Eastern Illinois University

The Keep

Values-Based Recruitment: Recruitment Strategy Effectiveness on Gaining Generation Z Matriculation

Alexandra Thompson
Eastern Illinois University

Follow this and additional works at: https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses

Abstract

This study investigated the values of Generation Z students that matriculated at a rural mid-sized mid-west institution. Further, this study examined what recruitment strategies were effective in gaining this populations matriculation and the intersection of values and recruitment strategy effectiveness. A quantitative method was utilized with a mixed model approach. Participants included students that were born between 1995 and 2010 that were enrolled during the Fall 2019 and Spring 2020 semesters as first-time first-year students. Findings indicated that this population values *Honesty, Hard-Work, Personal Growth, Financial Fulfillment,* and *Education.* The most effective recruitment strategies to gain matriculation were indicated to be relationship-based recruitment strategies such as *Faculty One-on-One Appointments* and *Shadow Visits*. There was no indication of a relationship between values and recruitment strategy effectiveness. However, some values were influenced by demographic factors such as gender and high school location. A recommendation for student affairs professionals would be to investigate the values of the student population at a given institution and ensure that the campus climate reflects the values of the students.

Dedication

I dedicate my thesis to everyone who has supported me through this incredible process.

From my partner Ben, to my family, and to the friends that I have met along the way, I

could not have done this without you! Thank you for believing in me even when I didn't

believe in myself.

Acknowledgements

Dr. Polydore, without you there would be no thesis. Thank you for every single meeting that we had to work towards this end product, I am so appreciative for your dedication, expertise, support, and guidance. But, thank you most of all for your patience. I will forever be grateful to you and I cannot thank you enough for all that you have done for me. I am not sure you realize what a profound impact you have had on me so thank you for being a positive force in my life and thank you for showing me the joy of research.

Thank you to Kelly Miller and Josh Norman for giving me great feedback and helping me to hone the scope of the study. Your feedback was so helpful, and I am so grateful that you took the time to be a part of this process.

Lastly, thank you to each and every one of my classmates. To the late nights in the library, the Saturday morning study sessions, and even the FaceTime calls when we were no longer able to be together in person. I will forever be grateful to everyone that I have met at EIU and I am so lucky to call myself a Panther. Thank you for directly and indirectly helping me complete this thesis and thank you for being apart of a place and memories that I will treasure greatly.

Table of Contents

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

Introduction

In 2017, the median cost of recruiting a single undergraduate student in the United States at four-year public and private colleges and universities was $536 and $2,357, respectively (Ruffalo Noel Levitz, 2018). Recruitment budgets for public institutions continued to increase during the 2017-2018 academic year with 23% of institutions reporting at least a 2% budgetary increase, 40% reporting a stagnant budget, and only 7% reporting a budgetary decrease of more than 2% (Ruffalo Noel Levitz, 2018). Much of these recruitment efforts are targeted at the traditional aged undergraduate student, the newest generation to set foot on campus, Generation Z (Gen Z).

Generation Z, also known as the iGeneration or dot com kids, represents individuals born between 1995 and 2010 (Bencsik, Horváth-Csikós, & Juhász, 2016). The tech savvy nature of this generation is a defining characteristic of the group. They are often referred to as "the sharing generation," (p.2) as information is easily shared between individuals, and are known for having "all technology all the time" (p.2) and having been "born digital" (Barnes & Nobel College, 2015, p.2). Generation Z's upbringing in a world of technological growth has caused them to be constantly connected to both the online and offline world, making them smart and efficient (Trevino, 2018).

In addition to their tech savviness, Generation Z is being raised differently from previous generations (Desai & Lele, 2017). They were born into smaller families, causing them to have the fewest siblings of any era (Desai & Lele, 2017). Further, these individuals were born to older mothers and higher rates of multiracial

households due to the 400% rise in multiracial marriages over the last 35 years (Sparks and Honey Ad Agency, 2014). Trevino (2018) predicted that their unique childhood upbringing and their position as global citizens will lead Gen Zs' to develop a heightened desire to change the world and increased resiliency amid the changes that they have and will face.

Generation Z has already faced significant adversity (Bencsik, Horváth-Csikós, & Juhász, 2016; Bershidsky, 2014; Trevino, 2018). Having witnessed the 2008 financial crisis during seminal years of growth, they are worried about money and financial security (Bershidsky, 2014). In additional, Gen Z faces daily terrors that undermine a sense of security, such as terrorism and the breakdown of the family (Kantorová, Jonášova, Panuš, & Lipka, 2017). This lack of security is tied to the generation having grown up in an increasingly complex and uncertain world due to the global connectedness afforded by technology (Bencsik, Horváth-Csikós, & Juhász, 2016).

With recruitment spending at an all-time high, it is imperative that current higher education recruitment strategies are effective in gaining the matriculation of students. According to Breaugh (2016), the key to effective recruitment is understanding the audience that is being recruited. For today's higher education institutions, this means an increasing understanding of Generation Z. Generation Z is a new type of student and thus requires different strategies to catch their attention and to gain matriculation. The technology centered generation is challenging college recruitment offices to innovate and think outside of the box to successfully recruit (Keller, 2012). Websites, text messaging, and email communications have become the most effective method of communication in

reaching this demographic (Ruffalo Noel-Levitz, 2017). Understanding the values and ideals of Generation Z is integral in understanding how to effectively engage this new group of potential students and use targeted recruitment strategies to gain their matriculation. Due to Generation Z arriving on campuses with different expectations from their predecessors, it is imperative that enrollment management professionals have a keen understanding of what sets them apart in order to effectively attract and retain them (Trevino, 2018).

According to the U.S. Census data, the United States population grew from 309,558,592 on August 1, 2010 to 323,623,410 on August 1, 2016 (United States Census Bureau). Despite the growth in population the number of enrolled students in higher education remained stagnant from 2010 to 2016 (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2018). Along with the shifting enrollment rates, over the last decade public institutions have seen an overall decrease in state funding, yet an increasing proportion of their budget is allocated to recruitment (Ruffalo Noel Levitz, 2018). Hence, these institutions could benefit from examining the effectiveness of the strategies in order to streamline tightening overall budgets.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this quantitative study was to investigate the effectiveness of particular recruitment strategies on matriculating Generation Z students at a public four-year institution located in the rural Midwest. In the past three years, Millennials have transitioned out of college and Generation Z have begun matriculating. Through this transition, recruitment strategies must be reevaluated to target the values of the

new generation. This study examined the values of Generation Z and the importance of targeted recruitment to ensure their matriculation.

Research Questions

In this study I investigated how different admissions recruitment strategies affected the matriculation of Generation Z. The overarching question was: What recruitment strategies are effective in matriculating Generation Z students? This was answered through an exploration of the following research questions:

1. What are the values of Generation Z students at a regional, midsized four-year institution in the Midwest?

2. What recruitment strategies do Generation Z students identify as influential to their matriculation?

3. Does location (urban, suburban, rural), gender, or race (White/non-White) impact Gen Zs' values?

4. Is there a relationship between Gen Zs' values and the effectiveness of specific recruitment strategies?

Hypothesis

It was hypothesized that the more effective recruitment strategies in gaining matriculation will align with the values of Generation Z.

H1. Generation Z students highly value Globalism, Financial Security, Education, and Entrepreneurship/Creativity.

H2. At least one of the variables (location, gender, or race) is associated with values.

H3. There is a relationship between recruitment strategies and student's values.

Significance of Study

Each generation has unique characteristics and values that are cultivated during the seminal years of development (Twenge, Campbell, & Freeman, 2012). Worldwide events cause shifts in ideals and the way that children are raised. Many studies have investigated the distinct differences between Generation Z and the preceding generations, specifically Generation Z's collective values and effective marketing techniques to reach this unique group of consumers (Adobe, 2016; Kantorová, Jonášova, Panuš, & Lipka, 2017; Mathur & Hameed, 2016; Spears, Zobac, Spillane, & Thomas, 2015). The future of college admissions offices and institutional enrollment management is dependent on the understanding of Generation Z. Through the understanding of Gen Z's values, admissions recruitment strategies can be tailored to better target the wants and needs of this population when choosing a higher education institution. Understanding the effectiveness of currently used tactics will aid in a better distribution of admissions resources as more effective strategies may be employed. Findings of this study can be used to determine which strategies are most effective in gaining matriculation and that productively utilize admissions staff, resources, and funding. Institutions will be able to utilize recruitment strategies that are more effective in gaining the matriculation of Generation Z.

Assumptions, Limitations and Delimitations

Assumptions. This research study assumed that there is an inherent difference between Generation Z and the generations that have come before. It is then assumed that this difference requires a different targeted recruitment strategy. The study also assumed that the participants would answer the survey truthfully and to the best of their ability. Furthermore, the study assumed that participants engaged in at least one recruitment

strategy utilized by the research institution prior to choosing to attend said institution. A final assumption is that Generation Z values are similar across demographics such as geographical location and race.

Limitations. It was difficult to gain the insight into every matriculated student attending the proposed research institution in fall 2019. Beyond those who have matriculated the study also failed to capture those students that had not matriculated. Therefore, the study lacks the perspective of those for whom the recruitment strategies were unsuccessful in gaining matriculation.

Delimitations. The research study specifically targeted the recruitment aspect of higher education and how Generation Z can most effectively be recruited. The study is generalizable to institutions of similar size and with similar student demographics in terms of race, ethnicity, and gender.

Definition of Terms

Effectiveness. Specific efforts made by an admissions office, through the use of strategic planning, which were attributed to an increase in matriculation of students and campus enrollment (Hanover Research, 2014).

Generation Z. Individuals born between the years of 1995 and 2010 (Bencsik, Horváth-Csikós, & Juhász, 2016).

Matriculated. A student that applies, is accepted, and commits to attending or is currently attending a given post-secondary institution.

Recruitment strategy. A targeted plan of action that encourages matriculation and attendance of potential students (Breaugh, 2016).

Value. Intrinsic and individualize characteristics that influence decision making and problem solving (Illies & Reiter-Palmon, 2008).

Summary

A generational shift is occurring in the student body on college campuses. As Generation Z enters higher education, different recruitment strategies will need to be employed to more effectively matriculate these students. The purpose of this study was to discover which recruitment strategies are most effective in recruiting Generation Z to aid college admission offices as well as enrollment management officers in their matriculation efforts.

CHAPTER II

Review of Literature

Previous research has investigated the effectiveness of college recruitment strategies in increasing campus matriculation and attendance (Croteau & Maginnis, 2005; Hanover, 2014; Miller & Skimmyhorn, 2018; Ruffalo Noel Levitz, 2018; Secore, 2018). This literature review examines the history of enrollment management, the effectiveness of currently used college admissions recruitment strategies to reach potential students, as well as the values and characteristics of Generation Z and how Generation Z differs from the previous college aged generation, Millennials.

History of Enrollment Management

Higher education within the United States has continually changed and adapted to better meet the needs of changing student populations (Coomes, 2000; Croteau & Maginnis, 2005; Henderson, 1998; Johnson, 2000). Due to significant enrollment declines beginning in the 1970's, competition to recruit prospective students became more intense, and it became clear that admissions offices alone could not be responsible for maintaining institutional enrollment, thus, the concept of enrollment management arose (Dixon, 1995a; Johnson, 2000). Enrollment management is "a comprehensive process designed to achieve and maintain the optimum recruitment, retention, and graduation rates of students" (Dolence, 1998, p. 72). Successful enrollment management requires the collaboration of many student affairs departments; these can include, but are not limited to, the offices of student marketing and recruitment, pricing and financial aid, academic and career counseling, academic assistance programs, institutional research, orientation, retention programs, and student

services working collaboratively to reach specific goals (Dixon, 1995b). These goals

were to:

- Define of the institution's mission, vision, and characteristics;

- Incorporate campus into marketing plans and activities;

- Strategic decisions making regarding the role of financial aid;

- Appropriate commitment of human, monetary, and technological

resources (Dixon, 1995b, p. 7).

Essentially, "any factor that influences a student's decision to attend or continue

enrolling" is a factor for enrollment management (Dolence, 1998, p72).

Emergence of enrollment management. Colonial colleges, such as Harvard,

were a natural progression of the United States settlement (Henderson, 1998). Due to the

minimal number of institutions within the United

States, higher education institutions (HEIs) had minimal admissions standards to

determine entrance (Coomes, 2000). Harvard's admission standards at the time were

simply,

> when any Scholar is able to Read Tully or such like classical Latin Author *ex*
>
> *tempore*, and make and speak true Latin in verse and prose *suo (ut aiunt)*
>
> *Marte,* and decline perfectly the paradigms of Nouns and verbs in the Greek
>
> tongue, then may he be admitted into the College, nor shall any claim admission
>
> before such qualifications ("Statutes," 1989, p.89 as cited in Coomes, 2000).

Following the lead of Harvard, institutions began to develop admissions criteria, for

example, Yale created an arithmetic requirement, and William and Mary added French as

a requirement (Henderson, 1998). However, as the colonists began to embrace the

frontier spirit, student demographics began to shift and institutions such as the University of Vermont, proposed a practical rather than classical focused degree (Henderson, 1998). Students would be admitted to this degree without a successful demonstration of Greek or Latin (Henderson, 1998). The frontier spirit, which has become a U.S. trademark, caused institutions to shift admissions criteria to include opportunities for a practical and individualistic curriculum (Croteau & Maginnis, 2005; Henderson, 1998).

Paper-pusher era. The transition from the 19th to the 20th century saw a significant growth in the number of HEIs and their enrollment (Coomes, 2000; Croteau & Maginnis, 2005). With a focus on applicable skills and specialization, standards of admission began to develop (Coomes, 2000; Johnson, 2000). The position of dean of admissions was created to aid with this transition and determine enrollment eligibility (Coomes, 2000). By the 1930's the dean of admissions position became widespread among U.S. HEIs (Coomes, 2000). This role served students administrative needs and was subsequently viewed as a paper pusher position (Johnson, 2000). However, the formal recognition of admissions as a profession led to the formation of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admission Officers (AACRAO) in 1910 (Johnson, 2000).

During the shift in the function of HEIs, American high schools began to develop curriculum that allowed students to study a variety of interests and meet shifting student needs (Henderson, 1998). Colleges began to parallel the subjects being taught at the secondary level and new programs of study such as American History, physical geography, physiology, and modern languages began to develop (Henderson, 1998). Further, the newly introduced secondary education system provided HEI's with a steady

pool of qualified candidates for admission (Henderson, 1998). Universities in the Midwest even began to use high schools as a method of pre-qualifying students for admission, for example, the University of Michigan began pre-qualifying and admitting students from high schools they felt had a well-developed college preparatory program (Henderson, 1998). High school counselors began to seek the advice of admissions counselors and a partnership between secondary and post-secondary institutions was cultivated (Croteau & Maginnis, 2005).

Gatekeeper era. With the introduction of affirmative action programs to combat discriminatory practices and the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958 creating the beginning of a federal loan and grant program, coupled with the postwar Baby Boom, enrollment numbers began to soar (Croteau & Maginnis, 2005; Dixon, 1995b). The growth of community colleges made higher education accessible to all, and the idea that receiving a college education was a fundamental right began to take hold (Dixon, 1995b). This rise in applications led HEIs to become more selective and admission standards became stricter (Henderson, 1998; Johnson, 2000). During this time, admissions counselors were viewed as the gatekeepers of the institution, they were tasked with ensuring that only the highest quality applicants were admitted while also maintaining enrollment levels (Johnson, 2000). AACRAO further defined the role of the admissions officer during the gatekeeper era; the responsibilities were outlined as "recruitment, interviewing, testing, counseling, evaluation and placement, orientation, research, and publication" (Quann, 1979 (from Henderson p.22). This definition cemented the place of admissions as a key position within a functioning HEI.

Marketers era. Following the postwar Baby Boom came the inevitable baby bust. The landscape of American higher education began to shift in response to rising costs and falling enrollments (Croteau & Maginnis, 2005). Higher education institutions were tasked with finding new and inventive ways to market their institutions and increase recruitment efforts (Croteau & Maginnis, 2005; Dixon, 1995b). Admission offices were no longer seen as the gatekeepers, weeding out the unqualified applicants, but instead they became recruiters hoping to entice potential students to attend their institution (Croteau & Maginnis, 2005). Higher education institutions were determined to maintain Baby Boom level enrollment in order to maintain the student support services that had become standard across the field (Croteau & Maginnis, 2005). In an attempt to stabilize enrollment, nontraditional students, such as ethnic minorities, older students, and women, were granted access to higher education (Dixon, 1995b). In response to declining enrollment, the concept of enrollment management was created (Coomes, 2000; Croteau & Maginnis, 2005; Dixon, 1995b; Johnson, 2000).

Marketing and recruitment remain at the center of the admissions process (Clinedinst & Koranteng 2018). As cited within Phair (2014) the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics [U.S. BLS] Occupational Outlook Handbook states that the role of the admission counselor is to determine the number of students to admit, prepare promotional materials, schedule meetings with potential students, review applications, and analyze data. The National Association for College Admission Counseling [NACAC] (2000) indicates, in their "Statement on Counselor Competencies," that admissions and enrollment management personnel should be well educated on appropriate recruitment strategies and effective marketing. Through targeted recruitment

and marketing efforts, college admissions offices are hoping to combat declining

enrollment nationwide (Hanover, 2014; Levitz, 2017).

Higher Education Recruitment

Higher education enrollment reached a peak of 21 million students in 2010

(NCES, 2018). Current projections show that while higher education enrollment is

expected to continue to rise over the next eight years, it is not expected to reach the

enrollment levels of 2010 (NCES, 2018). In a diminishing pool of prospective

students, offices of admission and enrollment management have become increasingly

important in ensuring that institutional enrollment either increases or remains

unchanged (Phair, 2014). The effective development of recruitment strategies is directly

linked to the effective marketing and branding of the institution (Frolich,

Brandt, Hovduaugen, & Aamodt, 2009). Many universities have increased marketing

spending to create a unified university brand to have a competitive recruitment and

retention advantage (Hanover, 2014). No longer will students target specific

institutions, but instead, institutions are needing to use marketing and recruitment

strategies to target students and student populations (Johnson, 2000).

Targeted student's demographic. Higher education institutions continually

change and evolve their recruitment strategies to better reach the changing demographics

of potential students as generational shifts occur (Clinedinst & Koranteng, 2018; Nichols

& Chang, 2013; Schulmann, Le, & World Education Services, 2018; Secore, 2018). The

Admissions Trends Survey distributed in 2018 by the National Association for College

Admission Counseling (NACAC) found that 68.6% of institutions listed transfer students

and transfer recruitment efforts as considerably important in reaching enrollment goals

and 38.9% indicated considerable importance on international student recruitment (Clinedinst & Koranteng, 2018). The effectiveness of a given recruitment strategy is directly related to the recruited population (Clinedinst & Koranteng, 2018). For example, the Admissions Trends Survey found that 50.5% of institutions found direct mail to be considerably important to the recruitment of new freshman, 25% of institutions found direct mail to be considerably important to the recruitment of transfer students and only 2.8% of institutions found direct mail to be considerably important to the recruitment of international students (Clinedinst & Koranteng, 2018). Recruitment strategies should be adjusted and tailored to meet the needs and expectations of the population being recruited.

Recruitment strategies. Higher education recruiters face many challenges due to the current climate surrounding post-secondary education. Some of these challenges include the changing demographics of less prepared and less fiscally stable prospective students, limits on the willingness to invest in higher education, limits being placed on affirmative action, as well as external efforts drawing attention to characteristics that institutions wish not to highlight (Jaschik & Lederman, 2018). Higher education recruitment begins with potential students understanding the importance and value of higher education. High school access to college planning resources facilitates a connection between high school students and higher education institutions (Martinez, 2014). High school guidance counselors are viewed as considerably important in the recruitment of new freshman by 57.3% of surveyed schools (Clinedinst & Koranteng, 2018). Ensuring diverse school districts are receiving similar efforts of recruitment at the secondary level is integral in gaining a diverse population of

applicants to an institution (Chen & Zerquera, 2018; Martinez, 2014). Many institutions are beginning to expand the breadth of their recruitment efforts beyond that of those employed within the admissions office (Secore, 2018).

Recruitment includes both passive and active efforts from admissions counselors (Clinedinst & Koranteng, 2018). Examples of passive recruitment efforts include maintaining an updated website, and using social media, direct mail/email to prospective students, and high school counselors. However, these passive efforts are all listed within the top eight strategies that have a considerable importance in matriculation to admissions staff (Clinedinst & Koranteng, 2018). Active efforts such as campus tours, college fairs, and high school visits are also significant to recruiting potential students. The first impression of the institution begins with the scheduling of the tour itself and extends into the post-tour follow up (Secore, 2018). Every interaction a potential student has with an institution, both within a passive and an active capacity, has an effect on the student's perception of the institution and can persuade or dissuade a student from matriculating (Secore, 2018).

A study conducted by Miller and Skimmyhorn (2018) investigated four specific recruitment strategies and their effectiveness: an admissions phone call, application encouragement from a role model, targeted recruitment by a staff member, and an invitation to visit campus. They found that all four methods were effective in gaining the matriculation of students compared to a control group which only received a solicitation email. However, after using the data to complete a cost-effectiveness analysis it was determined that the most cost and resource effective method was a targeted admissions phone call. According to a study completed by Ruffalo Noel Levitz (2014) the top five

most effective recruitment strategies for four-year public institutions include campus open house events, campus visit days for high school students, weekend visit days, overnight visits for high school students, and campus visit events designed for high school counselors. As indicated in Ruffalo Noel Levitz (2014), Hanover (2014) and Miller and Skimmyhorn (2018) it is significant that the most effective recruitment strategies are event driven programs that utilize direct student interaction.

Generation Z Values

To maintain meaningful direct student interaction, it is important to understand the targeted population. Representative of the global nature of Generation Z, much of the research involving this group has been conducted in countries other than the United States (Adobe, 2016; Kantorová, Jonášova, Panuš, & Lipka, 2017; Mathur & Hameed, 2016; Puiu, 2017). Locations such as India, Romania, Czech Republic, Australia, Germany, and the United Kingdom are represented in previous literature. This research has found that generational values are not simply dependent upon age, but also country, culture, economy, and social and technologically development (Puiu, 2017). However, the global nature of Generation Z indicates that certain values can be seen across country and cultural divides (Adobe, 2016). Still, the factor of research location should be considered.

Generation Z displays distinctly different characteristics than previous generations which has led to the cultivation of distinct generational values that drive their choices regarding education, the workplace, and consumerism (Kantorová, Jonášova, Panuš, & Lipka, 2017). Research investigating Generation Z's values involved multiple approaches. For example, Kantorová, Jonášova, Panuš, and Lipka (2017) and Barnes and

Nobel College (2015) investigated the generation's views of higher education. Whereas others, such as Adobe (2016), focused on the generation's views of education from elementary to post-secondary. How current workplace environments fit the needs and values of Generation Z was another common topic of study for many researchers (Bencsik, Horváth-Csikós, & Juhász, 2016; Desai & Lele, 2017; Mathur & Hameed, 2016; Puiu, 2017). The final distinctive group of Generation Z research is that of the generation's consumer trends. Researchers, such as Puiu (2016), were interested in how to market to a new generation. Despite the distinctly different research focuses, there were four distinct values that Generation Z consistently displayed: globalism, financial fulfilment, education, and entrepreneurship/creativity.

Globalism. Technological advances have allowed for Generation Z to become global citizens with the desire to travel abroad and impact the world in a meaningful way (Puiu, 2017). Connecting globally fills Gen Zs with a sense of hope at the potential and possibility that technology and globalization afford them (Adobe, 2016). The interconnectivity that defines Generation Z has led them to have a more inclusive outlook and mindset (Adobe, 2016). A participant from the United States in Adobe's (2016) study believed that Generation Z "is more open and tolerant to different types of people" due to their inherent interconnectedness (p.14). Their globalist nature also brings environmental conscientiousness and conservation efforts to the forefront of their concerns (Adobe, 2016; Desai & Lele, 2017; Mathur & Hameed, 2016; Puiu, 2016). Generation Z's respect for the environment and their ecological consciousness can influence their choice on college attendance, employment, and consumerism (Puiu, 2016).

Generation Z is also known as the zappers, because of their openness to sudden shifts in environment, such as moving to a new city (Desai & Lele, 2017). Generation Z does not fear or shy away from sudden change due to their connectedness to the world (Desai & Lele, 2017). Being free to travel and move without constraints is important to Generation Z as they are looking for new environments and experiences (Puiu, 2017). Having grown up in an era of information and shifting economies, Generation Zs do not fear a continuously changing world or personal environment (Bencsik, Horváth-Csikós, & Juhász, 2016). If they become unpleased, it is common for them to change what it is that is making them unhappy, even if this means a large change; Generation Zs do not often make compromises regarding their personal environment and are not afraid to leave a job for one that challenges them or has a better salary (Desai & Lele, 2017; Puiu, 2017).

Financial fulfilment. Having experience the 2008 market crash during a key time in their development, Generation Z is extremely financially conscious (Bershidsky, 2014). Further, many Gen Zs witnessed their older siblings graduate from college only return to their childhood homes unemployed (Trevino, 2018). Generation Z views success through a financial lens; when stating a personal success, financial accomplishment is often cited as a significant factor (Barnes & Nobel College, 2015). In addition, many Gen Z's fears are linked to finances and financial stability (Barnes & Nobel College, 2015). A study by Adecco (2019) surveyed 1001 Generation Z college students and recent college graduates between the ages of 18-24. Participants were asked to cite their post college graduation aspirations. They overwhelmingly indicated that their greatest aspiration is financial stability, followed closely by having their dream job.

When thinking in terms of their future, Generation Z's focus on getting a good job to ensure that finances will not be of significant concern (Adecco, 2019).

In the Adecco (2019) study, the top three Generation Z concerns for the future include the ability to find a job, the cost of education such as tuition and student loans, with the third being a tie between personal financial health, and the ability to live on their own. These results echo a study done by Puiu (2017) which indicated that Generation Z views finding a job is the number one priority for the future. When choosing a higher education institution, it is important that Generation Z feels as though the education will offer an opportunity for future employment (Kantorová, Jonášova, Panuš, & Lipka, 2017). This study found that Generation Zs are more concerned with future mobility than comfort during their studies. Ensuring a financially stable future is of significant concern to Generation Z.

Education. Having started school younger and being projected to continue in the education system for longer, Generation Z is the most formally educated generation in history (Desai & Lele, 2017). In a study conducted by Barnes and Nobel College (2015), 1,300 middle and high school Generation Z students were surveyed about their views on higher education. Nearly 90% of respondents indicated that they felt a college education was valuable and 82% indicated having plans to attend a higher education institution. These results were similar to that of a study conducted by Adobe (2016) that found 88% of U.S. respondents were likely to attend a higher education institution.

Generation Z highly values creativity in the classroom and workplace as they believe that creativity will be integral in solving global issues (Adobe, 2016). Hence, theory-to-practice is incredibly important in a Generation Z classroom (Puiu, 2017). Gen

Zs value the use of case studies, team projects, and debates, as they provide a hands-on

learning experience (Puiu, 2017). 51% of participants in the Barnes and Nobel College

(2015) study indicated that they learned best by doing whereas only 12% said they learn

best by listening. This, when taken with Adobe (2015), is particularly significant as

students and educators indicated that listening and writing are the two most frequent

modes of instruction.

Entrepreneurship and creativity. The words Generation Z and entrepreneurial

are used in close connection with one another in many studies (Adobe, 2015; Barnes &

Nobel College, 2015; Bencsik, Horváth-Csikós, & Juhász, 2016; Puiu, 2017; Trevino,

2018). The creative nature of Generation Z has led to a cultivation of entrepreneurial

spirit (Barnes and Nobel, 2015). Generation Z wants to create and be active within the

world around them (Puiu, 2017). Independence, self-sustenance, and a drive to influence

the world has inspired many within Generation Z to entrepreneurial paths (Bencsik,

Horváth-Csikós, & Juhász, 2016; Trevino, 2018).

Barnes and Nobel College (2015) conducted a nationwide study that investigated

Generation Z's expectations and perceptions of higher education. The survey included

participants from 49 states and included 1,300 middle and high school students between

the ages of 13-18. They discovered that Generation Z strives for the opportunity to be

creative in many facets of their life such as co-creating their education or cultivating their

own businesses. They are driven by their ability to discover, self-educate and process

information faster than before. For example, 64% of students preferred AP and college

credit courses to their regular classes as it helped develop their critical thinking skills.

Further, the researchers found that over one-third of Generation Z students have or plan

to own a business. This is especially true of the younger Generation Zs with 13-15-year old's being twice as likely to have their own business compared to their older counterparts (Barnes & Nobel College, 2015). This desire to be creative and create stability for themselves is a driving factor for Generation Z.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework guiding this study is Strauss and Howe's generational theory. William Strauss and Neil Howe (1997) investigated the cyclical nature of generations. They discovered, what they termed the four turnings and archetypes, predictive attributes that define the distinctions seen between generations. Each generation, according to their historical investigation of American generations, has distinct characteristics that repeat in a cyclical pattern. The first turning is a *high*, during this upbeat time institutions are strengthened, and individualism is weakened. The second turning is an *awakening* where passionate spiritual change occurs, and the old regime is challenged with new values and ideals. The third turning is an *unraveling* seen through a downcast era that brings value and strengthening to individuals and chastises institutions. The fourth turning is a *crisis* where decisive action replaces the old civic order with a new one propelled by a shift in values. These turnings last roughly the length of a phase of life and recur each saeculum.

A generation is composed of individuals who are born within a time period that have a collective persona of values and ideas. As each new generation enters the saeculum an archetype is attributed to the group that embodies the group's ideals and values. The four archetypes occur in the same order of Hero, Artist, Prophet, and Nomad. Each of these archetypes aid in understanding a generation. Strauss and Howe (1997)

broke down these values into positive reputations, negative reputations, and endowments of each archetype. Furthermore, Strauss and Howe break down each archetype based on their reputation during the different stages of life and how to best nurture the generation. This framework provides a structure for not only understanding Generation Z, but possibly predicting the values of characteristics of future generations, thus allowing admissions and enrollment management offices to focus their recruitment efforts.

Summary

Higher education and recruitment within the United States has continued to evolve and grow. As the enrollment populations began to shift at higher education institutions the method of recruiting students also began to shift and change. The upcoming generation, Generation Z, values globalism, financial fulfillment, education, and entrepreneurship/creativity. It is important that higher education institutions shift their methods of recruitment with the changing demographics as generational shifts occur (Clinedinst & Koranteng, 2018; Nichols & Chang, 2013; Schulmann, Le, & World Education Services, 2018; Secore, 2018).

CHAPTER III

Methods

The purpose of this quantitative study was to investigate the values of Generation Z and the perceived effectiveness of specific recruitment strategies at a midsized Midwestern university. Data was collected through an online survey and was analyzed through Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The instrument was created by the researcher based upon Clinedinst and Koranteng (2018) and Holley (1975) and includes a modified version of the Value Sort activity found within Harvard Universities the Good Project (2017). This chapter provides a detailed description of the methods used including instrumentation, participants, research site, and treatment of data.

Design of Study

This study used an online cross-sectional survey to explore the generational values of Generation Z, and the effectiveness of the institutional recruitment strategies to gain Generation Zs' matriculation. The survey was distributed via email to the current freshman class at a rural Midwestern institution. Emails were sent by the institution's registrar's office to all qualifying students. Participants responded to demographic questions, as well as questions about their values and institutional recruitment strategies and their perceived effectiveness.

Participants

Participants for this study included 180 full-time first year students of any race and gender identity enrolled at the research institution during the fall 2019/spring 2020 semesters, who voluntarily completed the 14-question survey. The target population included all members of the fall 2019 freshman class. The survey had a 96.3% completion rate. Most of the participants were female, and a majority of the participants

identified as White/Caucasian. Further, a majority of the participants indicated that they were not first-generation college students. Over half of students graduated from a rural secondary education environment. See Table 3.1 for more demographic information.

Table 3.1

Demographic and Biographic Information of Sample of Undergraduate Students (N = 180)

Demographic/biographic category		*n (%)*
Gender		
	Female	118 (65.6)
	Male	57 (31.7)
	Non-Binary	5 (2.8)
Race/Ethnicity		
	Caucasian/White	126 (70)
	African-American/Black	29 (16.1)
	Asian-American/Asian	2 (1.1)
	Hispanic/LatinX	10 (5.6)
	Pacific Islander	0 (0)
	Native American	0 (0)
	Other	8 (4.4)
	Prefer not to answer	5 (2.8)
First Generation		
	Yes	70 (38.9)
	No	110 (61.1)
High School Location		
	Urban	21 (11.7)
	Suburban	63 (35)
	Rural	96 (53.3)

Research Site

The study took place at a rural midsized four-year state institution located in the Midwest. The institution is located in a city of about 21,000 and is roughly 2.5 hours from two major cities. The research institution experienced substantial enrollment declines from 2008 to 2017. The fall 2018 freshman class has seen an enrollment increase

from the previous two years. The total full-time undergraduate enrollment in spring 2020 was 3,577 with 1,443 (40.3%) of them being male and 2,134 (59.7%) being female. Full time freshman enrollment for the spring 2020 semester was about 760 students. Of the total enrolled students for the fall 2019 semester, 61.5% identify as White, 14.7% identify as African-American/Black, 11.7% identify as Hispanic/Latino, 4.1% identify as international, 2.9% are unclassified, 2.9% identify as Asian, 1.9% identify as two or more races, 0.2% identify as American Indian/Alaska Native, and 0.1% identify as Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander. Total student headcount included 7,806 total students with 4,649 being undergraduate and 1,577 being graduate students.

Instrument

The primary instrument was a researcher developed electronic survey that was designed to identify which recruitment strategies had the largest influence on causing Generation Z students to matriculate at the institution. The survey was created due to other instruments being outdated in their content (e.g. a similar survey was utilized in a 1975 study that did not account for current recruitment strategies) and very little research having been conducted on Generation Z matriculation. There are three distinct portions of the survey, which included demographic questions, the Value Sort Questionnaire, and the Recruitment Strategy Effectiveness Questionnaire. The full instrument can be found in Appendix A.

Demographic questionnaire. The survey included demographic questions to better understand the participating population (e.g. "What is your enrollment status?" and "what is your age?"). Participants were asked what best describes their demographic

information from a series of questions. Further information was be collected such as

gender, first-generation status, and race.

Values Sort Questionnaire. The Values Sort Questionnaire is a modified version

of the Value Sort activity found within Harvard Universities the Good Project (2017).

The modifications included shortening the number of values from 30 to 15 and changing

some of the values to reflect the values found in the Review of Literature. Further, the

modified instrument had the participants use a Likert-type scale to rate the values rather

than utilizing a 1 to 15 rank order model. The Values Sort Questionnaire included a list of

15 values that participants ranked on their perceived importance; from "1" (*not

important*) to "5" (*extremely important*). This aspect of the survey was designed to

answer research questions 1, 3, and 4, and it investigated if the participants' personal

values align with the values of the generation, as determined by the review of literature.

Some of the values included honesty, creativity, flexibility, and independence. Of the

fifteen total values, seven were values that aligned with the generation values found

within the review of literature.

Recruitment Strategy Effectiveness Questionnaire. Recruitment based

questions utilized a 5-point Likert-type scale from "1" (*not at all important*) to "5"

(*extremely important*) to discover what impact that strategy had on the student's decision

to attend. The recruitment strategies listed included, but were not limited to, open houses,

admitted student days, campus tours, and virtual tours. The survey was created based on

information found within Clinedinst and Koranteng (2018) and Holley (1975). Holley

(1975) surveyed incoming new students about the factor that were influential to their

matriculation decision. These factors included items such as location, cost, size of

institution, etc. In the creation of the instrument for this study, the ranking system used by Holley (1975) was adapted to replace factors with recruitment strategies and the scale was converted from a 3-point scale to a 5-point scale. In deciding the scope of recruitment strategies (inclusion of marketing materials or not) Clinedinst and Koranteng (2018) was helpful as their study researched the most utilized recruitment strategies of admissions offices nationwide. Their scope of recruitment strategies was utilized in determining what should be included in the instrument when investigating recruitment strategy effectiveness at the matriculated student level.

Data Collection

Data was collected through an online survey software, Qualtrics. The target population was contacted via email by the research institutions registrar's office. Students were contacted on a Friday in February of 2020 and they had three total weeks to respond with weekly reminders occurring at the beginning of week two and three. Reminders were sent to encourage participation and increase the sample size. After opening the emailed survey, only individuals who answered in the affirmative to the informed consent approved by the Institution Review Board (see Appendix B) were able to proceed. Participants were also incentivized to participate with the chance to win one $50 gift card to Amazon. To be considered for the incentive, the completion of the initial survey linked the participant to a second survey where they could enter their email for the drawing. The second survey was utilized in order to protect to anonymity of the participants.

Data Analysis

Pre-analysis preparation. At the completion of data collection, data was exported into Microsoft Excel for examination and cleaning (removal of Qualtrics created

columns, deletion of unfinished responses, and non-qualifying reponses, etc.).

Respondents with incomplete data were deleted and not used in data analysis. Individuals

that were part-time students or that were born outside of the Generation-Z age range were

also deleted and not used for analysis. Data was then exported into The Statistical

Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), a statistical analysis tool, for data analysis.

Descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics such as frequencies were conducted

on demographic variables (gender, race, first-generation status, and high school setting)

to better understand the sample. Descriptive statistics were also run to answer research

question 1 (what are the values of Generation Z students at a regional, midsized four-year

institution in the Midwest?), question 2 (what recruitment strategies do Generation Z

students identify as influential to their matriculation?), and question 4 (is there a

relationship between Gen Z's values and the effectiveness of specific recruitment

strategies?).

Analysis of variance and t-test. A factorial ANOVA was conducted to answer

the research question: Does location (urban, suburban, rural), gender, or race (White/non-

White) impact Gen Z's values? A one-sample t-test was conducted when investigating

question determine if the mean scores of each value varied from neutral (3).

Treatment of Data

The data was collected through the online survey program, Qualtrics, and was

then imported into Microsoft Excel. The data was then imported into the Statistical

Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software for statistical analysis. Prior to beginning

the survey, participants were required to read and agree to a modified informed consent

(see Appendix B). This was to ensure that they understood the nature of the research and

their rights as a participant. All data was stored on a password protected computer and on a private flash drive to ensure the confidentiality. In addition, no identifying information was gathered. Emails that were provided in the secondary survey for the incentive, were also protected on a password enable computer and private flash-drive. Per the policies of the Institutional Review Board (IRB), the data will be maintained for three years after which time it will be destroyed.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the generational values of Generation Z and the effectiveness of specific recruitment strategies on gaining Generation Z matriculation. Results were collected through Qualtrics and were analyzed through the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) analysis software. No identifying information was collected on the participants and all data was kept on a password protected computer and a private flash drive. Participants were contacted via email to participate in the researcher developed electronic survey on a Friday and reminder emails were sent out at the beginning of week two and three to encourage participation. Statistical tests such as ANOVA's and descriptive statistics were conducted. The findings of this study are discussed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER IV

Findings

The purpose of this study was the investigate the effectiveness of certain recruitment strategies on gaining the matriculation of Generation Z students through the lens of generational values. Further, the study sought to uncover if demographic variables such as high school location, gender, and race impact individuals' values. This chapter presents the results of a survey that was conducted with first year undergraduate students enrolled at a mid-sized Midwestern four-year institution in spring 2020. The survey was developed to answer four research questions, what are the values of Generation Z at a regional mid-sized four-year institution in the Midwest?, what recruitment strategies do Generation Z students identify as influential to their matriculation?, does high school location (urban, suburban, rural), gender (female, male, non-binary), or race (white/non-white) impact Generation Z values?, and is there a relationship between Generation Z's values and the effectiveness of specific recruitment strategies?

Research Question 1

Descriptive statistics were conducted to answer the question: what are the values of Generation Z at a regional, midsized four-year institution in the Midwest? It was hypothesized that Generation Z students highly value Globalism, Financial Security, Education, and Entrepreneurship/Creativity. The results, presented in Table 4.1, are mixed. The three most important values to the Generation Z students was *Honesty, Personal Growth,* and *Financial Security* and the three least important was *Globalism, Faith* and *Entrepreneurship*. A single sample t-test with Bonferroni correction ($\alpha = 0.003$) was conducted to test if values were different from 3 "*moderately important*". Results indicated that Gen Zs in this study hold 12 of 15 values as important while

Table 4.1

Mean and Standard Deviation of Values for Generation Z in Descending order of

Importance (N=180)

Generation Z Values	M (SD)
Honesty	4.55 (0.65)
Personal Growth	4.52 (0.64)
Financial Security	4.49 (0.65)
Hard Work	4.39 (0.68)
Education	4.32 (0.74)
Comfort	4.15 (0.88)
Independence	4.02 (0.77)
Flexibility	3.78 (0.81)
Interconnectedness	3.74 (0.89)
Creativity	3.74 (0.89)
Challenge	3.56 (0.83)
Technology	3.48 (0.89)
Globalism	3.20 (0.95)*
Faith	3.14 (1.45)*
Entrepreneurship	3.01 (0.64)*

Note. Ratings were made on a 5-point scale "1" (*not at all important*) to "5" (*extremely important*). Wasn't statistically different from 3 (moderately important).

holding the other 3 values investigated as only moderately important as determined by

average ratings that were not different from 3(*moderately important*). These were

Globalism, $t(179) =$ 2.814, $p = 0.005$; *Faith*, $t(179) =1.283$, $p = 0.201$ and

Entrepreneurship, $t(179) = 0.148$, $p = 0.883$. Therefore, the researcher rejects the null

hypothesis that the 15 values were only moderately important and concludes that all

values were very important to Gen Zs except globalism, faith and entrepreneurship.

In order to get a more accurate picture of the participants' values, they were also

asked to list any values that they felt were important but were not the list. Overall, 17

extra values were discovered with varying levels of frequency. The top five were:

Personal Relationships (*n* = 8), *Kindness* (*n* = 7), *Respect* (*n* = 5), *Happiness* (*n* = 3),

and *Health* (*n* = 3).

Table 4.2

Frequency of Response for Each Value (N = 180)

Value	Not at All Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Very Important	Extremely Important
Honesty	0 (0.0%)	4 (2.2%)	4 (2.2%)	61 (33.9%)	111 (61.7%)
Personal Growth	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.6%)	11 (6.1%)	61 (33.9%)	107 (59.4%)
Financial Security	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.6%)	12 (6.7%)	64 (35.6%)	103 (57.2%)
Hard Work	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.6%)	17 (9.4%)	72 (40.0%)	90 (50.0%)
Education	1 (0.6%)	1 (0.6%)	21 (11.7%)	74 (41.1%)	83 (46.1%)
Comfort	1 (0.6%)	8 (4.4%)	34 (18.9%)	74 (41.1%)	63 (35.0%)
Independence	0 (0.0%)	3 (1.7%)	43 (23.9%)	82 (45.6%)	52 (28.9%)
Flexibility	0 (0.0%)	8 (4.4%)	59 (32.8%)	77 (42.8%)	36 (20.0%)
Interconnectedness	3 (1.7%)	7 (3.9%)	62 (34.4%)	70 (38.9%)	38 (21.1%)
Creativity	0 (0.0%)	12 (6.7%)	63 (35.0%)	64 (35.6%)	41 (22.8%)
Challenge	0 (0.0%)	14 (7.8%)	77 (42.8%)	63 (35.0%)	26 (14.4%)
Technology	2 (1.1%)	20 (11.1%)	70 (38.9%)	65 (36.1%)	23 (12.8%)
Faith	34 (18.9%)	34 (18.9%)	27 (15.0%)	43 (23.9%)	42 (23.3%)
Globalism	4 (2.2%)	37 (20.6%)	76 (42.2%)	45 (25.0%)	18 (10.0%)
Entrepreneurship	11 (6.1%)	44 (24.4%)	70 (38.9%)	42 (23.3%)	13 (7.2%)

Research Question 2

Frequency statistics were conducted to answer the research question, "what

recruitment strategies do Generation Z students identify as influential to their

matriculation?" Prior to rating the perceived effectiveness of each recruitment strategy,

the participants first indicated which strategies they participated in or attended. As seen in

Table 4.3, the most utilized strategy was the *Open House* (52.8%) and the least utilized

strategy was the *Regional Admitted Student Day* (2.2%). Table 4.3 also outlines the

strategies participants identified at the most effective based on the Likert-type scale

rankings. The most effective strategy to gain the matriculation of a Generation Z student

was *Faculty One-on-One,* followed by an *Honors visit*, and a *Shadow visit*. Aside from

the range of *Other* strategies that individuals participated in, the least effective strategy is

the *Daily visit* (*M = 3.23, SD = 1.135, N = 30).* It is important to note that there was a

range in the number of strategies a participant would utilize before matriculating, which

Table 4.3

Generation Z Perceptions of Recruitment Strategy Effectiveness

Recruitment Strategies	*n* (%)	*M (SD)*	Effectiveness Ranking
Open House	95 (52.8)	3.41 (1.016)	12
Admitted Student Day	78 (43.3%)	3.49 (1.246)	10
Daily Visit	30 (16.7%)	3.23 (1.135)	13
Saturday Visit	27 (15.6%)	3.68 (1.101)	7
Virtual Tour	25 (13.9%)	2.60 (1.000)	8
Admissions Counselor One-on-One	20 (21.1%)	3.85 (1.040)	4
Group Visit	20 (21.1%)	3.75 (1.020)	5
Other	18 (10%)	3.22 (1.555)	14
Faculty One-on-One	11 (6.1%)	4.36 (0.674)	1
Future Panther Friday	11 (6.1%)	3.73 (0.905)	6
Honors Visit	10 (5.6%)	4.10 (1.101)	2
Shadow Visit	8 (4.4%)	4.00 (1.414)	3
Summer Camp/Conference	7 (3.9%)	3.43 (1.512)	11
Regional Admitted Student Day	4 (2.2%)	3.50 (1.000)	9

Note. Ratings were made on a 5-point scale "1" (*not at all important*) to "5" (*extremely important*)*;* n represents the number of individuals that participated in each strategy.

complicated the analysis. Participants were first asked which strategies they participated

in and then asked to give only those that they participated in a Likert style ranking. The

results showed that 43.9% of participants participated in only one recruitment strategy

before making an enrollment decision whereas, 27.8% utilized two strategies, 17.2%

utilized 3, and 11.2% of participants engaged with 4 or more recruitment strategies before

enrolling. The highest number of strategies utilized by any singular participant was 6, at

2.8%, or 5 participants.

Research Question 3

A 2x2x2x3 factorial ANOVA was conducted for each value with gender (male versus female), first generation status, high school location, and minority status (ethnic minority versus non-minority) as the fixed factors to assess research question 3, "Does location (urban, suburban, rural), gender, or race (White/non-White) impact Gen Z's values?" Appendix C contains the full results of this analysis. It was hypothesized that gender, first generation status, high school location, and minority status would be associated with the importance of specific values. Only five of the fifteen values were found to have statistically significant relationships with demographic variables (Table 4.4). Thus, for the values of *Hard Work, Creativity, Comfort, Interconnectedness, Flexibility, Technology, Globalism, Challenge, Entrepreneurship,* and *Personal Growth* the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis of no impact. However, for the values of *Honesty, Education, Faith, Independence,* and *Financial Security* the null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 4.4

Statistically Significant ANOVA Results with Eta Squared Effect Size for Demographic

Variables and Values

Value	Source	df	F	p	η_p^2
Honesty	Minority Status	1	6.786	.010	.044
	Gender x Hslocation x Minoritystatus	1	3.964	.048	.026
Education	Gender x Firstgen	1	4.982	.027	.032
	Gender x Minoritystatus	1	4.921	.028	.032
	Firstgen x Hslocation x Minoritystatus	2	3.106	.048	.040
Faith	Gender	1	3.978	.048	.026
Independence	Hslocation	2	3.249	.042	.042
	Firstgen x Hslocation	2	4.351	.015	.055
	Firstgen x Hslocation x Minoritystatus	2	3.892	.023	.050
Financial Security	Firstgen x Hslocation	2	4.208	.017	.053

Note. Ethnic Minority Status was defined as non-minority (White) and Minority (all other race/ethnicities); Hslocation was broken down into Urban, Suburban, and Rural; Gender included male and female due to the low number of non-binary participants. Significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$)

Research Question 4

The recruitment strategies were categorized by type of strategy. There were four types of strategy identified, relationship-based, student-initiated, invitation-based, and experience based. Within the context of this study relationship-based strategies are recruitment strategies that primarily focus on building significant one-on-one relationships with the prospective student. Events that fall into this category include professional one-on-one's and shadow visits. Student-initiated strategies are recruitment strategies that the student must seek out themselves such as daily visits and virtual tours. With that, invitation-based strategies are large campus wide recruitment events that

encourages hundreds of students to attend, this would include events such as *Future Panther Friday* and *Open Houses*. Lastly, there are experience-based strategies which allow the prospective student a look into life on campus. These events include summer camps and conferences and group visits. Table 4.5 breaks down which strategies fall into which categories.

Table 4.5

Recruitment Strategy Categorization

Categorization	Recruitment Strategies
Relationship Based	Shadow Visit, Faculty One-on-One, Admissions Counselor One-on-One, Honors Visit
Student Initiated	Daily Visit, Saturday Visit, Virtual Tour
Invitation Based	Open House, Admitted Student Day, Future Panther Friday, Regional Admitted Student Day
Experience Based	Summer Camp and Conference, Group Visit, Other

Table 4.6 outlines the top-rated values for individuals that rated a specific strategy a "4" (*very important*) or "5" (*extremely important*) on the Likert-type scale. For each strategy, the top three values of the participants are listed. Among the values that are indicated for the recruitment occurring across all of the recruitment strategies the researcher fails to reject the null hypothesis and concludes that there is no relationship between recruitment strategy effectiveness and generational values.

Table 4.6

Intersection of Recruitment Strategies and Generation Z Values

Recruitment Categorization	Recruitment Strategy	N	Values	M(SD)
Relationship Based	Honors Visit	7	Financial Security	4.71 (0.488)
			Personal Growth	4.57 (0.535)
			Education	4.57 (0.535)
			Honesty	4.57 (0.535)
	Shadow Visit	6	Personal Growth	4.83 (0.408)
			Financial Security	4.67 (0.816)
			Education	4.67 (0.816)
	Faculty One-on-one	10	Education	4.60 (0.699)
			Honesty	4.60 (0.516)
			Personal Growth	4.50 (0.527)
	Admissions Counselor One-on-one	14	Hard Work	4.71 (0.469)
			Honesty	4.71 (0.469)
			Personal Growth	4.50 (0.650)
Student Initiated	Virtual Tour	3	Hard Work	4.67 (0.577)
			Honesty	4.67 (0.577)
			Personal Growth	4.33 (0.577)
	Daily Visit	11	Hard Work	4.45 (0.688)
			Honesty	4.45 (0.934)
			Education	4.18 (0.982)
	Saturday Visit	17	Personal Growth	4.71 (0.470)
			Financial Security	4.65 (0.493)
			Honesty	4.59 (0.507)
Invitation Based	Open House	47	Personal Growth	4.53 (0.718)
			Hard Work	4.47 (0.620)
			Honesty	4.45 (0.686)
	Admitted Student Day	47	Financial Security	4.62 (0.677)
			Hard Work	4.62 (0.573)
			Honesty	4.57 (0.744)
	Future Panther Friday	7	Hard Work	4.71 (0.756)
			Financial Security	4.57 (0.535)
			Honesty	4.57 (0.535)
Experience Based	Group Visit	12	Hard Work	4.67 (0.492)
			Honesty	4.67 (0.492)
			Personal Growth	4.67 (0.492)
	Summer Camp or Conference	4	Personal Growth	5.00 (0.000)
			Financial Security	5.00 (0.000)
			Education	5.00 (0.000)
	Other	9	Honesty	4.89 (0.333)
			Personal Growth	4.67 (0.500)
			Comfort	4.56 (0.527)

Note. The top three values for each recruitment strategy are listed except for the Honors Visit where four values are listed due to a tie between top values. Regional Admitted

Student Day could not be conducted due to only one participant indicating that this strategy was "Very Important" to their matriculation decision.

Summary

Results from this study were mixed. Generation Z students indicated that they valued *Honesty* the most and *Entrepreneurship* the least. Additionally, they found relationship-based recruitment strategies such as *Faculty One-on-Ones,* and *Shadow Visits* as the most impactful in their college choice decision. It was also found that demographic factors had an impact on some of the values that were tested. Finally, there was found to be no relationship between the effectiveness of a particular recruitment strategy and values. The next chapter will discuss the results and implications of the findings.

CHAPTER V

Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to investigate if there was a connection between generational values, specifically Generation Z, and the effectiveness of specific college recruitment strategies. Further, this study sought to determine if demographic factors, such as gender, first-generation status, race/ethnicity, and high school location, impact generational values? The study was able to provide an opportunity to better understand the newest generation of college students within the context of their values and what they identified as being influential to their matriculation at the research institution. These findings will be beneficial to college admissions offices and enrollment management officials, by providing insight into the values of the students they are recruiting and the connection between those values and the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of certain recruitment strategies. Additionally, other factors of influence on matriculation were also identified, further giving context into the recruited population.

Discussion

The study was designed to collect demographic/biographic information about the target population and to answer quantitative research questions about the values of Generation Z at the research institution and the effectiveness of specific recruitment strategies. College recruitment has been examined in previous studies (e.g. Clinedinst & Koranteng, 2018; Nichols & Chang, 2013; Schulmann, Le, & World Education Services, 2018; Secore, 2018, Hanover, 2014, Frolich, Brandt, Hovduaugen, & Aamodt, 2009, Johnson, 2000, Phair, 2014, Jaschik & Lederman, 2018); however, there has been little to no previous research conducted on the connection between generational values and recruitment strategy effectiveness.

When examining the results of the current study, four major findings emerged (1) though Generation Zs who are enrolled at the research institution hold some of the same values that are the same as those indicated in previous research, they value some to a lesser degree different (2) Generation Zs found relationship-based recruitment strategies such as *Faculty One-On-Ones*, *Admission Counselor One-On-One's*, and *Shadow Visits* as the most influential to their matriculation; (3) some demographic factors are related to some values, and (4) there is no evidence of any relationship between recruitment strategies and Generation Zs values.

The first major finding of this study was that the Generation Z students at the research institution appear to hold values that are inconsistent with what was found in previous studies. According to previous research, Generation Zs value globalism, financial fulfillment, education, and entrepreneurship/creativity (Adobe, 2016; Desai & Lele, 2017; Mathur & Hameed, 2016; Puiu, 2016). However, in this study, Generation Zs indicated that they value, as shown by a level of importance to them, honesty, personal growth, financial security, hard-work, and education and an only moderately valued globalism and entrepreneurship. While two of the top values of the participants align with the values in previous research, globalism and entrepreneurship were in the bottom three values of the participants.

There are several possible explanations for this disparity between pervious research and the findings of this study. Perhaps the most logical explanation can be found in the difference in the approach, which resulted in very different types of Generation Zs. Previous research approached the generational values from a global perspective. Many of the studies sampled individuals from different countries (Adobe, 2016; Kantorová,

Jonášova, Panuš, & Lipka, 2017; Mathur & Hameed, 2016; Puiu, 2017). Whereas, given that the research site is a regional rural institution in the Midwest, many of the participants may not have much experience interacting with the world on a global nature, outside perhaps through social media or other indirect means. This could explain why globalism and interconnectedness would be found within the bottom half of the values.

Another surprising finding was where technology ranked among the 15 values of Gen Zs in this study, within the bottom four. Technology has become significantly integrated into daily society. As a result, it is possible that the Generation Z students that were a part of this study may not value technology in the same way as older Generation Z individuals. The participants likely do not remember a time before the integration of technology was as significant as it is today and thus, they take for granted the impact that is has on their daily lives and the world which they occupy.

The values of education and financial security/fulfillment were both found in the top third of values that the participants felt were important. This can be explained again by important characteristics the subset of the generation that was sampled; they were all first-year, first-time students enrolled at an institution of higher learning. Therefore, it makes sense that they would value education. Further, they all have recently exited the K-12 education system. Education has never not been a part of their lives and their interactions of the world. The same explanation could be used to explain why financial security was also highly valued. In addition, finances are a significant topic of conversation during higher education in a multitude of ways. First, there is the idea of using one's degree to get a job. Second, students may be worried about the ability to pay for their education in the moment and looking farther into the future may be worried

about the ability to pay back any loans that they have taken out to fund their degrees. With education and financial security forming a large portion of their daily psyche, it is easy to see why this subsection of Generation Z aligned with the broader generation within these two values.

The second major finding was that Generation Z students found relationship-based recruitment strategies as the most important to their decision to matriculate. The top four strategies that the participants indicated as the most important to their matriculation decision were, in order of importance, *Faculty One-On-One Appointments*, *Honors Visits*, *Shadow Visits*, and *Admissions Counselor One-On-One Appointments*. Each of these recruitment strategies employs a one-on-one relationship to build a connection between the prospective student and the institution. These strategies are also the only four included in the study that were categorized as a relationship-based strategy. It is significant that all four of the relationship-based strategies were indicated as the top four most important to Generation Z matriculation. Within these subcategories of recruitment strategies, the other four categorizations were found across the board in terms of effectiveness. For example, the fifth most effective strategy, as well as the least effective strategy were both categorized as experience based. This significant spread between the effectiveness of strategy types reinforces the importance of relationship-based strategies. While some students may find invitation-based, experience-based, or student-initiated strategies to be effective, each of the top strategies were categorized as relationship-based. Thus, a focus on events that cultivate and create genuine one-on-one relationships will be integral in gaining matriculation.

The third major finding was that certain demographic factors such as minority status, first generation stats, high school location, and gender all have an impact on certain values. Five values, *Honesty, Education, Faith, Independence,* and *Financial Security*, were impacted by a combination of some of the factors listed above. *Education* and *Independence* were the most impacted by combinations of demographic factors with each having three combinations that were statistically significant. There are many reasons why these factors and intersections of them could cause a shift in values. Within *Education,* there were three statistically significant combinations, gender and first-generation status, gender and minority status, and first-generation status, high school location and minority status. Education at many levels has not been accessible by all and higher education specifically has historically been occupied by white males. Each of these intersections of identities could represent marginalized populations that at one time did not have access to education and thus place a higher value on their current ability to get an education. Each of these values and their combination of demographic factors highlights that life experiences alter an individual's values.

The connection between recruitment strategy effectiveness and generation values aligns heavily with the values of Generation Z. For individuals that indicated that a particular strategy was impactful on their decision to matriculate, their top values were the same as the top five values of the generation. There is little variance of the values that are represented within each recruitment strategy; however, the values that were important based on recruitment strategy effectiveness were the top values of the generation as a whole. Research regarding the intersection of values and recruitment is limited, however, this shows the importance of values regardless of the strategy utilized. In building a

relationship with students through effective recruitment, it is important to recognize the values of the recruited population in order to build more honest and authentic relationships. With the Generation Z individuals represented in this study, their values are ingrained and important to their identity, but recruitment strategy effectiveness was not influenced by their values.

Recommendations for Student Affairs Professionals

The following recommendations are intended for student affairs and higher education professionals at the institution of intent. However, data from this research study could be generalized to other institutions of similar size and demographic make-up to improve recruitment practices in order to aid in gaining Generation Z matriculation.

1. *Ensure that building a significant one-on-one relationship be a part of the recruitment experience*. Having admissions personnel facilitate connections between students and other areas of campus to allow individuals to feel as though they have received an honest view of campus and that they have built an authentic relationship with campus professionals.

2. *Create a campus climate that reflects, promotes, and supports the values of the student populations*. It is important to uncover the values of the Generation Z students currently attending the institution. Then those values can be shown and emphasized during targeted relationship building recruitment.

3. *During each recruitment events create a component of one-on-one relationship building*. This is the most impactful way to secure a student's decision to enroll and there is a likelihood that there will not be another

opportunity to build those integral relationships with that same student in the future.

Recommendations for Future Research

Further research is needed to understand what recruitment strategies are most effective in recruiting Generation Z transfers students, non-traditional students, and part-time students. Each of these student populations have a different recruitment experience and thus further research would need to be conducted on the effectiveness of the strategies with which they participated. This research should also include a look into these special population's values. This would help to learn more about how Generational Values are influenced by experiences. This research could also be repeated to understand the effectiveness of recruitment strategies at different institutional types (community colleges, private liberal arts, historically Black colleges and universities, etc.) and uncover the values of student attending such institutions.

Additionally, it would be beneficial for the research to be repeated with the fall 2020 incoming class. First and foremost, a repetition of the study would allow for a testing of the reliability and validity of the instrument. Further, it would help to determine if time of year impacts the perceived effectiveness of certain recruitment strategies. For example, if a student more recently made the decision to attend a specific institution would they feel that a recruitment strategy had a larger impact on that decision versus a semester into their college career. Along with repeating the study at a different time, it would also be beneficial to add a qualitative competent to the survey to understand why students felt a strategy was impactful to their decision to attend the research institution.

Lastly, it would be beneficial to also survey students as they participate in the recruitment strategies. This would remove the concern for decay as the memories of the event would be fresh in the participants minds. Further, this would also allow for individuals that do not decide to matriculate to give insight into their perceptions of the recruitment strategies. For example, a student may participate in an Open House event but then choose to attend a different institution. By surveying the attendees, that individual would be able to indicate how that event impacted their decision. This research would then allow for an investigation into the ineffectiveness of such recruitment strategies and potentially the negative impact they could have on student matriculation rates.

Limitations

While this study aids in understanding the values of Generation Z students at the research institution, it also has some limitations. The first limitation is the sample size, and sampling procedure. This was a non-random sample, and therefore may not be representative of the population of first-time, freshman Generation Zs at the institution.

Another limitation was the time of year (spring) when the data was collected which may have allowed for decay. According to Hardt, Nader, and Nadel (2013), decay is a passive process that occurs when there is a gradual loss of memory between the time when they occur and a later point. Thus, due to the span of time between when the student participated in the recruitment efforts of the institution, decided to matriculate, and then was surveyed there had been decay.

Another significant limitation of this study includes that there was no ability to test the instrument prior to the distribution of the survey. Due to the instrument being

created by the researcher for the purpose of this study it was not tested psychometrically to ensure validity and reliability. This could lead to errors in measurements where responses do not relate to the research questions, are open to misinterpretation, or there is no homogeneity (Coughlan, Cronin, & Ryan, 2009).

Lastly, due to the sample of participants, the study was only able to capture data on students that chose to matriculate at the research institution. Thus, there is a glaring area of study that was not captured, the students for whom the recruitment strategies were not successful in gaining matriculation. This group would give valuable insight into the areas where the recruitment efforts were not successful. Further, and more significantly, this study assumed that the individuals made their college institution decision based on their personal values. However, the study does not consider whether this was a convenience-based decision rather than a values-based decision.

Conclusions

The cost of recruiting a single student to matriculate at a given institution is at an all-time high and thus it is imperative that the recruitment efforts employed are effective in truly gaining the matriculation of prospective students. In order to do this, recruitment needs to be targeted to the population that is currently entering higher education, Generation Z. Through an investigation of values and recruitment strategies admissions counselors and enrollment managers will be able to cultivate targeted experiences that are particularly effective in gaining Generation Z matriculation.

This study is able to give context into what the targeted population values and thus gives insight into how to effectively gain their matriculation. To uncover the values of the target population, a modified version of Value Sort activity found within Harvard

Universities the Good Project (2017) was utilized. In addition, in order to examine the effectiveness of certain recruitment strategies, an effectiveness instrument was created based on information found within Clinedinst and Koranteng (2018) and Holley (1975).

This study found that values are important to Generation Z, but that the values presented in worldwide research may not generalizable to small subgroups of Generation Z students. For the sample, the most highly rated values were *Honesty, Personal Growth, Financial Security, Hard-work,* and *Education.* These same five values were found to important to the sample and to those individuals that felt certain recruitment strategies were effective. Further, the most impactful strategies were relationship-based strategies. Building those personal relationships with these students while engaging with their personal values will aid in getting these students to enroll at a particular institution.

References

Adecco. (2019). The Difference Between Gen Z and Millennials in the Workplace.

Adobe. (2016). Gen Z in the Classroom: Creating the future. Adobe Education Creativity
Study. [PowerPoint slides]

Barnes & Nobel College. (2015). Getting to Know Gen Z: Exploring middle and high
schoolers expectations for higher education.

Bencsik, A., Horváth-Csikós G., & Juhász T. (2016). Y and Z Generations at
workplaces. *Journal of Competitiveness*, *8*(3).

Bershidsky, L. (2014). Here comes generation z. Bloomberg View. Retrieved from
http://www.bloombergview.com/articles/2014-06-18/nailing-generation-z

Breaugh, J. (2016). Talent acquisition: A guide to understanding and managing the
recruitment process. *SHRM Foundation's Effective Practice Guideline Series.*

Cabera, A., La Nasa, S. (2000). Understanding the College-choice Process. *New
Directions for Institutional Research.*

Chen, J., & Zerquera, D. (2018). Leaving or staying home: Predicting where students
attend college. *Education & Urban Society*, *50*(4), 376–399.

Clinedinst, M., & Koranteng, A. (2018). 2017 state of college admission. *The National
Association for College Admissions Counseling*.

Coomes, M. (2000). The historical roots of enrollment management. *New Directions for
Student Services.* 89. 5-17.

Croteau, L. & Maginnis, H. (2005). Admissions, enrollment management, and student
affairs: Creating the seamless transition. *The (Un)Changing Academy.* 26.

Desai, S., Lele, V. (2017). Correlationing Internet, Social Networks and Workplace – A case of Generation Z students. *Journal of Commerce and Management Thought.* 8(4).

Dixon, R. (1995a). Editor's Notes. *Making Enrollment Management Work, New Directions for Students Services.* 71. 1-3.

Dixon, R. (1995b). What is enrollment management? *Making Enrollment Management Work, New Directions for Students Services.* 71. 5-10.

Dolence, M. (1998). Strategic enrollment management. *Handbook for the College Admissions Profession.* 71-91.

Eastern Illinois University (2017). *Fall 2017 Tenth Day Enrollment.* [Data file]. Retrieved from https://www.eiu.edu/ir/fa2017.pdf

Eastern Illinois University (2018). *Fall 2018 Tenth Day Enrollment.* [Data file]. Retrieved from https://www.eiu.edu/ir/fa2017.pdf

Fan, W., & Yan, Z. (2010). Factors affecting response rates of the web survey: A systematic review. Computers in Human Behavior, 26(2), 132-139.

Frolich, N., Brandt, S., Hovduaugen, E., Aamodt, P. (2009). Coping by Copying? Higher education institutions' student recruitment strategies. *Tertiary Education and Management.* 15(3).

Hanover Research (2014). Trends in higher education marketing, recruitment, and technology. *Academy Administration Practice.*

Henderson, S. (1998) A historical view of an admissions dilemma: Seeking quantity or quality in the student body. *Handbook for the College Admissions Profession.* 11-26.

Holley, J. (1975). Reasons for college choice: A study of responses given by Eastern Illinois University Fall Freshman, 1974 and their parents.

Illies, J. J., & Reiter-Palmon, R. (2008). Responding destructively in leadership situations: The role of personal values and problem construction. Journal of Business Ethics, 82(1), 251-272.

Imenda, S. (2014). Is there a conceptual difference between theoretical and conceptual frameworks? *Journal of Social Sciences*, *38*(2), 185-195.

Jaschik, S., Lederman, D. (2018). Strategies for recruiting students. *Inside Higher Ed.*

Johnson, A. (2000). The evolution of strategic enrollment management: A historical perspective. *The Journal of College Admissions.* 166. 4-11.

Kantorová, K., Jonášová, H., Panuš, J., & Lipka, R. (2017). A study of Generation Z from the communication perspective of universities. *Scientific Papers of the University of Pardubice. Series D, Faculty of Economics & Administration*, *24*(40), 83–94.

Katzman, J. (2016). The spending war on student recruitment. *Inside Higher Education.*

Keller, A. (2012). Marketing techniques and recruiting effectiveness at a public community college.

Martinez, M. A. (2014). College information, support, and opportunities for all? *Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership*, *17*(2), 94–107.

Mathur, M., & Hameed, S. (2016). A study on behavioral competencies of the Z Generation. *International Conference on Management and Information Systems.*

McCrindle, M. New Generations at Work: Attracting, recruiting, and retaining & training Generation Y.

Miller, B., Skimmyhorn, W. I want you! Expanding college access through targeted recruiting efforts. *Education Finance and Policy.* 13(3).

National Association for College and Admission Counseling. (2000). Statement on Counselor Competencies.

National Center for Education Statistics (2018). *Back to School Statistics.* Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=372

National Center for Education Statistics (2018). *College Enrollment Rates.* Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cpb.asp

Nichols, T., & Chang, K. (2013). Factors influencing honors college recruitment persistence, and satisfaction at an Upper-Midwest land grant university. *Journal of the National Collegiate Honors Council.* 14(2).

Phair, J. (2014). Career Paths for Admission Officers: A survey report. *National Association for College Admission Counseling.*

Puiu, S. (2016). Generation Z – A new type of consumers. *The Young Economists Journal.* 13(27).

Puiu, S. (2017). Generation Z – An educational and managerial perspective. *The Young Economists Journal.* 14(29).

Rocco, T. S., & Plakhotnik, M. S. (2009). Literature reviews, conceptual frameworks, and theoretical frameworks: Terms, functions, and distinctions. *Human Resource Development Review*, *8*(1), 120-130.

Ruffalo Noel Levitz. (2017). 2017 Marketing and student recruitment report of effective practices. Cedar Rapids, Iowa: Ruffalo Noel Levitz.

Ruffalo Noel Levitz. (2018). 2018 Cost of recruiting an undergraduate student report. Cedar Rapids, Iowa: Ruffalo Noel Levitz.

Schulmann, P., Le, C., & World Education Services (WES). (2018). Navigating a new paradigm for international student recruitment. *Report 10. World Education Services*. World Education Services.

Secore, S. (2018). The significance of college visitations to college choice and strategic enrollment management. *Strategic Enrollment Management Quarterly.* 5(4).

Sigler, W. (2018). 8 Fundamentals of Successful Student Recruitment. *American Association of Collegitate Registrars and Admissions Officers.*

Sparks and Honey Ad Agency(2014). Meet generation z: Forget everything you learned about Millennials. [PowerPoint slides].

Spears, J., Zobac, S. R., Spillane, A., & Thomas, S. (2015). Marketing learning communities to Generation Z: The importance of face-to-face interaction in a digitally driven world. *Learning Communities: Research & Practice*, *3*(1).

Strauss,W. & Howe, N. (1997). *The fourth turning: What the cycles of history tell us about America's next rendezvous with destiny.* New York, NY: Random House LLC.

Trevino, N. (2018). The arrival of Generation Z on college campuses. *The Athenaeum.*

Twenge, J.M., Campbell, W.K., & Freeman, E. C. (2012). Generational differences in young adults' life goals, concern for others, and civic orientation, 1966-2009. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 102, 1045-1062.

United States Census Bureau (n.d). *U.S. and World Population Clock.* Retrieved from https://www.census.gov/popclock/

APPENDIX A

Survey Questionnaire--Recruitment Strategy Effectiveness on Matriculating

Generation Z

Demographic Questionnaire

What is your student status?

    Part time student

    Full time student

What year were you born?

With which of these do you most identify?

    Male

    Female

    Non-binary

    Other

Please select your race.

    Caucasian/White

    African-American/Black

    Asian-American/Asian

    Hispanic/Latino

    Pacific Islander

    Native American

    Other

    Prefer not to answer

Are you a first-generation student?

    Yes

No

Which of these best matches your high school location?

Urban

Suburban

Rural

Please rate the following values on their importance to you personally with 5 being extremely important, 3 being moderately important, and 1 being not at all important.

Honesty

Hard work

Creativity

Comfort

Education

Interconnectedness

Flexibility

Faith

Independence

Financial Security

Technology

Globalism

Challenge

Entrepreneurship

Personal Growth

Please list anything you value that was not capture above. (Text answer)

Of the following, which did you participate in when deciding to attend EIU? Check all that apply.

Open House

Daily Visit

Saturday Visit

Honors Visit

Shadow Visit

Admitted Student Day

Future Panther Fridays

Regional Admitted Student Days

Group Visit

Virtual Tour

Faculty one-on-one

Admissions Counselor one-on-one

Other

Of those that you participated in, what impact did that interaction have on your decision to attend EIU? 1:Not at all important 3:Moderately important 5:Extremely Important

Open House

Daily Visit

Saturday Visit

Honors Visit

Shadow Visit

Admitted Student Day

Future Panther Fridays

Regional Admitted Student Days

Group Visit

Virtual Tour

Faculty one-on-one

Admissions Counselor one-on-one

Other

Were there any other factors that led to your decision to attend EIU?

Yes

No

What other factors led to your decision to attend EIU? Choose all that apply.

Location

Size

Cost

Parents/Siblings/or close relatives attended EIU

Close friends attend EIU

Other [short answer]

Appendix B

INFORMED CONSENT

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Alexandra Thompson from the Department of Counseling and Higher Education at Eastern Illinois University. This research is conducted as a Master's thesis under the supervision of Dr Catherine Polydore, to investigate admissions recruitment strategies and Generation Z. All data will be examined in aggregate and will not be linked back to you. Your participation is entirely voluntary, and you can end the survey at any time. It should take about four(4) minutes to complete

At the end of this survey, you will have an opportunity to enter your email address into a drawing to win one $50 Amazon gift card.

If you have questions or concerns about this research, please contact Alexandra Thompson at ███████████

If you have any questions or concerns about the treatment of human participants in this study, you may call or write:
Institutional Review Board
Eastern Illinois University
600 Lincoln Ave.
Charleston, IL 61920
Telephone: (217) 581-8576
E-mail: eiuirb@www.eiu.edu

Do you wish to continue?

Yes

No

APPENDIX C

Frequency of Response for the Importance of Each Recruitment Strategy on

Matriculation

Recruitment Strategy	Not at All Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Very Important	Extremely Important
Open House	5 (2.8%)	10 (5.6%)	33 (18.3%)	35 (19.4%)	12 (6.7%)
Daily Visit	2 (1.1%)	5 (2.8%)	12 (6.7%)	6 (3.3%)	5 (2.8%)
Saturday Visit	1 (0.6%)	1 (0.6%)	9 (5.0%)	12 (6.7%)	5 (2.8%)
Honors Visit	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.6%)	2 (1.1%)	2 (1.1%)	5 (2.8%)
Shadow Visit	1 (0.6%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.6%)	2 (1.1%)	4 (2.2%)
Admitted Student Days	9 (5.0%)	7 (3.9%)	15 (8.3%)	31 (17.2%)	16 (8.9%)
Future Panther Friday	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.6%)	3 (1.7%)	5 (2.8%)	2 (1.1%)
Regional Admitted Student Day	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (1.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.6%)
Group Visit	1 (0.6%)	0 (0.0%)	7 (3.9%)	7 (3.9%)	5 (2.8%)
Virtual Tour	4 (2.2%)	6 (3.3%)	12 (6.7%)	2 (1.1%)	1 (0.6%)
Faculty One-on-One	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.6%)	5 (2.8%)	5 (2.8%)
Admissions Counselor One-on-One	0 (0.0%)	3 (1.7%)	3 (1.7%)	8 (4.4%)	6 (3.3%)
Summer Camp or Conference	1 (0.6%)	1 (0.6%)	1 (0.6%)	2 (1.1%)	2 (1.1%)
Other	4 (2.2%)	2 (1.1%)	3 (1.7%)	4 (2.2%)	5 (2.8%)

ANOVA Results for Demographic Data and Honesty

Source	*df*	F	*p*	η_p^2
Corrected Model	20	1.312	.179	.150
Intercept	1	2650.957	.000	.947
GENDER	1	1.505	.222	.010
FIRSTGEN	1	.548	.460	.004
HSLOCATION	2	.481	.619	.006
MINORITYSTATUS	1	6.786	.010	.044
GENDER X FIRSTGEN	1	.616	.434	.004
GENDER X HSLOCATION	2	.196	.822	.003
GENDER X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.921	.339	.006
FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION	2	.054	.948	.001
FIRSTGEN X MINORITYSTATUS	1	3.800	.053	.025
HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	2	.416	.660	.006
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION	2	.698	.499	.009
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X MINORITYSTATUS	1	3.093	.081	.020
GENDER X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	1	3.964	.048	.026
FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	2	.331	.719	.004
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	0	.000	.000	.000
Error	149			
Total	170			
Corrected Total	169			

ANOVA Results for Demographic Data and Hard Work

Source	*df*	F	*p*	η_p^2
Corrected Model	20	1.142	.314	.133
Intercept	1	2100.114	.000	.934
GENDER	1	.129	.720	.001
FIRSTGEN	1	.865	.354	.006
HSLOCATION	2	.296	.744	.004
MINORITYSTATUS	1	.245	.621	.002
GENDER X FIRSTGEN	1	2.464	.119	.016
GENDER X HSLOCATION	2	1.823	.165	.024
GENDER X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.460	.499	.003
FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION	2	1.448	.238	.019
FIRSTGEN X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.725	.396	.005
HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	2	2.003	.139	.026
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION	2	.017	.983	.000
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.732	.394	.005
GENDER X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.001	.975	.000
FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	2	.517	.597	.007
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	0	.000	.000	.000
Error	149			
Total	170			
Corrected Total	169			

ANOVA Results for Demographic Data and Creativity

Source	*df*	F	*p*	η_p^2
Corrected Model	20	1.004	.461	.119
Intercept	1	851.787	.000	.851
GENDER	1	.311	.578	.002
FIRSTGEN	1	.014	.905	.000
HSLOCATION	2	.332	.718	.004
MINORITYSTATUS	1	.270	.604	.002
GENDER X FIRSTGEN	1	.180	.672	.001
GENDER X HSLOCATION	2	.950	.389	.013
GENDER X MINORITYSTATUS	1	1.381	.242	.009
FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION	2	.789	.456	.010
FIRSTGEN X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.099	.753	.001
HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	2	.871	.421	.012
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION	2	.650	.523	.009
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.319	.573	.002
GENDER X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.308	.580	.002
FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	2	.420	.658	.006
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	0	.000	.000	.000
Error	149			
Total	170			
Corrected Total	169			

ANOVA Results for Demographic Data and Comfort

Source	*df*	F	*p*	η_p^2
Corrected Model	20	.925	.556	.110
Intercept	1	1052.499	.000	.876
GENDER	1	1.083	.300	.007
FIRSTGEN	1	.005	.946	.000
HSLOCATION	2	.096	.909	.001
MINORITYSTATUS	1	3.372	.068	.022
GENDER X FIRSTGEN	1	.474	.492	.003
GENDER X HSLOCATION	2	.014	.986	.000
GENDER X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.011	.917	.000
FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION	2	2.992	.053	.039
FIRSTGEN X MINORITYSTATUS	1	1.656	.200	.011
HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	2	.486	.616	.006
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION	2	.325	.723	.004
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X MINORITYSTATUS	1	1.497	.223	.010
GENDER X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.233	.630	.002
FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	2	.130	.878	.002
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	0	.000	.000	.000
Error	149			
Total	170			
Corrected Total	169			

ANOVA Results for Demographic Data and Education

Source	*df*	F	*p*	η_p^2
Corrected Model	20	2.242	.003	.231
Intercept	1	1716.995	.000	.920
GENDER	1	.340	.561	.002
FIRSTGEN	1	.006	.937	.000
HSLOCATION	2	.694	.501	.009
MinorityStatus	1	3.418	.066	.022
GENDER x FIRSTGEN	1	4.982	.027	.032
GENDER x HSLOCATION	2	.054	.947	.001
GENDER x MinorityStatus	1	4.921	.028	.032
FIRSTGEN x HSLOCATION	2	.948	.390	.013
FIRSTGEN x MinorityStatus	1	2.221	.138	.015
HSLOCATION x MinorityStatus	2	2.446	.090	.032
GENDER x FIRSTGEN x HSLOCATION	2	.561	.572	.007
GENDER x FIRSTGEN x MinorityStatus	1	.544	.462	.004
GENDER x HSLOCATION x MinorityStatus	1	.010	.921	.000
FIRSTGEN x HSLOCATION x MinorityStatus	2	3.106	.048	.040
GENDER x FIRSTGEN x HSLOCATION x MinorityStatus	0	.000	.000	.000
Error	149			
Total	170			
Corrected Total	169			

ANOVA Results for Demographic Data and Interconnectedness

Source	*df*	F	*p*	η_p^2
Corrected Model	20	.932	.548	.111
Intercept	1	868.460	.000	.854
GENDER	1	1.132	.289	.008
FIRSTGEN	1	.088	.767	.001
HSLOCATION	2	.061	.941	.001
MINORITYSTATUS	1	.595	.442	.004
GENDER X FIRSTGEN	1	.126	.723	.001
GENDER X HSLOCATION	2	.948	.390	.013
GENDER X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.630	.429	.004
FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION	2	1.163	.315	.015
FIRSTGEN X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.685	.409	.005
HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	2	.401	.670	.005
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION	2	.540	.584	.007
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.297	.586	.002
GENDER X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	1	1.506	.222	.010
FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	2	.784	.459	.010
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	0	.000	.000	.000
Error	149			
Total	170			
Corrected Total	169			

ANOVA Results for Demographic Data and Flexibility

Source	df	F	p	η_p^2
Corrected Model	20	1.026	.436	.121
Intercept	1	1043.106	.000	.875
GENDER	1	1.625	.204	.011
FIRSTGEN	1	.089	.766	.001
HSLOCATION	2	.381	.684	.005
MINORITYSTATUS	1	.639	.425	.004
GENDER X FIRSTGEN	1	.305	.582	.002
GENDER X HSLOCATION	2	1.075	.344	.014
GENDER X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.916	.340	.006
FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION	2	1.208	.302	.016
FIRSTGEN X MINORITYSTATUS	1	1.975	.162	.013
HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	2	1.283	.280	.017
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION	2	.284	.753	.004
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.140	.709	.001
GENDER X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.007	.932	.000
FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	2	.303	.739	.004
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	0	.000	.000	.000
Error	149			
Total	170			
Corrected Total	169			

ANOVA Results for Demographic Data and Faith

Source	df	F	p	η_p^2
Corrected Model	20	1.430	.117	.161
Intercept	1	207.557	.000	.582
GENDER	1	3.978	.048	.026
FIRSTGEN	1	.552	.459	.004
HSLOCATION	2	.228	.797	.003
MINORITYSTATUS	1	.415	.521	.003
GENDER X FIRSTGEN	1	.812	.369	.005
GENDER X HSLOCATION	2	.239	.788	.003
GENDER X MINORITYSTATUS	1	2.408	.123	.016
FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION	2	.010	.990	.000
FIRSTGEN X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.374	.542	.003
HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	2	2.509	.085	.033
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION	2	.156	.856	.002
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.007	.932	.000
GENDER X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	1	1.218	.272	.008
FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	2	.000	1.000	.000
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	0	.000	.000	.000
Error	149			
Total	170			
Corrected Total	169			

ANOVA Results for Demographic Data and Independence

Source	df	F	p	η_p^2
Corrected Model	20	1.471	.100	.165
Intercept	1	1279.276	.000	.896
GENDER	1	.263	.609	.002
FIRSTGEN	1	.201	.655	.001
HSLOCATION	2	3.249	.042	.042
MINORITYSTATUS	1	.448	.504	.003
GENDER X FIRSTGEN	1	2.214	.139	.015
GENDER X HSLOCATION	2	1.574	.211	.021
GENDER X MINORITYSTATUS	1	1.339	.249	.009
FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION	2	4.351	.015	.055
FIRSTGEN X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.453	.502	.003
HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	2	1.112	.332	.015
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION	2	1.092	.338	.014
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X MINORITYSTATUS	1	1.225	.270	.008
GENDER X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.112	.738	.001
FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	2	3.892	.023	.050
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	0	.000	.000	.000
Error	149			
Total	170			
Corrected Total	169			

ANOVA Results for Demographic Data and Financial Security

Source	*df*	F	*p*	η_p^2
Corrected Model	20	1.653	.048	.182
Intercept	1	2479.060	.000	.943
GENDER	1	.052	.820	.000
FIRSTGEN	1	.965	.327	.006
HSLOCATION	2	.593	.554	.008
MINORITYSTATUS	1	1.126	.290	.008
GENDER X FIRSTGEN	1	.438	.509	.003
GENDER X HSLOCATION	2	1.552	.215	.020
GENDER X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.642	.424	.004
FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION	2	4.208	.017	.053
FIRSTGEN X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.110	.741	.001
HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	2	2.015	.137	.026
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION	2	.717	.490	.010
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X MINORITYSTATUS	1	3.681	.057	.024
GENDER X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.779	.379	.005
FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	2	1.457	.236	.019
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	0	.000	.000	.000
Error	149			
Total	170			
Corrected Total	169			

ANOVA Results for Demographic Data and Technology

Source	df	F	p	η_p^2
Corrected Model	20	1.213	.251	.140
Intercept	1	820.231	.000	.846
GENDER	1	2.968	.087	.020
FIRSTGEN	1	.010	.921	.000
HSLOCATION	2	.756	.471	.010
MINORITYSTATUS	1	.134	.715	.001
GENDER X FIRSTGEN	1	.334	.564	.002
GENDER X HSLOCATION	2	1.017	.364	.013
GENDER X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.197	.658	.001
FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION	2	.706	.495	.009
FIRSTGEN X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.009	.925	.000
HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	2	1.425	.244	.019
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION	2	.995	.372	.013
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.006	.939	.000
GENDER X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.059	.808	.000
FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	2	1.796	.170	.024
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	0	.000	.000	.000
Error	149			
Total	170			
Corrected Total	169			

ANOVA Results for Demographic Data and Globalism

Source	df	F	p	η_p^2
Corrected Model	20	1.060	.398	.125
Intercept	1	516.965	.000	.776
GENDER	1	1.182	.279	.008
FIRSTGEN	1	.078	.780	.001
HSLOCATION	2	.865	.423	.011
MINORITYSTATUS	1	.003	.959	.000
GENDER X FIRSTGEN	1	.309	.579	.002
GENDER X HSLOCATION	2	.023	.978	.000
GENDER X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.129	.720	.001
FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION	2	.297	.743	.004
FIRSTGEN X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.491	.485	.003
HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	2	.161	.851	.002
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION	2	1.683	.189	.022
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.380	.538	.003
GENDER X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.099	.753	.001
FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	2	1.402	.249	.018
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	0	.000	.000	.000
Error	149			
Total	170			
Corrected Total	169			

ANOVA Results for Demographic Data and Challenge

Source	*df*	F	*p*	η_p^2
Corrected Model	20	.805	.704	.098
Intercept	1	886.590	.000	.856
GENDER	1	.000	.990	.000
FIRSTGEN	1	1.740	.189	.012
HSLOCATION	2	1.287	.279	.017
MINORITYSTATUS	1	.791	.375	.005
GENDER X FIRSTGEN	1	2.296	.132	.015
GENDER X HSLOCATION	2	.838	.435	.011
GENDER X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.828	.364	.006
FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION	2	.904	.407	.012
FIRSTGEN X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.003	.953	.000
HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	2	.541	.583	.007
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION	2	.372	.690	.005
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.017	.898	.000
GENDER X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	1	2.371	.126	.016
FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	2	1.171	.313	.015
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	0	.000	.000	.000
Error	149			
Total	170			
Corrected Total	169			

ANOVA Results for Demographic Data and Entrepreneurship

Source	df	F	p	η_p^2
Corrected Model	20	1.448	.109	.163
Intercept	1	483.102	.000	.764
GENDER	1	.496	.482	.003
FIRSTGEN	1	.353	.553	.002
HSLOCATION	2	.795	.453	.011
MINORITYSTATUS	1	.745	.390	.005
GENDER X FIRSTGEN	1	2.524	.114	.017
GENDER X HSLOCATION	2	1.174	.312	.016
GENDER X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.889	.347	.006
FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION	2	.421	.657	.006
FIRSTGEN X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.170	.681	.001
HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	2	.344	.710	.005
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION	2	.402	.670	.005
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X MINORITYSTATUS	1	1.533	.218	.010
GENDER X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	1	.755	.386	.005
FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	2	.884	.415	.012
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	0	.000	.000	.000
Error	149			
Total	170			
Corrected Total	169			

ANOVA Results for Demographic Data and Personal Growth

Source	*df*	F	*p*	η_p^2
Corrected Model	20	1.192	.269	.138
Intercept	1	2515.660	.000	.944
GENDER	1	.691	.407	.005
FIRSTGEN	1	.132	.717	.001
HSLOCATION	2	.472	.625	.006
MINORITYSTATUS	1	1.094	.297	.007
GENDER x FIRSTGEN	1	.374	.542	.003
GENDER x HSLOCATION	2	.747	.475	.010
GENDER x MINORITYSTATUS	1	.003	.954	.000
FIRSTGEN x HSLOCATION	2	.315	.730	.004
FIRSTGEN x MINORITYSTATUS	1	.007	.933	.000
HSLOCATION x MINORITYSTATUS	2	1.091	.339	.014
GENDER x FIRSTGEN x HSLOCATION	2	.777	.462	.010
GENDER x FIRSTGEN x MINORITYSTATUS	1	2.118	.148	.014
GENDER x HSLOCATION x MINORITYSTATUS	1	.194	.660	.001
FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	2	.439	.645	.006
GENDER X FIRSTGEN X HSLOCATION X MINORITYSTATUS	0	.000	.000	.000
Error	149			
Total	170			
Corrected Total	169			