors weren't helpful at all. Orientation was really bad about the advisors helping students to organize their class schedule

### *Personal Concerns*

Another common area of concern among students after completing their first quart at college revolved around personal challenges and balance. Over 6.8%, or 47 students, responded that they were concerned about time management and other personal challenges. For example, students said the following:

- Time management (11)
- Partying too much
- Making decisions, homework or party
- Staying on task
- Having both a social life and an academic life
- Getting everything done
- Getting a routine
- Being able to get up for class
- Keeping on top of school work, separating social and academic affairs
- Keeping priorities straight
- Making time for everything
- Balancing outside activities with grades
- Going to school and going to work

A related concern that students expressed was staying focused or being successful.

- Maintaining my focus for studying
- Whether or not I will make it past the first year (2)
- Staying on task/track (2)
- Trying to stay academically focused
- Performance expectations/living up to expectations
- Keeping up with goals

Another area of concern that connects the personal concerns with academic and the structure of the university was with the ability to graduate in a timely manner and extract as much as possible from the college experience.

- Getting through it in four years/graduating in 4 years (6)
- If I will finish (2)
- Graduating (2)
- Getting to graduate on time (2)
- Getting out
- Getting as much out of the experience as I can/taking advantage of all the opportunities
- Trying to get as much education I can for the money

### *Size*

Concerns related to the size of the university continued to be expressed. Thirty-one students found the size of campus and classes to be an issue. Comments include:

- Too big/size of campus (5)
- Classes are too big/class size (5)
- Seems impersonal
- Watching out for yourself in such a big place
- Too much like a bureaucracy
- Size of campus – not able to get questions answered
- So big that you get lost. Being successful is based on your own initiative
- Not getting a hold of the resources I need to advance

- Dislike being at a large school
- Staying connected to a large university
- Teacher-student ratio
- Getting attention from faculty due to size of school
- Not being just a number (2)
- Run around in financial aid/fees and deposits (2)
- Getting enough individual attention
- Too hard to make a complaint because the school is too big
- Finding where to go, you call one number, then another, then another.
- Finding the correct person to talk to for problems

### *Campus Life Related Concerns*

Safety, housing, and diversity also continued to be concerns for students.

#### Safety

- Safety (6)
- Safety at night, escort service hours (2)
- Safety and taking night classes
- Crime

#### Housing

- Finding housing/finding an apartment (3)
- Don't think it's right that they're changing all residence halls to non-smoking
- The dorm I stay in, construction
- Cleanliness of some areas
- Room too small
- Commuting, because he lives at home
- Dorm life is weird because things happen out of the ordinary like a fight in front of my dorm room
- Food in commons isn't good

#### Diversity

- Still not diverse
- The need for more diversity among the student body
- Diversity

## **Obstacles**

No matter how well the University does in providing support and services to assist with the transition to college, a number of incidents or experiences may serve as obstacles for a successful transition to college. They may significantly shape how a student feels about Ohio State and how welcome they feel here. These potential obstacles include incidents of discrimination and crime. (Because of the low number of responses in each category, we are unable to examine the data by student subgroups.) Tables 9.0 and 9.1 present that data for the total sample, the returning students, and the non-returning students. Percentages and actual numbers are provided.

Examining discrimination on campus, we find the following (See Tables 9.0 and 9.1):

- Of all student respondents, 6% reported experiencing ethnic/racial discrimination, 1.3% reported sex discrimination, and 1.2% reported discrimination based on sexual orientation.
- Non-returning students reported experiencing discrimination at a higher rate than returning students did. Almost 7% reported experiencing racial discrimination

compared to 5.8% of returning students. This finding is particularly noteworthy because of the high representation of students of color among the returning students.

- Similarly, non-returning students were almost twice as likely (2% compared to 1.2%) to report having experienced discrimination because of gender.
- The biggest difference was in the reported levels of discrimination based on sexual orientation. Almost 5% of non-returning students reported this type of discrimination compared to only 0.5% of returning students.

**Table 9.0: Last quarter did you personally experience...while on or around campus?**

Reporting those who had the following experiences

	Ethnic/racial discrimination	Discrimination because of gender	Discrimination because of sexual orientation
Total (n=689)	6.0% (41)	1.3% (9)	1.2% (8)
Returners (n=587) unweighted	5.8% (34)	1.2% (7)	0.5% (3)
Non-returners (n=102)	6.9% (7)	2.0% (2)	4.9% (5)

- Overall, approximately 5% of first-year students reported being a victim of crime and experiencing threats of physical violence. In addition, 3.6% reported experiencing actual acts of physical violence, and 1.7% being sexually assaulted or touched in unwelcomed ways.
- Generally, returning and non-returning students reported similar rates of experiencing crime, violence, and sexual assault. However, non-returning students did report a higher rate of receiving threats of physical violence (7.8% compared to 4.4%).

**Table 9.1: Last quarter did you personally experience...while on or around campus?**

Reporting those who had the following experiences

	Victim of a crime	Threats of physical violence	Actual acts of physical violence	Sexually assaulted or touched
Total (n=689)	5.1% (35)	4.9% (34)	3.6% (25)	1.7% (12)
Returners (n=587) unweighted	5.1% (30)	4.4% (26)	3.4% (20)	1.9% (11)
Non-returners (n=102)	4.9% (5)	7.8% (8)	4.9% (5)	1.0% (1)

## Personal Competencies

Another way to assess students' transition to college is through the development of skills and abilities. Thus, students rated themselves on a number of personal and academic-related competencies after one quarter at Ohio State ("How do you feel you are/were doing...?"). In addition to being able to examine differences across groups, these findings may also provide guidance for program emphasis and new initiatives. In presenting the findings, the competencies are organized into two areas: personal and academic-related competencies. Differences based on status (returning and non-returning students) and race are considered. Also, differences based on gender and residency are discussed with regard to personal competencies, and differences based on GPA are discussed in the academic-related competencies. The scale used in the series of competency questions is as follows:

- 1 = "very well"
- 2 = "good"
- 3 = "okay"
- 4 = "still making the transition"
- 5 = "doing poorly"

Thus, a lower average indicates a better self-rating of their competency in the particular area.

### Non-Returning Students Compared to Returning Students

Overall, non-returning students reported being significantly less successful in most areas of personal competency. (See Tables 10.0-10.5)

- When rating how they are doing on their own, 44.8% of non-returning students reported doing "very well" where as 61.6% of returning students reported the same. On average, returning students rated themselves significantly higher than non-returning students (1.56 and 1.89 respectively). (Table 10.0)
- Similarly, 17.6% of non-returning students reported either "still making the transition" or "doing poorly" with regard to how they were doing managing their emotions. Only 7.5% of returning students reported the same. (Table 10.1)
- Related to students' connectedness to campus, non-returning students reported doing significantly worse than returning students in making new friendships. Only 64.7% of non-returning students reported doing "very well" or "good" compared to 86% of returning students. (Table 10.2)
- Non-returning students were also significantly less likely to report doing well at getting to know others of different backgrounds than returning students were, with mean scores of 2.45 and 1.87 respectively. (Table 10.3)
- Moreover, returning students (average score of 2.11) reported doing significantly better than non-returning students (average score of 2.48) when rating themselves on their spiritual growth and development. (Table 10.4)
- Significantly more non-returning students reported "doing poorly" (17.3%) managing their finances than did returning students (6.6%). (Table 10.5)

**Table 10.0: How do/did you feel you are/were doing on your own: Non-returners compared to Returners**

Responses (unweighted)	Non-returners n=102	All Returners n=587
Very well (1)	44.8	61.6
Good (2)	33.3	25.4
Okay (3)	13.5	9.0
Still making the transition (4)	5.2	3.1
Doing poorly (5)	3.1	0.9
<b>Average of those who rated</b>	<b>**1.89</b>	<b>1.56</b>
Not important/NA	5.9	1.5

**Table 10.2: How do/did you feel you are/were doing at making new friendships: Non-returners compared to Returners**

Responses (unweighted)	Non-returners n=102	All Returners n=587
Very well (1)	36.3	52.3
Good (2)	28.4	32.7
Okay (3)	20.6	10.7
Still making the transition (4)	2.0	2.7
Doing poorly (5)	11.8	1.5
<b>Average</b>	<b>**2.24</b>	<b>1.68</b>

**Table 10.4: How do/did you feel you are/were doing at your spiritual growth and development: Non-returners compared to Returners**

Responses	Non-returners n=102	All Returners n=587
Very well (1)	22.1	34.9
Good (2)	29.5	34.9
Okay (3)	34.7	20.1
Still making the transition (4)	5.3	5.1
Doing poorly (5)	8.4	5.1
<b>Average of those who rated</b>	<b>**2.48</b>	<b>2.11</b>
Not important/NA/don't know	6.9	2.7

**Table 10.1: How do/did you feel you are/were doing managing your emotions: Non-returners compared to Returners**

Responses (unweighted)	Non-returners n=102	All Returners n=587
Very well (1)	31.4	41.2
Good (2)	32.4	36.1
Okay (3)	17.6	15.2
Still making the transition (4)	8.8	4.6
Doing poorly (5)	8.8	2.9
<b>Average</b>	<b>**2.31</b>	<b>1.92</b>

**Table 10.3: How do/did you feel you are/were doing at getting to know others of different backgrounds: Non-returners compared to Returners**

Responses (unweighted)	Non-returners n=102	All Returners n=587
Very well (1)	32.4	46.3
Good (2)	25.5	30.2
Okay (3)	18.6	17.2
Still making the transition (4)	6.9	2.7
Doing poorly (5)	14.7	3.6
<b>Average</b>	<b>**2.45</b>	<b>1.87</b>

**Table 10.5: How do/did you feel you are/were doing at managing your finances: Non-returners compared to Returners**

Responses (unweighted)	Non-returners n=102	All Returners n=587
Very well (1)	24.5	27.6
Good (2)	31.6	32.2
Okay (3)	21.4	27.4
Still making the transition (4)	5.1	6.1
Doing poorly (5)	17.3	6.6
<b>Average of those who rated</b>	<b>**2.59</b>	<b>2.32</b>
Not important/NA	3.9	0.0

\*\* Statistically significant at the 95% level from the unweighted returners (some at 99%)

Also as part of the personal competencies, students' decision-making abilities were considered. (See Tables 11.0-11.3)

- Non-returning students rated themselves significantly worse than returning students did at making important decisions with a mean score of 2.40 compared to 1.97. (Table 11.0)
- Similarly, non-returning students rated themselves significantly worse at making responsible choices with regard to alcohol use than returning students did, with average scores of 1.91 and 1.69 respectively. (Table 11.1)
- Although they were not statistically significant differences, non-returning students also rated themselves worse than returning students did with regard to making responsible decisions regarding sexual behavior and drug use. (Tables 11.2 and 11.3)

**Table 11.0: How do/did you feel you are/were doing at making important decisions: Non-returners compared to Returners**

Responses (unweighted)	Non-returners n=102	All Returners n=587
Very well (1)	22.5	36.1
Good (2)	37.3	40.5
Okay (3)	20.6	16.0
Still making the transition (4)	11.8	4.9
Doing poorly (5)	5.9	2.4
<b>Average</b>	<b>**2.40</b>	<b>1.97</b>

**Table 11.1: How do/did you feel you are/were doing at making responsible choices regarding alcohol use: Non-returners compared to Returners**

Responses (unweighted)	Non-returners n=102	All Returners n=587
Very well (1)	45.5	55.0
Good (2)	29.3	27.7
Okay (3)	19.2	13.2
Still making the transition (4)	1.0	1.7
Doing poorly (5)	5.1	2.4
<b>Average for those who rated</b>	<b>**1.91</b>	<b>1.69</b>
Not important/NA/don't know	2.9	0.9

\*\* Statistically significant at the 95% level from the unweighted returners.

**Table 11.2: How do/did you feel you are/were doing at making responsible choices regarding sexual behavior: Non-returners compared to Returners**

Responses (unweighted)	Non-returners n=102	All Returners n=587
Very well (1)	58.6	64.0
Good (2)	25.3	26.0
Okay (3)	16.2	7.9
Still making the transition (4)	0.0	0.7
Doing poorly (5)	0.0	1.4
<b>Average for those who rated</b>	<b>1.58</b>	<b>1.49</b>
Not important/NA/don't know	2.9	1.2

**Table 11.3: How do/did you feel you are/were doing at making responsible choices regarding drug use: Non-returners compared to Returners**

Responses	Non-returners n=102	All Returners n=587
Very well (1)	64.6	72.5
Good (2)	23.2	19.7
Okay (3)	8.1	6.0
Still making the transition (4)	2.0	0.3
Doing poorly (5)	2.0	1.4
<b>Average for those who rated</b>	<b>1.54</b>	<b>1.38</b>
Not important/NA/don't know	2.9	1.4

## Comparisons Among Returning Students

In examining personal competencies among returning students, differences with regard to race, residence, and gender are considered. Because there are no significant differences based on GPA, these data are not presented. However, the fact that there aren't significant differences is an important finding in and of itself.

### ***Ratings of All Returning Students and Differences Based on Residence and Gender***

#### *On Their Own*

Students were asked to rate themselves on how well they were doing on their own. (See Table 12.0)

- Overall, returning students rated themselves as doing well on their own with 91.1% responding that they were doing either “very well” or “good.”
- On-campus students rated themselves significantly better than off-campus students did with a mean score of 1.44 compared to 1.63. Furthermore, more off-campus students (21.9%) responded that it wasn't important how they were doing on their own whereas there weren't any on-campus students who responded this way.
- Women reported having a significantly more difficult time on their own than men did, with average scores of 1.54 and 1.39 respectively.

**Table 12.0: How do you feel you are doing on your own: Returners and Comparisons by Residence & Gender**

Responses (weighted)	All Returners n=587	On-campus n=518	Off-campus n=69	Men n=315	Women n=272
Very well (1)	66.5	67.9	52.9	67.0	65.8
Good (2)	24.6	23.4	35.5	29.0	19.4
Okay (3)	6.6	6.3	9.1	2.7	11.1
Still making the transition (4)	1.6	1.7	0.6	0.7	2.7
Doing poorly (5)	0.8	0.7	1.9	0.6	1.0
<b>Average of those who rated</b>	<b>1.46</b>	<b>1.44</b>	<b>*1.63</b>	<b>1.39</b>	<b>*1.54</b>
Not important/ NA	2.6	0.0	21.9	2.3	2.9

\* Statistically significant at the 95% level comparing two groups (on campus v. off campus and men v. women).

### *Managing Their Emotions*

Students were also asked to rate themselves on how they were doing managing their emotions. (See Table 12.1)

- Overall, Returning students reported doing “good” at managing their emotions with an average score of 1.84.
- Although not statistically significant, off-campus students evaluated themselves better than on-campus students did with regard to managing their emotions. Over 87% of off-campus students responded that they were doing either “very well” or “good” compared to 81.2% of on-campus students.
- Women rated themselves significantly lower than men did with regard to managing their emotions, with mean scores of 1.96 and 1.73 respectively.

**Table 12.1: How do you feel you are doing managing your emotions: Returners and Comparisons by Residence & Gender**

Responses (weighted)	All Returners n=587	On-campus n=518	Off-campus n=69	Men n=315	Women n=272
Very well (1)	41.4	41.5	41.2	47.3	34.6
Good (2)	40.5	39.7	46.2	38.4	42.9
Okay (3)	13.0	13.5	9.3	9.1	17.5
Still making the transition (4)	3.2	3.3	2.7	3.8	2.5
Doing poorly (5)	1.9	2.1	0.6	1.3	2.6
<b>Average</b>	<b>1.84</b>	<b>1.85</b>	<b>1.75</b>	<b>1.73</b>	<b>*1.96</b>

\* Statistically significant at the 95% level comparing two groups (on campus v. off campus and men v. women).

### *Making New Friends*

In addition, students rated themselves on how well they were doing at making new friends. (See Table 12.2)

- Almost 55% of all returning students thought they were doing “very well” at making new friends.
- There was a large difference between how off-campus and on-campus students rated themselves with regard to making new friends. Only 28.9% of off-campus students thought they were doing “very well” compared to 57.9% of on-campus students.
- Men and women were remarkably similar in this area with mean scores of 1.63 and 1.62 respectively.

**Table 12.2: How do you feel you are doing at making new friendships: Returners and Comparisons by Residence & Gender**

Responses (weighted)	All Returners n=587	On-campus n=518	Off-campus n=69	Men n=315	Women n=272
Very well (1)	54.5	57.9	28.9	52.7	56.6
Good (2)	33.3	32.2	41.8	35.0	31.4
Okay (3)	8.8	8.0	15.2	9.9	7.5
Still making the transition (4)	2.2	1.8	5.1	2.0	2.4
Doing poorly (5)	1.3	0.2	9.1	0.5	2.2
<b>Average</b>	<b>1.62</b>	<b>1.54</b>	<b>*2.24</b>	<b>1.63</b>	<b>1.62</b>

\* Statistically significant at the 95% level comparing two groups (on campus v. off campus and men v. women).

### *Getting to Know Others of Different Backgrounds*

Table 12.3 presents the results from students' responses to how well they were doing at getting to know others of different backgrounds.

- Returning students rated themselves as doing worse at getting to know others of different backgrounds than they did at making new friends. Less than 45% rated themselves as doing "very well."
- Off-campus students (with a mean score of 2.08) rated themselves slightly worse at getting to know others of different backgrounds than on-campus students did (with a mean score of 1.84).
- Men and women responded similarly to their success at getting to know others of different backgrounds with 77.8% of men and 77.8% of women responding "very well" or "good."

**Table 12.3: How do you feel you are doing at getting to know others of different backgrounds: Returners and Comparisons by Residence & Gender**

Responses (weighted)	All Returners n=587	On-campus n=518	Off-campus n=69	Men n=315	Women n=272
Very well (1)	44.2	45.0	38.0	44.4	44.0
Good (2)	33.6	33.9	31.3	33.4	33.8
Okay (3)	16.0	15.4	20.9	16.1	15.9
Still making the transition (4)	3.2	3.1	4.2	4.0	2.4
Doing poorly (5)	3.0	2.6	5.6	2.1	3.9
<b>Average</b>	<b>1.87</b>	<b>1.84</b>	<b>2.08</b>	<b>1.86</b>	<b>1.88</b>

### *Spiritual Growth and Development*

In addition, students were asked about their spiritual growth and development. (See Table 12.4)

- With regard to spiritual growth and development, returning students rated themselves as doing "good" with a mean score of 2.08. Also noteworthy was that 3.3% of students felt spiritual growth wasn't important or didn't apply.
- Off-campus students (mean of 1.92) rated themselves slightly better than on-campus students did (mean of 2.10) at developing spiritually, although a higher percentage of off-campus students felt it wasn't important (4.9% compared to 3.1%).
- Similarly, women reported a higher success than men did, with mean scores of 2.05 and 2.10 respectively, but women were also more likely to respond that spiritual growth wasn't important.

**Table 12.4: How do you feel you are doing at your spiritual growth and development: Returners and Comparisons by Residence & Gender**

Responses (weighted)	All Returners n=587	On-campus n=518	Off-campus n=69	Men n=315	Women n=272
Very well (1)	35.1	35.0	36.2	34.8	35.5
Good (2)	35.3	35.0	37.9	35.2	35.4
Okay (3)	20.4	19.8	24.7	20.6	20.2
Still making the transition (4)	5.1	5.7	0.4	3.9	6.5
Doing poorly (5)	4.1	4.5	0.8	5.5	2.4
<b>Average of those who rated</b>	<b>2.08</b>	<b>2.10</b>	<b>1.92</b>	<b>2.10</b>	<b>2.05</b>
Not important/NA/don't know	3.3	3.1	4.9	2.9	3.8

*Managing Their Finances*

In Table 12.5, findings are presented on how all returning students, along with on- and off-campus students and men and women, responded to how well they were doing at managing their finances. (See Table 12.5)

- In comparison to other personal competencies, returning students rated themselves lowest in their success at managing their finances with an average score of 2.21.
- On-campus students rated themselves lower than off-campus students did with regard to managing their finances (mean scores of 2.23 and 2.06 respectively).
- Women rated themselves lower than men did with regard to managing their finances, with mean scores of 2.33 and 2.11 respectively.

**Table 12.5: How do you feel you are doing at managing your finances: Returners and Comparisons by Residence & Gender**

Responses (weighted)	All Returners n=587	On-campus n=518	Off-campus n=69	Men n=315	Women n=272
Very well (1)	30.2	31.2	22.6	33.9	56.6
Good (2)	33.0	30.4	53.0	34.7	31.4
Okay (3)	26.8	27.5	21.7	22.1	7.5
Still making the transition (4)	5.2	5.8	0.7	4.8	2.4
Doing poorly (5)	4.7	5.1	1.9	4.5	2.2
<b>Average of those who rated</b>	<b>2.21</b>	<b>2.23</b>	<b>2.06</b>	<b>2.11</b>	<b>2.33</b>

*Making Important Decisions*

Students also rated themselves in how well they were doing at making important decisions. (See Table 13.0)

- When examining how students were doing in their decision-making abilities, returning students generally felt they were doing either “very well” or “good” (81.1%) at making important decisions.
- Off-campus student (average of 1.73) rated themselves a little higher with regard to making important decisions as compared to on-campus students (average of 1.94).
- Men and women rated themselves the same (averages of 1.92).

**Table 13.0: How do you feel you are doing at making important decisions: Returners and Comparisons by Residence & Gender**

Responses (weighted)	All Returners n=587	On-campus n=518	Off-campus n=69	Men n=315	Women n=272
Very well (1)	36.0	35.2	41.4	34.2	38.0
Good (2)	45.1	44.3	50.8	47.2	42.7
Okay (3)	12.2	13.3	4.0	13.1	11.3
Still making the transition (4)	4.5	5.0	1.3	3.9	5.3
Doing poorly (5)	2.2	2.1	2.5	1.7	2.8
<b>Average</b>	<b>1.92</b>	<b>1.94</b>	<b>1.73</b>	<b>1.92</b>	<b>1.92</b>

*Responsible Choices regarding Alcohol Use*

Related to making important decisions, students were asked how they were doing at making responsible choices regarding alcohol use. (See Table 13.1)

- Returning students had an average score of 1.79 with regard to making responsible choices regarding alcohol use. However, 18.5% rated themselves as doing less than “good.”
- Off-campus students rated themselves significantly higher at making responsible choices regarding alcohol use compared to on-campus students (mean scores of 1.53 and 1.83 respectively).
- Women (mean of 1.76) rated themselves slightly higher than did men (mean of 1.81).

**Table 13.1: How do you feel you are doing at making responsible choices regarding alcohol use: Returners and Comparisons by Residence & Gender**

Responses (weighted)	All Returners n=587	On-campus n=518	Off-campus n=69	Men n=315	Women N=272
Very well (1)	46.4	43.6	67.6	46.2	46.3
Good (2)	35.1	37.3	18.7	34.0	36.3
Okay (3)	14.0	14.5	10.2	13.8	14.2
Still making the transition (4)	1.9	2.1	0.4	2.6	1.1
Doing poorly (5)	2.6	2.5	3.1	3.0	2.0
<b>Average for those who rated</b>	<b>1.79</b>	<b>1.83</b>	<b>*1.53</b>	<b>1.81</b>	<b>1.76</b>
Not important/ NA/don't know	0.9	1.0	0.4	0.9	1.0

*Responsible Choices regarding Sexual Behavior*

In addition, students responded to a question asking them how well they were doing at making responsible choices regarding sexual behavior. (See Table 13.2)

- Most returning students (at least 90% in all subgroups) reported that they were doing either “very well” or “good” at making responsible choices regarding sexual behavior.
- Off-campus students rated themselves slightly higher than on-campus students did, and women slightly higher than men.

**Table 13.2: How do you feel you are doing at making responsible choices regarding sexual behavior: Returners and Comparisons by Residence & Gender**

Responses (weighted)	All Returners n=587	On-campus n=518	Off-campus n=69	Men n=315	Women n=272
Very well (1)	61.7	59.9	75.5	61.2	62.3
Good (2)	30.4	32.4	15.5	29.3	31.8
Okay (3)	6.2	6.1	7.5	7.5	4.7
Still making the transition (4)	0.6	0.6	0.0	1.0	0.1
Doing poorly (5)	1.1	1.0	1.4	1.0	1.2
<b>Average for those who rated</b>	<b>1.49</b>	<b>1.51</b>	<b>1.36</b>	<b>1.51</b>	<b>1.46</b>
Not important/NA/don't know	1.1	1.0	2.1	0.5	1.8

*Responsible Choices regarding Drug Use*

The last personal competency question asked students how they were doing at making responsible choices regarding drug use. (See Table 13.3)

- Of the decision making competencies, returning students reported the highest scores at making responsible choices regarding drug use, with an average score of 1.38.
- On-campus and off-campus students reported similar results (1.39 and 1.34 respectively).
- Although women reported making better choices regarding alcohol use compared to men, they rated themselves slightly worse than men did at making responsible decisions regarding drug use.

**Table 13.3: How do you feel you are doing at making responsible choices regarding drug use: Returners and Comparisons by Residence & Gender**

Responses (weighted)	All Returners n=587	On campus n=518	Off campus n=69	Men n=315	Women n=272
Very well (1)	70.8	69.9	78.0	74.2	66.9
Good (2)	23.0	24.2	14.2	20.1	26.4
Okay (3)	4.6	4.4	6.0	4.0	5.4
Still making the transition (4)	0.4	0.5	0.0	0.8	0.1
Doing poorly (5)	1.1	1.0	1.8	1.0	1.3
<b>Average for those who rated</b>	<b>1.38</b>	<b>1.39</b>	<b>1.34</b>	<b>1.34</b>	<b>1.42</b>
Not important/NA/don't know	0.9	0.6	2.9	0.6	1.2

## ***Ratings by Race/Ethnicity***

### *On Their Own*

Similar to the results from the overall questions, we find that there are differences in how students rate themselves on personal competencies based on their race, including how they were doing on their own. (See Table 14.0)

- African Americans and Asian Americans (with mean scores of 1.65 and 1.67 respectively) rated themselves as doing significantly worse at being on their own than Caucasian students did (with a mean score of 1.41).

**Table 14.0: How do you feel you are doing on your own: By Race**

Responses (unweighted)	African American n=155	Asian Americans n=132	Hispanic/Latino n=80	Caucasians n=201
Very well (1)	61.4	53.8	60.8	68.2
Good (2)	20.9	29.5	30.4	24.6
Okay (3)	11.1	12.1	7.6	5.6
Still making the transition (4)	4.6	4.5	1.3	1.0
Doing poorly (5)	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.5
<b>Average of those who rated</b>	<b>*1.65</b>	<b>*1.67</b>	<b>1.49</b>	<b>1.41</b>
Not important/NA	1.3	0	1.3	3.0

\* Statistically significant at the 95% level when compared to Caucasian students.

### *Managing Their Emotions*

Students of color also rated themselves as being less successful at managing their emotions than Caucasian students did. (See Table 14.1)

- Hispanic/Latino students reported doing significantly worse than Caucasian students at managing their emotions, with average scores of 2.04 and 1.81 respectively.

**Table 14.1: How do you feel you are doing managing your emotions: By Race**

Responses (unweighted)	African American n=155	Asian Americans n=132	Hispanic/Latino n=80	Caucasians n=201
Very well (1)	47.1	40.2	32.5	41.3
Good (2)	29.7	32.6	40.0	42.3
Okay (3)	12.3	20.5	20.0	12.4
Still making the transition (4)	6.5	3.8	6.3	2.5
Doing poorly (5)	4.5	3.0	1.3	1.5
<b>Average</b>	<b>1.92</b>	<b>1.97</b>	<b>*2.04</b>	<b>1.81</b>

\* Statistically significant at the 95% level when compared to Caucasian students.

### *Making New Friendships*

Although there were no statistically significant differences, all three groups of students of color rated themselves worse than Caucasian students did regarding making new friendships. (See Table 14.2)

**Table 14.2: How do you feel you are doing at making new friendships: By Race**

Responses (unweighted)	African American n=155	Asian Americans n=132	Hispanic/Latino n=80	Caucasians n=201
Very well (1)	50.3	51.5	52.5	55.7
Good (2)	29.0	34.1	33.8	33.3
Okay (3)	16.1	9.8	8.8	8.0
Still making the transition (4)	2.6	3.0	5.0	2.0
Doing poorly (5)	1.9	1.5	0.0	1.0
<b>Average</b>	<b>1.77</b>	<b>1.69</b>	<b>1.66</b>	<b>1.59</b>

### *Getting to Know Others of Different Backgrounds*

Table 14.3 presents differences by race when students were asked how they were doing at getting to know others of different backgrounds. (See Table 14.3)

- Of all four groups, Hispanic/Latino students rated themselves the highest at getting to know others of different backgrounds with a mean score of 1.74.
- Interestingly, African American students (with an average score of 1.96) reported having a more difficult time than the other three groups at getting to know others of different backgrounds.

**Table 14.3: How do you feel you are doing at getting to know others of different backgrounds: By Race**

Responses (unweighted)	African American n=155	Asian Americans n=132	Hispanic/Latino n=80	Caucasians n=201
Very well (1)	46.5	47.7	53.8	43.8
Good (2)	26.5	28.8	25.0	34.8
Okay (3)	18.1	10.5	16.3	15.4
Still making the transition (4)	2.6	1.5	3.8	3.5
Doing poorly (5)	6.5	1.5	1.3	2.5
<b>Average</b>	<b>1.96</b>	<b>1.80</b>	<b>1.74</b>	<b>1.86</b>

### *Spiritual Growth and Development*

While African American and Asian American students reported doing better in the area of spiritual growth and development than Caucasian students, Hispanic/Latino students reported doing significantly worse. (See Table 14.4)

- Hispanic/Latino students (mean of 2.44) rated themselves significantly lower than African American (2.01), Asian American (2.06), and Caucasian (2.07) students with regard to their spiritual growth and development. Over 10% of Hispanic students responded that they were “doing poorly,” which is at least doubles the percentage of students who responded the same in the other racial groups.

- Also noteworthy is that all African American students responded that spiritual growth was important to them. In contrast, 3.8% of Asian American students, 2.5% of Hispanic/Latino students, and 3.5% of Caucasian students responded that spiritual development was not important to them or that such as question did not apply to them.

**Table 14.4: How do you feel you are doing at your spiritual growth and development: By Race**

Responses (unweighted)	African American n=155	Asian Americans n=132	Hispanic/Latino n=80	Caucasians N=201
Very well (1)	43.2	30.7	25.6	35.1
Good (2)	28.4	44.1	32.1	35.6
Okay (3)	18.7	16.5	25.6	20.6
Still making the transition (4)	3.9	6.3	6.4	5.2
Doing poorly (5)	5.8	2.4	10.3	3.6
<b>Average of those who rated</b>	<b>2.01</b>	<b>□2.06</b>	<b>*■2.44</b>	<b>2.07</b>
Not important/ NA/don't know	0.0	3.8	2.5	3.5

- \* Statistically significant at the 95% level when compared to Caucasian students.
- Statistically significant at the 95% level comparing Asian Americans and Hispanic/Latinos
- Statistically significant at the 95% level comparing African Americans and Hispanic/Latinos

### *Managing Their Finances*

Caucasian students rated themselves as doing better at managing their finances than students of color. (See Table 14.5)

- Caucasian students rated themselves as being more successful at managing their finances than the other racial groups. There was a significant difference between Caucasian students and Hispanic/Latino students (with mean scores of 2.17 and 2.49 respectively).

**Table 14.5: How do you feel you are doing at managing your finances: By Race**

Responses (unweighted)	African American n=155	Asian Americans n=132	Hispanic/Latino n=80	Caucasians N=201
Very well (1)	27.1	26.5	20.0	31.3
Good (2)	24.5	35.6	35.0	33.3
Okay (3)	34.8	21.2	28.8	26.4
Still making the transition (4)	6.5	6.1	10.0	5.0
Doing poorly (5)	7.1	10.6	6.3	4.0
<b>Average</b>	<b>2.42</b>	<b>2.39</b>	<b>*2.48</b>	<b>2.17</b>

- \* Statistically significant at the 95% level when compared to Caucasian students.

### *Making Important Decisions*

Table 15.0 presents findings by race to the question, “How do you feel you are doing at making important decisions?”

- Generally, across race students reported similar success at making important decisions.
- African American students rated themselves slightly higher than the other groups with a mean score of 1.88.

**Table 15.0: How do you feel you are doing at making important decisions: By Race**

Responses (unweighted)	African American n=155	Asian Americans n=132	Hispanic/Latino n=80	Caucasians n=201
Very well (1)	40.6	33.3	35.0	35.8
Good (2)	38.1	35.6	40.0	46.8
Okay (3)	16.1	22.0	17.5	10.9
Still making the transition (4)	3.2	6.8	7.5	4.5
Doing poorly (5)	1.9	2.3	0.0	2.0
<b>Average</b>	<b>1.88</b>	<b>2.09</b>	<b>1.98</b>	<b>1.90</b>

### *Responsible Choices regarding Alcohol Use*

Consistent with the findings of Student Affairs’s 1998 Core Drug and Alcohol report, students of color reported having more success at making responsible choices regarding alcohol use than Caucasian students did. (See Table 15.1)

- African American and Asian American students (average scores of 1.43 and 1.62 respectively) rated themselves as doing significantly better at making responsible decisions regarding alcohol use than Caucasian students did (average score of 1.83).
- There was also a significant difference between African American and Hispanic/Latino students’ responses, with African American students rating themselves better than Hispanic students.
- Hispanic and Caucasian students rated themselves similarly with average scores of 1.82 and 1.83 respectively.

**Table 15.1: How do you feel you are doing at making responsible choices regarding alcohol use: By Race**

Responses (unweighted)	African American n=155	Asian Americans n=132	Hispanic/Latino n=80	Caucasians n=201
Very well (1)	71.6	59.2	50.6	42.7
Good (2)	18.1	25.4	22.8	38.2
Okay (3)	7.7	11.5	22.8	14.6
Still making the transition (4)	1.3	1.5	1.3	2.0
Doing poorly (5)	1.3	2.3	2.5	2.5
<b>Average for those who rated</b>	<b>*1.43</b>	<b>*1.62</b>	<b>□1.82</b>	<b>1.83</b>
Not important/ NA/don’t know	0.0	1.5	1.3	1.0

\* Statistically significant at the 95% level when compared to Caucasian students.

□ Statistically significant at the 95% level comparing African Americans and Hispanic/Latinos.

*Responsible Choices regarding Sexual Behavior*

Differences by race with regard to making responsible choices regarding sexual behavior are presented in Table 15.2.

- African American and Asian American students responded similarly when rating themselves on how they were doing at making responsible choices regarding sexual behavior with mean scores of 1.44 and 1.45.
- Hispanic/Latino students reported that lowest rating of the four groups with a mean score of 1.60.

**Table 15.2: How do you feel you are doing at making responsible choices regarding sexual behavior: By Race**

Responses (unweighted)	African American n=155	Asian Americans n=132	Hispanic/Latino n=80	Caucasians n=201
Very well (1)	71.6	66.7	57.7	60.8
Good (2)	18.1	22.0	28.2	32.2
Okay (3)	7.7	8.3	11.5	5.5
Still making the transition (4)	1.3	0.0	1.3	0.5
Doing poorly (5)	1.3	1.5	1.3	1.0
<b>Average for those who rated</b>	<b>1.44</b>	<b>1.45</b>	<b>1.60</b>	<b>1.49</b>
Not important/ NA/don't know	0.0	0.0	2.5	1.0

*Responsible Choices regarding Drug Use*

Lastly, Table 15.3 presents the comparisons by race for how students rated themselves on how well they were doing at making responsible choices regarding drug use. (See Table 15.3)

- Hispanic/Latino students rated themselves lowest of the four racial groups at making responsible choices regarding drug use. However, the differences were not statistically significant.

**Table 15.3: How do you feel you are doing at making responsible choices regarding drug use: By Race**

Responses (unweighted)	African American n=155	Asian Americans n=132	Hispanic/Latino n=80	Caucasians n=201
Very well (1)	79.9	73.4	65.8	70.0
Good (2)	12.3	18.8	21.5	24.5
Okay (3)	6.5	5.5	11.4	4.0
Still making the transition (4)	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.5
Doing poorly (5)	1.3	2.3	0.0	1.0
<b>Average for those who rated</b>	<b>1.31</b>	<b>1.39</b>	<b>1.48</b>	<b>1.38</b>
Not important/ NA/don't know	0.6	3.0	1.3	0.5

## Academic-Related Competencies

The academic-related competencies focus on academic and career success as well as campus-specific competencies such as learning their way around campus and using campus resources.

### Non-Returning Students Compared to Returning Students

Evidence suggests that non-returning students differed significantly from returning students when examining academic-related competencies. (See Tables 16.0-16.4)

- Non-returning students rated themselves significantly worse with regard to getting satisfactory grades with a mean score of 2.76 compared to 2.32 for returning students. (Table 16.0)
- Similarly, non-returning students were much more likely to respond that they were doing poorly managing their time with 22.5% responding this way than returning students were, 9.2% of whom responded that they were doing poorly. (Table 16.1)
- Non-returning students also struggled more with establishing academic and career goals than did returning students. There was a significant difference between the two groups with an average score of 2.77 for non-returning students and of 2.12 for returning students. (Table 16.2)
- Non-returning students also reported doing significantly worse than returning students at learning their way around campus with 46.5% reporting doing “very well” compared to 65.9% of returning students. (Table 16.3)
- Similarly, non-returning students rated themselves as doing significantly worse at using campus resources compared to returning students, with mean scores of 2.71 and 2.18 respectively. (Table 16.4)

**Table 16.0: How do/did you feel you are/were doing at getting satisfactory grades: Non-returners compared to Returners**

Responses (unweighted)	Non-returners n=102	All Returners n=587
Very well (1)	24.0	28.8
Good (2)	23.0	32.6
Okay (3)	23.0	22.4
Still making the transition (4)	13.0	10.1
Doing poorly (5)	17.0	6.1
<b>Average for those who rated</b>	<b>**2.76</b>	<b>2.32</b>
Not important/NA/don't know	0.0	0.2

**Table 16.1: How do/did you feel you are/were doing managing your time: Non-returners compared to Returners**

Responses (unweighted)	Non-returners n=102	All Returners n=587
Very well (1)	13.7	16.9
Good (2)	32.4	31.2
Okay (3)	22.5	27.3
Still making the transition (4)	7.8	15.5
Doing poorly (5)	22.5	9.2
<b>Average</b>	<b>**2.93</b>	<b>2.69</b>

\*\* Statistically significant at the 95% level from the non-weighted returners.

**Table 16.2: How do/did you feel you are/were doing at establishing academic and career goals: Non-returners compared to Returners**

Responses (unweighted)	Non- returners n=102	All Returners n=587
Very well (1)	14.0	32.6
Good (2)	31.0	37.0
Okay (3)	30.0	19.6
Still making the transition (4)	14.0	7.7
Doing poorly (5)	11.0	3.1
<b>Average for those who rated</b>	<b>**2.77</b>	<b>2.12</b>
Not important/ NA/don't know	2.0	0.0

**Table 16.3: How do/did you feel you are/were doing at learning your way around campus: Non-returners compared to Returners**

Responses (unweighted)	Non- returners n=102	All Returners n=587
Very well (1)	46.5	65.9
Good (2)	38.6	27.9
Okay (3)	9.9	4.9
Still making the transition (4)	4.0	1.0
Doing poorly (5)	1.0	0.2
<b>Average</b>	<b>**1.74</b>	<b>1.42</b>

**Table 16.4: How do/did you feel you are/were doing at using campus resources: Non-returners compared to Returners**

Responses (unweighted)	Non- returners n=102	All Returners n=587
Very well (1)	17.2	28.9
Good (2)	23.2	35.6
Okay (3)	41.4	27.7
Still making the transition (4)	8.1	5.0
Doing poorly (5)	10.1	2.9
<b>Average for those who rated</b>	<b>**2.71</b>	<b>2.18</b>
Not important/ NA/don't know	2.9	0.9

\*\* Statistically significant at the 95% level from the non-weighted returners.

### Comparisons Among Returning Students

The discussion of academic-related competencies of returning students focuses on differences based on GPA and race. Very few significant differences were found between men and women and between on-campus and off-campus students; these differences are noted when they occurred.

## *Ratings of All Returning Students and Differences Based on GPA*

### *Getting Satisfactory Grades*

Students rated themselves on how they were doing at getting satisfactory grades. ( See Table 17.0)

- Most returning students (86.7%) reported that they were at least doing “okay” at getting satisfactory grades.
- Interestingly, students with less than a 2.0 did not rate themselves significantly different from those students with a higher GPA in how they were doing regarding getting satisfactory grades. In fact, 29% said they were doing “very well.”

**Table 17.0: How do you feel you are doing at getting satisfactory grades: Returners and Comparisons by GPA**

Responses (weighted)	All Returners n=587	Less than 2.0 n=115	Between 2.0 & 2.9 n=196	3.0 or better n=276
Very well (1)	31.9	29.0	30.6	34.0
Good (2)	34.3	34.4	33.3	35.0
Okay (3)	20.5	23.4	21.1	19.0
Still making the transition (4)	7.6	6.0	9.3	7.2
Doing poorly (5)	5.6	7.3	5.7	4.8
<b>Average for those who rated</b>	<b>2.21</b>	<b>2.28</b>	<b>2.26</b>	<b>2.14</b>
Not important/NA/don't know	0.4	0.0	1.2	0.0

### *Time Management*

In addition, students responded to the question, “How do you feel you are doing managing your time?” (See Table 17.1)

- Time management appeared to be a relatively more difficult issue for students with almost 50% responding that they were “doing okay,” “still making the transition,” or “doing poorly.”
- While there were not statistically significant differences between the three GPA categories, students with less than a 2.0 felt better about their time management skills than students with between a 2.0 and 2.9 and those with a 3.0 or better did.

**Table 17.1: How do you feel you are doing managing your time: Returners and Comparisons by GPA**

Responses (weighted)	All Returners n=587	Less than 2.0 n=115	Between 2.0 & 2.9 n=196	3.0 or better n=276
Very well (1)	16.4	19.2	13.1	17.7
Good (2)	33.9	36.8	39.1	28.9
Okay (3)	30.0	24.0	30.4	32.3
Still making the transition (4)	14.6	13.7	13.8	15.5
Doing poorly (5)	5.1	6.3	3.7	5.5
<b>Average</b>	<b>2.58</b>	<b>2.51</b>	<b>2.56</b>	<b>2.62</b>

### *Establishing Academic and Career Goals*

Table 17.2 presents the findings of all returning students and comparisons by GPA on how well students were doing establishing academic and career goals. (See Table 17.2)

- Just under 70% of returning students responded that they were doing “very well” or “good” at establishing academic and career goals.
- Interestingly, students with less than a 2.0 rated themselves better in their progress related to establishing academic career goals than students with between a 2.0 and a 2.9 and students with a 3.0 or better did. Students with less than a 2.0 GPA had an average score of 1.98 compared to a 2.13 for students with a GPA between a 2.0 and 2.9 and a 2.14 for students with a 3.0 or better.

**Table 17.2: How do you feel you are doing at establishing academic and career goals: Returners and Comparisons by GPA**

Responses (weighted)	All Returners n=587	Less than 2.0 n=115	Between 2.0 & 2.9 n=196	3.0 or better n=276
Very well (1)	33.0	38.8	25.3	36.1
Good (2)	36.6	38.9	47.3	28.1
Okay (3)	20.8	12.1	20.3	24.9
Still making the transition (4)	5.8	5.9	3.8	7.2
Doing poorly (5)	3.7	4.4	3.3	3.7
<b>Average for those who rated</b>	<b>2.10</b>	<b>1.98</b>	<b>2.13</b>	<b>2.14</b>

### *Learning their Way Around Campus*

Students were also asked to rate how well they were doing at learning their way around campus. (See Table 17.3)

- After one quarter at OSU, returning students felt confident about knowing their way around campus with 68.9% responding that they were doing “very well” and 26.4% doing “good.”
- Students with less than a 2.0 (mean score of 1.24) rated themselves significantly better than students with between a 2.0 and a 2.9 (mean score of 1.37) and students with a 3.0 or better (mean score of 1.41).
- Male students (with an average score of 1.27) rated themselves significantly higher than female students did (with an average score of 1.47) in their knowledge of campus. (Data not shown)

**Table 17.3: How do you feel you are doing at learning your way around campus: Returners and Comparisons by GPA**

Responses (weighted)	All Returners n=587	Less than 2.0 n=115	Between 2.0 & 2.9 n=196	3.0 or better n=276
Very well (1)	68.9	79.0	67.0	66.0
Good (2)	26.4	18.8	29.4	27.4
Okay (3)	4.4	1.4	3.4	6.4
Still making the transition (4)	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.2
Doing poorly (5)	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0
<b>Average for those who rated</b>	<b>1.36</b>	<b>*1.24</b>	<b>^ 1.37</b>	<b>1.41</b>

\* Statistically significant at the 95% level with students with a 3.0 or better.

^ Statistically significant at the 95% level comparing a GPA of less than a 2.0 to a GPA of a 2.0 to a 2.9

### *Using Campus Resources*

Lastly, students were asked how well they were doing at using campus resources. (See Table 17.4)

- Overall, returning students did not rate themselves as highly on their success at using campus resources as they did in learning their way around campus. Over 36% rated themselves as doing “okay” or as being less successful at using campus resources.
- Although the differences were not significant, once again, students with a lower GPA rated themselves higher on their ability to use campus resources than did students with a higher GPA. Only 5.6% of students with under a 2.0 (with a mean score of 2.11) rated themselves as “still making the transition” or “doing poorly” compared to 9.5% of students with a 3.0 or better (with a mean score of 2.26).

**Table 17.4: How do you feel you are doing at using campus resources: Returners and Comparisons by GPA**

Responses (weighted)	All Returners n=587	Less than 2.0 n=115	Between 2.0 & 2.9 n=196	3.0 or better n=276
Very well (1)	25.1	30.8	22.2	24.8
Good (2)	38.3	33.7	43.6	36.4
Okay (3)	28.9	29.8	27.9	29.3
Still making the transition (4)	5.7	5.1	4.8	6.6
Doing poorly (5)	2.0	0.5	1.6	2.9
<b>Average for those who rated</b>	<b>2.21</b>	<b>2.11</b>	<b>2.20</b>	<b>2.26</b>
Not important/ NA/don't know	1.3	2.2	0.2	1.7

### ***Ratings by Race/Ethnicity***

Unlike the personal competencies, there were fewer significant differences across racial groups with regard to academic-related competencies.

### *Getting Satisfactory Grades*

Table 18.0 presents the findings by race regarding how well students rated themselves at getting satisfactory grades.

- Caucasian students rated themselves as doing better at getting satisfactory grades than students of color did. Moreover, for African American students, these differences were statistically significant with a mean score of 2.43 compared to 2.17 for Caucasian students.

**Table 18.0: How do you feel you are doing at getting satisfactory grades: By Race**

Responses (unweighted)	African American n=155	Asian Americans n=132	Hispanic/Latino n=80	Caucasians n=201
Very well (1)	26.5	30.3	23.8	33.0
Good (2)	29.0	31.1	36.3	35.0
Okay (3)	25.8	19.7	25.0	20.0
Still making the transition (4)	12.3	13.6	8.8	6.5
Doing poorly (5)	6.5	5.3	6.3	5.5
<b>Average for those who rated</b>	<b>*2.43</b>	<b>2.33</b>	<b>2.38</b>	<b>2.17</b>
Not important/ NA/don't know	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5

\* Statistically significant at the 95% level in comparison to Caucasian students.

### *Time Management*

Students of color generally rated themselves as not doing as well at managing their time as Caucasian students did. (See Table 18.1)

- Over 13% of African American students responded that they were “doing poorly” managing their time compared to 11.4% of Asian American students, 7.5% of Hispanic/Latino students, and only 3.5% of Caucasian students.
- On average, African American students scored a 2.80 compared to Caucasian students’ score of 2.55, a statistically significant difference.

**Table 18.1: How do you feel you are doing managing your time: By Race**

Responses (unweighted)	African American n=155	Asian Americans n=132	Hispanic/Latino n=80	Caucasians n=201
Very well (1)	18.1	18.9	13.8	15.9
Good (2)	27.7	30.3	28.8	34.8
Okay (3)	23.9	27.3	27.5	31.3
Still making the transition (4)	16.8	12.1	22.5	14.4
Doing poorly (5)	13.5	11.4	7.5	3.5
<b>Average</b>	<b>*2.80</b>	<b>2.67</b>	<b>2.81</b>	<b>2.55</b>

\* Statistically significant at the 95% level in comparison to Caucasian students.

### *Establishing Academic and Career Goals*

Table 18.2 presents the findings regarding how students of different racial groups rated themselves on how well they were doing at establishing academic and career goals.

- Unlike the previous academic-related competencies, African Americans rated themselves the highest among the racial groups (with a mean score of 2.05) in regard to how they were doing at establishing academic and career goals.
- Asian Americans trailed the group with an average score of 2.21.

**Table 18.2: How do you feel you are doing at establishing academic and career goals: By Race**

Responses (unweighted)	African American n=155	Asian Americans n=132	Hispanic/Latino n=80	Caucasians n=201
Very well (1)	34.2	32.8	27.5	33.3
Good (2)	36.8	34.4	42.5	36.3
Okay (3)	21.3	15.3	20.0	21.4
Still making the transition (4)	5.8	13.7	8.8	5.0
Doing poorly (5)	1.9	3.8	1.3	4.0
<b>Average for those who rated</b>	<b>2.05</b>	<b>2.21</b>	<b>2.14</b>	<b>2.10</b>

### *Learning their Way Around Campus*

Overall, Caucasian students rated themselves as doing better at learning their way around campus than students of color did. (See Table 18.3)

- While the results do not represent significant differences, Caucasian students, with a mean score of 1.34, rated themselves more successful at learning their way around campus than students of color did, with mean scores of 1.43 or higher.
- African American, Asian American, and Hispanic/Latino students rated themselves similarly with average scores of 1.45, 1.46, and 1.43 respectively.

**Table 18.3: How do you feel you are doing at learning your way around campus: By Race**

Responses (unweighted)	African American n=155	Asian Americans n=132	Hispanic/Latino n=80	Caucasians n=201
Very well (1)	66.5	63.6	62.5	70.1
Good (2)	23.9	30.3	32.5	25.9
Okay (3)	7.7	3.0	5.0	4.0
Still making the transition (4)	1.9	2.3	0.0	0.0
Doing poorly (5)	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0
<b>Average for those who rated</b>	<b>1.45</b>	<b>1.46</b>	<b>1.43</b>	<b>1.34</b>

### *Using Campus Resources*

Lastly, students of color generally rated themselves better at using campus resources than Caucasian students did. (See Table 18.4)

- Students of color appear to have been more successful at using campus resources with 31.8% of African American students, 34.8% of Asian American students, and 30.4% of Hispanic/Latino students responding that they have done “very well” compared to 23.7% of Caucasian students.

**Table 18.4: How do you feel you are doing at using campus resources: By Race**

Responses (unweighted)	African American n=155	Asian Americans n=132	Hispanic/Latino n=80	Caucasians n=201
Very well (1)	31.8	34.8	30.4	23.7
Good (2)	31.2	33.3	36.7	39.4
Okay (3)	31.2	22.7	24.1	29.3
Still making the transition (4)	3.2	5.3	6.3	6.1
Doing poorly (5)	2.6	3.8	2.5	1.5
<b>Average for those who rated</b>	<b>2.14</b>	<b>2.10</b>	<b>2.14</b>	<b>2.22</b>
Not important/ NA/don't know	0.6	0.0	1.3	1.5

### **Non-Returning Students**

In addition to the questions asked of all students completing the survey, specific questions were asked of students who did not return to Ohio State for winter quarter in order to get an idea of students' current plans, the likelihood of them returning to Ohio State, when they decided not to return, and the reasons students cited for not returning.

#### Current Plans

Non-returning students were asked about their current plans. (See Table 19.0)

- Almost 74% said they were going to (or had) transfer to another school.
- Over 25% responded that they would be working.
- Over 18% stated that they would return to OSU at some point.

**Table 19.0: What are your current plans now that you are not attending OSU?**  
(multiple response, will not equal 100%)

Responses (n=102)	Percent
Transfer to or attend another school	73.6
Work	25.5
Return to OSU at some point	18.6
Something else (including having a baby, going into military service)	17.7

#### Likelihood of Returning to Ohio State

Non-returning students were also asked how likely it was that they would return to Ohio State someday. (See Table 19.1)

- When asked specifically about how likely it would be that they would return to Ohio State, 20.6% said "very likely."
- Almost 60% responded that they were "only a little likely" or "not likely at all" to return to Ohio State.

**Table 19.1: How likely are you to return to Ohio State someday?**

Responses (n=102)	Frequency	Percent
Very likely	21	20.6
Somewhat likely	20	19.6
Only a little likely	28	27.5
Not likely at all	33	32.4

### When They Decided Not to Return to OSU

Furthermore, non-returning students were asked when they decided not to return to Ohio State. (See Table 19.2)

- Students varied on when they decided not to return to Ohio State for winter quarter. The largest proportion (36.3%) responded that they decided during or shortly after midterms.
- Another 33.3% decided either “during or shortly after finals” or “during the winter break.”

**Table 19.2: When did you decide not to return to OSU for Winter Quarter?**

Responses (n=102)	Frequency	Percent
During first 2-3 weeks of fall classes	11	10.8
During or shortly after midterms	37	36.3
During or shortly after finals	16	15.7
During the break between quarters	18	17.6
Other (see below)	20	19.6

Other responses include:

- Before I started because I am pregnant
- Right before midterms of fall quarter
- First 4 weeks of classes
- When I was suppose to schedule and was blocked out of my classes
- Week before finals
- The beginning of winter quarter
- During the first two weeks of winter quarter

### Reasons for Not Returning to Ohio State

Table 19.3 provides the responses given to why students decided not to return to Ohio State.

- Financial reasons were the most frequently cited by students for one reason they did not return to Ohio State.
- Over 10% responded that grades or academic difficulty, feeling uncomfortable or out of place at OSU, or family/relationship reasons contributed to their decision not to return to Ohio State.
- Other reasons cited by students included size of the school, the distance from home, academic reasons, housing-related issues, personal reasons, and lack of institutional fit. (See below for further detail)

**Table 19.3: What were your reasons for not returning to OSU for Winter Quarter?**  
(multiple responses, will not equal 100%)

Responses	Frequency	Percent
Financial	26	25.5
Grades or academic difficulty	12	12.7
Not comfortable or out of place at OSU	12	11.8
Family or relationship reasons	12	11.8
Emotional concerns	9	8.8
Lack of academic or career directions	6	5.8
Lack of motivation	3	2.9
Health or physical	3	2.9
Other (see below)	67	63.8

Among the other reasons cited for choosing not to return to Ohio State include:

Size of school

- Wanted to be at a smaller school (2)
- The hugeness of it. I didn't like 600 kids in your classes
- The size of the school scared me
- Thought OSU was too big (4)

Distance from home

- Wanted to be closer to home (4)
- Did not feel comfortable leaving home
- Girlfriend is at home

Academic reasons

- Didn't have a sign language program
- Programs didn't meet standards
- Major was dropped from curriculum
- Didn't like department
- Wasn't fond of the way they taught classes

Housing related issues

- Did not like dorm life and food
- Bathrooms were dirty
- Problems with roommates
- Housing problems

Personal reasons

- Pregnant
- Got married and is attending cosmetology school
- Going to Germany

Lack of institutional fit

- Wasn't as fun as I expected
- Didn't feel that it was the right school for me (2)
- Wanted to attend a religious institution

## CONCLUSION

The Transition to College survey reveals a number of interesting findings. Coupled with the findings from the program reports for Summer Orientation, Welcome Week, and Family Weekend, which cover these programs in greater depth, the findings can be used to improve students' transition to college. The knowledge gained from the survey can inform University policy and practice.

Evidence suggests that non-returning students experience Ohio State very differently than students who stay at the University. Consistent with the literature, students who may be at greater risk of "dropping out" include older students, students who attend part-time, students who are employed especially those employed off-campus and full-time, and students who live off campus. Non-returning students are generally less satisfied with all aspects of their college experience and rate themselves as doing more poorly at most areas of personal and academic-related competencies than returning students. Further study is needed to determine causal relationships. What is confirmed from this study is that connection to the University community and satisfaction with their college experience along with the impact of Orientation and Welcome Week are related to students' retention after one quarter. Furthermore, this initial look at the reasons why students decide not to return begins to illuminate areas to target to improve retention.

For returning students, Ohio State is serving them well. Generally, they are making a successful transition to college. However, by looking at their concerns before entering college and after one quarter of enrollment, it becomes apparent that there are a number of issues that need to be addressed including assisting students in dealing with the size of the University and creating opportunities for smaller communities within the larger institution. Also, the University needs to address financial concerns for all students and issues relating to students' academic progress and success. Furthermore, by students' ratings of how they are doing in a number of transitional issues, certain areas may require some intentional efforts on the part of the University to assist students in their development. These include managing their finances, developing spiritually, managing their time, getting satisfactory grades, using campus resources, and establishing academic and career goals. Without developing skills in most of these areas, students may be at risk later in their academic career and may not develop as fully as possible during their college experience.

The differences between and among racial/ethnic groups are important findings from this survey. The study confirms that students of color experience Ohio State differently than Caucasian students and often times find the formal programs to be more helpful for their transition to college. Overall, African American students appear to have the most difficult time transitioning to college as compared to the other groups. These findings support the need for continued efforts and programs that target students of color as they enter Ohio State and that assist them in making the transition to college. In addition, differences in how students rate themselves on personal and academic-related competencies provide guidance for specific areas to address.

In addition, evidence also suggests that there are some differences between on- and off-campus students and between men and women in their transition to college. Also, students vary somewhat on how they respond to questions based on their GPA. Lastly, the study also shows that some first-quarter students do encounter discrimination and are victims of crime. Such incidents serve as obstacles for making a successful transition to Ohio State.

## REFERENCES

Chaskes, J. The first-year student as immigrant. The Journal of the Freshmen Year Experience and Students in Transitions, 8, 79-91

Fowler, F. J. (1993). Survey research methods: Second Edition. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Upcraft, M. L. & Gardner, J. N. (1990). The freshmen year experience. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Upcraft, M. L. (Ed.) (1984). Orienting students to college. New Directions for Student Services. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.