ABSTRACT

Factors Influencing African-American Students Enrollment in Texas Law Schools

Janis A. Hunter, M.S.Ed.

Mentor: Robert C. Cloud, Ed.D.

While extensive research has been conducted examining the college choice process of undergraduate students, little empirical research has been conducted on the relative factors affecting the law school choice of prospective African-American students, not only in Texas, but also nationwide. By developing a college choice model for African-American students considering legal education, this study will assist researchers and law school administrators in understanding the importance of these factors in the decision-making process. For example, how influential are (1) minority faculty role models and mentors; (2) financial aid; (3) assurance of employment after graduation; (4) supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations; and (5) scholarships in the law school selection process of African-Americans?

The study was designed to survey prospective African-American students enrolled in Texas law schools during the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 academic years. Of the nine law schools located in the state of Texas, four private law schools, three public law schools and one historically Black law school chose to participate. Overall, 364 African-American students were admitted and enrolled in Texas law schools when both
academic years were combined. Of the 364 African-Americans attending Texas law schools; 299 chose to participate in the study, which constitutes an overall response rate of 82%. In addition, seven of the eight law school administrators chose to participate in the interview portion of the survey, which constitutes an overall response rate of 87.5%.

The study focused on the consideration of eleven research questions related to the factors that affect the law school choice of prospective African-American students. Additionally, a purpose was associated with each research question. The need to understand the factors that influence the law school choice of African-American students in Texas has never been greater, not only because of the pressures involved with today’s recruitment process, but also because of the declining number of African-Americans in the legal profession. Hopefully, these reflections might help (1) determine the most influential factors; and (2) assist Texas law school administrators in determining whether to commit resources to (a) the recruitment of minority students, (b) the hiring of minority faculty, and/or (c) curricular modifications.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Alexander Astin (1982) states that the United States educational system is a pipeline that leads ultimately to positions of leadership and influence in our society. However, he contends that our educational system has five major “leakage” points that result in disproportionately large numbers of minority students dropping out of the pipeline. These “leakage” points include: (1) the completion of high school; (2) the entry into college; (3) the completion of college; (4) the entry into graduate or professional school; and (5) the completion of graduate or professional school. Consequently, the loss of minorities at these five “leakage” points accounts for the substantial underrepresentation of minorities in high-level employment positions, such as law and medicine.

Brown (1987) stated that only four percent of African-American students complete graduate and professional programs. In the 1960s, not only did the Black Power movement unsettle the foundations of academia, but it also altered the character of higher education in the United States. This movement forced open the doors of colleges and universities to unprecedented numbers of African-American, Asian American, Hispanic, and Native American students. During the 1970s, the effects of the Black Power movement became evident when the United States witnessed a significant increase in the number of minority students on White college campuses. However, the
momentum created by the Black Power movement of the 1960s was short-lived. From 1975 to 1986 the percentage of African-Americans enrolled in academics decreased to 9.9 percent in four-year institutions of higher education (Mazon & Ross, 1990).

According to Mazon and Ross (1990), the underrepresentation of minority group members has become a critical issue for graduate and legal education. The Postsecondary Education Planning Commission (1999) stated that “compared to their numbers in the general population, minorities are significantly underrepresented nationwide at all levels of the legal profession. *African-Americans and Hispanics account for only six percent of the lawyers and judges in the United States*” (p. 2).

Robert Carr (2005) of the Law School Admissions Council (LSAC) reported that there were approximately 10,674 African-American students who applied to at least one law school in the nation during the fall 2004. Of this number, 3,717 African-Americans were offered admissions nationwide and 3,101 chose to accept the admissions offer. The state of Texas received less than seven percent of the applicant pool nationwide, which equates to 754 African-American students. Yet, of the seven percent that applied to Texas law schools, an even smaller percentage of those students actually chose to attend. Since the Law School Admissions Council tracks only the number of students that apply to law schools nationwide, instead of actual student enrollment by state, Mr. Carr was unable to provide the actual percentage of African-Americans that not only accepted admissions, but also chose to attend a law school in the state of Texas (Carr, 2005). However, one concern that continues to arise involves the factors that attribute to the declining enrollment of African-American students in Texas law schools.
Some critics believe that since the 1996 *Hopwood* decision banned schools from giving special admissions considerations to minority students, there have been modest increases in minority enrollment at Texas law schools. For example, minority law enrollment at Texas Tech increased from 10 percent in 1997 to 17 percent in 1998. While the percentage may seem significant, the actual number of students enrolled was relatively small. In reality, Texas Tech’s Law School enrolled only one Black student in 1997 and five Black students in 1998. According to Frank Newton, former Dean of Texas Tech’s Law school, “[they] had dozens of volunteers and local attorneys help in recruiting minority students. We pulled out all of the stops and worked tirelessly” (Newton, 1999, p. 18). Unfortunately, the results were an inaccurate representation of the efforts exhibited by the Law school to recruit more African-American students.

Regardless of the above results, Steven Smith, the attorney who represented Cheryl Hopwood, maintains that law schools can achieve diversity without race-sensitive admissions policies. However, Dean Newton stated that “minority enrollment at Texas’ law schools doesn’t come close to matching the state’s minority population” (Newton, 1999, p. 18). After *Hopwood*, even the most selective Texas law schools experienced declines in minority enrollment from which they have yet to recover. A prime example of this was reflected in the drastic decrease of African-American students at the University of Texas School of Law between 1996 and 1997. In 1996, the University of Texas School of Law boasted an enrollment of 31 African-American students, only to quickly experience a sharp decline in 1997 to a mere four African-American students (Newton, 1999).
To overcome this deficiency in enrollment, law schools such as the University of Texas had to make several adjustments to their application procedures. First, like all Texas law schools, the University of Texas School of Law was mandated to remove the ethnicity question from their admissions application. Second, law school recruiters at the University of Texas recognized the need to visit major historically Black institutions in Atlanta; Washington, D.C.; and Nashville in an effort to recruit more African-American students. As a result of these efforts, the Law School offered admissions to seventeen African-American students in 1998, which was still miniscule when compared to the admissions offers from previous years. In 1996, the Law School offered sixty-five African-American students’ admissions under their affirmative action program that promoted the enrollment of Blacks and Mexican Americans, which yielded an actual enrollment of 31 African-American students as stated previously. Consequently, proponents of affirmative action contend that the severe decrease in enrollment was a direct result of the termination of the Law School’s affirmative action program (Smith, 1998).

Despite the amount of resources and new recruitment strategies employed by the University of Texas School of Law, the following statement by former Dean Mike Sharlot appeared in the June 1998 issue of Black Issues in Higher Education: “to tell the truth, I don’t think there is any way we can achieve the level of diversity we had in the past under Hopwood” (Smith, 1998, p. 11). Sharlot further asserted that the ultimate solution to increasing the number of minority law students lies in the judicial system (Smith, 1998). In conclusion, officials of the University of Texas believe that public universities will be at a severe disadvantage in recruiting minority students until
Hopwood is overturned – “a task that is critical in a state that will soon be one of the first in the nation to have no racial majority group” (Smith, 1998, p. 11).

Historical Perspective of African-Americans in Higher Education and Legal Education

In one form or another, American law schools have been around since the founding of the United States. A significant force in the American establishment, American law schools are perceived as both prestigious and mystifying. The leading American law schools seem to have a well-established position of power not only in the profession, but also in academic life and the country at large. Students who graduate from an American law school enter a profession that wields great power in politics, business, labor, and even social reform, which is often a major determinant in the law school selection process. In addition, law professors who teach in American law schools are perceived as not only living a charmed life within the profession, but also as having a profound impact on the procedures that occur within institutions of law (Stevens, 1983).

Although law is considered a wholesome career, the history of the legal profession and law schools has often reflected the clash between elitism and democracy because the best law schools have often served the upper-class, well-to-do gentry. For White males, the legal profession was to become the most obvious vehicle for claimed respectability and upward mobility. In 1890, even though the number of Black lawyers nationwide would outnumber women lawyers by 431, the Jim Crow laws took their toll. By 1900, the number of Black lawyers nationwide was only 728 below that of women lawyers. This prejudice against all but young White males is still present today and law

---

1 The terms Blacks (or Black) and Whites (or White) will be capitalized throughout the study except when the terms are being used in a direct quotation.
schools are still dealing with issues presented by Blacks and women in the legal profession (Stevens, 1983).

Ware (1976) stated that the journey of Blacks in the legal profession began in 1844 when three Blacks became lawyers: John Mercer Langston in Ohio, Robert Morris in Massachusetts, and Garrison Draper in Maryland. The emergence of these three lawyers was one of many developments that brightened the Reconstruction period. The shift in legal training from law offices (apprenticeships) to law schools seemed to be a good omen for Blacks, especially when Howard University opened a law department in 1869. However, the potential progress for Blacks in the legal profession during the Reconstruction period was short-lived. The Black legal pool from which judges, prosecutors, and defense counsels could be drawn was narrow, despite the slight increase in Black law students. From 1910 to 1970, there would be a five-fold increase in the number of Black lawyers nationwide. By 1970, there were forty-two hundred Black lawyers nationwide compared to eight hundred in 1910. While the increase in absolute numbers was impressive, the actual percentage increase was not because Blacks constituted less than one percent of the nation’s legal professionals in 1900.

Waring (1995) stated that it was not until the 1960s that all professional schools readjusted their thinking in regards to who their students were and what they should be. This period of readjustment would continue for 30 years into the 1990s. In 1970, Blacks represented 1.3 percent of the nation’s legal professionals. There were indications that the percentage of Black lawyers would increase; however, these increases would not be proportionate to the nation’s Black population. Ware (1976) stated that from 1973-1974 the paucity of Black law students was evident in that of the 106,102 students enrolled in
law schools approved by the American Bar Association, only 4,817 were represented by
Blacks. The controversy regarding reverse discrimination threatens the demise of
affirmative action programs that were designed to increase the proportion of Blacks in
law schools and the legal profession (Ware, 1976).

Yet, colleges and professional schools continue to profess that affirmative action
programs were developed because they had a role to play in educating minority students.
In addition, student protests on college campuses often encouraged university officials to
develop and initiate active programs that not only recruited minority students, but also
took race into account in the admissions process by admitting qualified Black students
with lower grades and test scores. While some colleges and professional schools stated
that they were initiating these programs in order to rectify past racial injustices,
traditionally, there were two primary reasons why college and university leaders began
such affirmative action admissions programs. First, administrators at these institutions
wanted to enrich the educational experience of all their students by “assembling a diverse
student body of varying talents, backgrounds, and perspectives” (Bowen & Bok, 1998, p.
7). Second, recognizing the need for more minority groups in business, government, and
the professions, they wanted to produce a more diverse set of leaders in a larger society
(Bowen & Bok, 1998).

The use of race in admissions policies had a dramatic effect on the participation of
minority students in higher education at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Bowen
and Bok (1998) stated that the beginning of the civil rights movement spurred an
enormous increase in the percentage of Black students graduating from colleges and
professional schools. From 1960 to 1995, the percentage of Blacks in the nation’s law
schools increased from less than 1 percent to 7.5 percent. According to one study, the proportion of Black law students had increased to 4.5 percent by 1975 (Bowen & Bok, 1998). From 1960 to 1990, Blacks almost tripled their share of the nation’s attorneys. In 1994, minority students comprised of approximately 23 percent of all students enrolled in professional schools and approximately 20 percent of all students enrolled in law school. Bowen and Bok (1998) contend that “the growing numbers of blacks graduating from colleges and professional schools, and the consequent increase in Black managers and professionals, have led to the gradual emergence of a larger black middle class” (p. 10).

In a memorandum to Deans of the American Bar Association (ABA)-approved Law Schools, David Rosenlieb (2004) reported that the total enrollment of Juris doctorates increased 3.6 percent from 132,901 students in 2002 to 137,676 students in 2003. In addition, total first year enrollment increased 0.9 percent from 48,433 students in 2002 to 48,867 students in 2003. Rosenlieb (2004) further stated that total minority Juris doctorate enrollment increased 4.3 percent from 27,169 students in 2002 to 28,346 students in 2003. Yet, the total enrollment of Juris doctorates for minorities nationwide increased 0.2 percent from 2002 (20.4%) to 2003 (20.6%). While the total first year enrollment of minorities increased 2.5 percent from 10,224 students in 2002 to 10,476 students in 2003; the total first year enrollment of minority students nationwide increased 0.4 percent from 2001 (21.2%) to 2003 (21.6%) (Rosenlieb, 2004).

Despite the widespread recognition of the value of diversity, Bowen and Bok (1998) contended that the use of race-inclusive admissions policies to increase the number of minority professionals was never fully accepted by the United States. While the 1976 Bakke decision seemed to have settled the issue from a legal standpoint, “large
segments of the public continued to object to the use of race as a factor in deciding who should gain entry to selective institutions” (Bowen & Bok, 1998, p. 13). Thus, the opposition to race-sensitive admissions policies became more vocal as the competition for admittance into leading colleges and professional schools increased with intensity. Even though Supreme Court opinions involving other aspects of affirmative action signaled a shift in attitudes toward raced-based policies in 1989, and again in 1995, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals disagreed in the case of *Hopwood v. Texas*. In 1996, the Court of Appeals concluded that “the University of Texas law school could not take race into consideration in admitting students unless such action was necessary to remedy past discrimination by the school itself” (Bowen & Bok, 1998, p. 14). In essence, affirmative action was established as a racial remedy for the *de jure* and *de facto* segregation of African-Americans. Additionally, affirmative action programs were developed for the educational and social benefits of more racially integrated institutions. Yet, others asserted that subsequent legal decisions have left only one rationale for the use of race-conscious admissions policies (Bowen & Bok, 1998).

*African-Americans in Higher Education*

Since the mid-1960s, African-Americans’ participation in higher education has experienced a series of changing trends (Allen, 1992). According to Exum (1983), racial inequality remains the longest unresolved problem in U.S. society. Thus, “many social institutions have been subject to conflicting pressures between those trying to maintain the status quo of racial privilege, and those seeking to change it” (p. 383). Particularly vulnerable to such pressures are colleges and universities that not only produce knowledge, transmit culture, and bestow status while serving an important economic
function as employers, but also that claim to rely on impartial meritocratic standards. Yet, in 1964, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act was enacted by Congress to prohibit discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion or national origin in colleges and universities receiving federal funding (Exum, 1983; Williams, 1988).

In addition, the United States made aggressive, widespread efforts to address many of the wrongs that had been imposed on Blacks for centuries. The first solution to racial inequality involved increasing African-Americans’ access to higher education. Consequently, this solution was the beginning of a decade of dramatic increases in the number of African-American students attending predominantly White colleges and universities. The civil rights movement resulted not only in strong public support for higher education; but also in strong support for the ongoing expansion of colleges and universities. Consequently, the insistence for Black equality was met by unusually favorable conditions in higher education (Allen, 1992). This trend was sustained through the mid-1970s by the following incentives: (1) legal action; (2) federal pressure; (3) moral suasion generated by the civil rights movement; and (4) aggressive recruitment practices that included generous financial aid packages (Allen, 1992; Orfield & Paul, 1988; Williams, 1988).

Yet, in recent years the moral response to Black demands for equality and programs that would aid African-Americans’ pursuit of obtaining degrees in higher education has dwindled, largely due to “downturns in the U.S. economy,” (Allen, 1992, p. 27) and declining support among Whites for race-based social policies and programs due to ambivalence and lack of interest (Schuman, Steeh, & Bobo, 1985). Allen (1992) further contended that the period of boundless expansion and optimism in higher
education “has moved into one of retrenchment and financial constraints, which is reflected in a dilution of higher education’s commitment to Blacks and other minorities” (p. 27). In general, this lack of support for race-based social policies and programs has caused the enrollment of African-American students in undergraduate and graduate programs to fall short of institutional goals (Schuman, Steeh & Bobo, 1985; Deskins, 1991).

Research further indicates that African-Americans, once enrolled, have negative college experiences and higher attrition rates compared to their White counterparts (Allen, Epps, & Haniff, 1991; Nettles, 1988). Thus, degree attainment among African-Americans lags far behind that of White students (Brown, 1988; Carter & Wilson, 1993; Ottinger, Sikula, & Washington, 1993; Thomas, 1987; Trent, 1991). African-Americans “have witnessed both absolute and proportional declines,” as opposed to Asian Americans and Hispanics who “accounted for virtually all of the increase in the minority share of the (doctoral) pool” (Brown, 1988, p. 7).

Allen (1992) stated that since the 1954 Supreme Court decision in Brown v. the Board of Education, profound changes occurred in patterns of college attendance among African-Americans. In previous years, the overwhelming majority of Black college students were enrolled in Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). Yet, by 1973 that percentage had declined to approximately one-fourth (Anderson, 1984). The American Council on Education (1988) stated that three-fourths of the currently enrolled Black students attended predominantly White institutions. The Council further estimated that predominantly White institutions granted 60 percent of the baccalaureate degrees received by Black students in 1988. In addition, the percentage of African-American
students matriculating and graduating from predominantly White institutions is likely to increase in the foreseeable future (American Council on Education, 1988).

“Several factors have spurred the rise – among them an increase in the number and percentage of black students graduating from high school and, perhaps more importantly, the expansion of college opportunities for black students at predominantly white institutions” (Jones, 1979, p. 1).

Although the 1954 groundbreaking decision, *Brown v. the Board of Education of Topeka Kansas*, was a beacon of hope for thousands of Black/African-Americans, who desired a better education for their children, this giant decision did not automatically open the doors to all educational institutions. However, it produced wide cracks that led to greater opportunities for African-Americans (1) by leading to additional court cases that opened up colleges and professional schools and (2) by encouraging more minorities to pursue educational degrees at all levels of higher education, especially doctoral and law degrees. Once the doors were cracked, the struggle for equal educational opportunities became the major focus. Hence, no longer were colleges and universities able to legally close off programs to students of color (Ellis, 2001).

*African-Americans in Legal Education*

Stevens (1983) contended that while the opportunities for Whites and poor immigrants’ entry into the legal profession increased during the nineteenth century, the number of Blacks and women entering the legal profession was limited during the nineteenth century. Yet, Blacks and women ignored the social ostracism and fought White middle-class prejudice in an effort to practice law. Ginsburg (1982) stated that women in the legal profession constituted anomalies at best and, at worst, abominations
during the nineteenth century. Stevens (1983) paralleled the bleak history of Blacks and
can women in the law up through 1900 as being unsuccessful for several reasons. First, even
though Howard’s Law School increased the number of Black lawyers quickly due to the
absence of admission requirements, a two-year program, and a reasonable supply of
government clerks enrolling in the evening program, the Law school soon fell on hard
times. In 1887, Howard Law School enrolled 12 students, which included 8 Blacks after
the District increased the training requirements of lawyers to three years and Congress
withdrew appropriation funding from Howard’s professional schools. Hence, in 1893,
Howard almost went out of business due to a financial panic. Second, the Jim Crow laws
had taken their toll and Blacks were lagging behind women. Thus, by 1945, neither
women nor Blacks were entering the legal profession in proportion to their numbers in
the country as a whole.

In 1962, Professor Walter Gellhorn made the following observations in his
address to the Association of American Law Schools. First, he acknowledged the
shortage of “Negro” lawyers in the country and more important, the shortage of “Negro”
students in law schools. Second, Professor Gellhorn commented that these shortages
constituted a national problem because they not only left the “Negro” without adequate
representation in many instances, but also these shortages left the “Negro” without
responsible, effective leadership. At the conclusion of his address, Professor Gellhorn
suggested that the Association of American Law Schools “recognize this problem, accept
its challenge, and, with the assistance and encouragement of certain benefactors, set up
the committee to study the problem with a view toward formulating and offering possible
solutions to it” (Carl & Callahan, 1965, p. 250).
In addition, Professor Gellhorn cited that in 1962, only seventeen Blacks graduated from the seven Negro law schools established and maintained in the South as segregated institutions. Professor Gellhorn further implied that these figures were significant because they either equaled or surpassed the total number of Negro students graduating from the remaining law schools in the nation during the same year. Professor Gellhorn’s report resulted in Carl and Callahan (1965) asking the following two-fold question: “Why the shortage of Negro lawyers and why the lack of Negro students in law schools of the country today?” (p. 253). Carl and Callahan (1965) proposed that the shortage of Negro lawyers was a travesty, based on the number of “Negroes” in the general population, and recommended an integration of “Negroes” into traditionally White institutions. In conclusion, Carl and Callahan (1965) made the following comments:

Segregation and discrimination have been complete, all-inclusive, and sanctioned by law until recent years. Is it any wonder then that such culturally deprived and disadvantaged people are not capable of demonstrating qualifications to study law when their ability is measured by methods and criteria designed to test a group from which they have been effectively excluded both culturally and educationally? (p. 257) [The authors further stated that] many Negro youth may be excluded from the study of law, not because they lack ability, but rather because inappropriate means of determining their ability have been and are being employed (p. 258).

*Blacks’ Enrollment in Law Schools*

Throughout the history of the United States, the trilogy of law, educational opportunity, and Blacks has played an astounding role. For instance, it took exactly one century for law schools to become convinced that a sufficient pool of qualified Blacks existed from which to draw their group of Black students (Parker & Stebman, 1973). Jaynes and Williams (1989) assert that racial discrimination in the legal profession differs
little from that prevailing in the larger American society, except that the latter perpetuates the former. Bell (1993) contends that while some barriers of racial discrimination have begun to recede, others that are no less oppressive have taken their place. Knapp and Grover (1994) traced the underrepresentation of minority attorneys back to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when apprenticeships were the accepted means of entering the legal profession. During these centuries, the opportunities for Blacks to participate in apprenticeships were far and few in between.

Littlejohn and Rubinowitz (1986) state that Blacks were barely visible in law schools, which is not surprising since it took approximately one-hundred years (1868) for the first Black student to enter an American law school. While modest gains in Black enrollment began in the late 1960s, the representation of Black students in American law schools would peak within a decade and level-off by the mid-1970s. This enrollment plateau continued through the mid-1980s until it became evident that Blacks might again become a rarity in American law schools. In the last century and a quarter, Blacks were underrepresented in law schools when compared to their percentage of the population. Littlejohn and Rubinowitz (1986) further stated that “at the highest point, Blacks constituted about five percent of [the nation’s] law students, [which was] less than half their proportion of the population” (p. 415). The researchers contended that these dismal figures raised many questions, such as: “why have Blacks constituted such a miniscule percentage of law students for so long; why were the increases in Black enrollment so modest; and why the growth in Black enrollment ceased so quickly, to be replaced by a leveling off, with intermittent declines” (Littlejohn & Rubinowitz, 1986, pp. 415-416).
These questions generated speculation about the future of Blacks not only in law school, but also in the legal profession (Littlejohn & Rubinowitz, 1986).

To further explain this circumstance, Littlejohn and Rubinowitz (1986) contended that Black enrollment was affected by various societal forces that interacted with factors in the law schools and the legal profession. The researchers asserted that intent and overt racism was the primary factor that affected Black enrollment in law schools and the legal profession because in earlier periods, racism prevented or limited Black enrollment. For more than one-hundred years, racial barriers have impeded Black enrollment, while other racial initiatives have helped to increase Black enrollment creating a double-edged sword. In addition to intentional racial considerations, Blacks’ ability to attend law school has also been affected by financial considerations. The differential ability of Blacks and Whites to afford the costs of law school was a direct result in the two groups’ disparities of income and wealth. In essence, the income and wealth of Whites increased during the nineteenth century as the income and wealth of Blacks plummeted; thereby, making it easier for Whites to attend law school. Finally, the increase of formal education requirements and the evolvement of admissions tests during the nineteenth century had an adverse impact on Black enrollment in law schools. Littlejohn and Rubinowitz (1986) asserted that had racial factors been non-existent in the larger society, law schools and the legal profession, “Blacks presumably would have been represented in law school in proportion to their percentage of the population” (p. 416).

_Blacks’ Entry into the Legal Profession: A Century of Exclusion and Segregation_

Few lawyers obtained formal legal education during the colonial period. Blacks had never attended an American law school until 1868. Consequently, during the
majority of the nineteenth century and the first two-thirds of the twentieth century, Black enrollment in law schools remained miniscule. By the end of the Civil War, legal education became institutionalized and law schools replaced apprenticeships, which allowed for the first Black, George Lewis Ruffin, to graduate from Harvard Law School in 1869 (Littlejohn & Hobson, 1987; Littlejohn & Rubinowitz, 1986). Because few people of color were enrolled in law school, Mr. Ruffin was an exception to the rule. Initially, the only African-Americans admitted to law schools were those who “had the determination and the desire to break out of the cycle of unequal educational opportunity” (Parker & Stebman, 1963, p. 145).

Accordingly, Howard Law School was later established in 1869 to produce lawyers of color. As a result of erratic enrollment levels and minimal resources, Howard Law School struggled to survive during the latter part of the century. For example, in 1890, the Law School awarded seven LL.B. degrees. Howard Law School continued to progress by awarding 29 LL.B. degrees in 1891, 10 in 1894, and 26 in 1899. However by the 1900s, Howard fell on hard financial times, which resulted in the awarding of only one LL.B degree. Yet, despite the downward slope in graduation figures, Howard Law School had graduated approximately 330 Black lawyers by 1900 (Littlejohn & Rubinowitz, 1986).

For a better explanation of the disproportionate number of Black lawyers in the legal profession when compared to the total number of lawyers in the United States, one would need to examine the classification of lawyers over a century ago. According to Table 1, lawyers were being classified by race at ten year intervals in 1890. Moreover, the figures collected by the United States Census indicated that increases in the numbers
of Black lawyers were small and slow, not only in absolute numbers, but also in the percentage of the total lawyer population (Table 1). In 1890, there were 431 Black lawyers, which constituted less than one-half of one percent in the United States almost eighty years later. In 1970, there were 3,406 Black lawyers in the United States, which constituted slightly more than one percent of the lawyers in the legal profession (Littlejohn & Rubinowitz, 1986).

Table 1
BLACK AND TOTAL LAWYERS IN THE UNITED STATES, 1890-1970 (Percentages of the total lawyer population appear in parentheses. Figures are rounded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Black Lawyers</th>
<th>Total Lawyers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>431 (0.48)</td>
<td>89,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>728 (0.63)</td>
<td>114,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>779 (0.72)</td>
<td>107,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>950 (0.78)</td>
<td>122,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>1,247 (078)</td>
<td>160,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1,052 (0.59)</td>
<td>177,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1,450 (0.80)</td>
<td>180,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>2,440 (1.16)</td>
<td>209,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>3,406 (1.29)</td>
<td>264,752</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Blacks’ at Historically Black Law Schools and Predominantly White Law Schools

The limited availability of enrollment data from 1890-1970 indicates that the increase in Black law school attendance was mainly attributable to the increase in number and size of traditionally Black law schools, not predominantly White law schools.
Howard Law School had graduated over 700 lawyers by the 1920s, the majority of whom were Black. In addition, the Law School had trained more than three-fourths of the nearly 950 Black lawyers practicing in the United States (Littlejohn & Rubinowitz, 1986).

While the primary responsibility of law schools was to train lawyers toward the end of the nineteenth century, this was not the case for Blacks. Instead, the transition from apprenticeships to law schools simply substituted one barrier for another because few Blacks could attend White law schools. Southern law schools completely closed their doors to the Black population. Conversely, Northern law schools opened their doors to the Black population. Regrettably, this was not enough because Northern law schools enrolled very few Blacks before the late 1960s (Littlejohn & Hobson, 1987).

In 1935, Black lawyers at Howard University planned and executed the first sustained attack on segregated education using the law against law schools.

In reaction to this suit and to the developing legal strategy to eliminate segregation in higher education, black law schools were hastily opened by southern states at Lincoln University in St. Louis, Missouri; at North Carolina College in Durham, North Carolina; at Texas Southern University in Houston, Texas; at Southern University in Scotlandville, Louisiana; at South Carolina A&M College in Orangeburg, South Carolina; and at Florida A&M in Tallahassee, Florida (Parker & Stebman, 1963, p. 146).

During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, there were fourteen Black law schools in existence in addition to Howard Law School. While these law schools were products of Jim Crow law practices and established by states in an effort to avoid admitting Black law applicants to predominantly White law schools, these schools were minimally funded, poorly staffed, and were indeed separate and unequal (Littlejohn & Hobson, 1987, Jenks & Reisman, 1967, Jackson & Nunn, 2003; Knapp & Grover, 1994).
Smith (1980) asserted that “black colleges and universities have historically led an embattled existence. Neglected by most Americans and denigrated by some, they were for a long time the only avenues open to blacks in quest of higher education” (p. 75). Levitan, Johnston and Taggart (1975) stated that in 1966, an evaluation of Black colleges was conducted, which concluded that historically Black medical schools and law schools were inadequate to those of predominantly White law schools. Yet, this report was denounced because it was written by Whites. Since predominantly White public and private schools have only recently admitted non-White students in large numbers, many of the Black lawyers were trained at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). For example, Howard University led in both the undergraduate and legal training of African-American lawyers, training 328 of the 728 Black lawyers in the nation by the 1900s (Parker & Stebman, 1973; Knapp & Grover, 1994).

By the year 1950, total enrollment in the six historically Black law schools (excluding Howard) was 113 students. In addition, the total number of Black lawyers in the United States had increased to 1,450. Howard University and these six predominantly Black state law schools trained an overwhelming majority of the Black lawyers. However, only three of those original, predominantly Black law schools remain in existence today: North Carolina Central University, Southern University, and Texas Southern University. Including Howard, these schools enrolled 1,146 African-American students in 1956. Southern states without Black law schools awarded out-of-state scholarships to Black students seeking legal education, in an effort to keep their own law schools entirely White. Despite their efforts, Black citizens won the right to attend predominantly White public and private law schools in the South through a series of law
suits brought by the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, with Thurgood Marshall at the helm. Yet, several school generations would pass before recognition of the seriousness of the shortage of Black lawyers would fully penetrate the minds of the legal community (Parker & Stebman, 1973).

Black inequality in legal education persisted into the 1960s. In 1964, the Association of American Law Schools (AALS) finally reported that none of its member schools denied admissions to Blacks on the basis of race. Despite the continuance of overt racial discrimination, the Civil Rights Movement and the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King caused many law schools to begin actively seeking Black law students in large quantities. Consequently, in 1964 there were 700 Blacks attending predominantly White law schools, which constituted less than two percent of all law students (Littlejohn & Hobson, 1987).

Levitan, Johnston and Taggart (1975) still contend that the majority of Blacks who were pursuing graduate and professional degrees attended Black colleges. In 1970, “predominantly black colleges accounted for one of every five law students (though Harvard and Yale had the third and fifth largest number of Black law students)” (Levitan, Johnston, & Taggart, 1975, p. 102). Nationwide, Blacks represented about twelve percent of the total population in 1970, but less than one percent of the country’s 300,000 lawyers. Of the American Bar Association (ABA) approved law schools, the enrollment of Black students increased to 3,744 or 4.1 percent of the total population by 1971 (Littlejohn & Hobson, 1987). In 1972, Black law students accounted for 4.3 percent of the total law school enrollment in comparison to the estimated 12 percent of Blacks in the United States general population (Parker & Stebman, 1973).
Historically Black law schools played an important role in the education of Black students. Between 1871 and 1970, Howard Law School was responsible for educating the majority of the Black lawyers in the country. The Law School graduated more than 2,100 students between the years of 1871 and 1970. In 1972, Professor Kenneth Tollett reported that since 1940, of the 1,554 Black law students attending historically Black law schools, Howard had graduated 983 law students and Texas Southern University had graduated 171 law students. Conversely, until the late 1960s, predominantly White law schools played a diminutive role in educating Black lawyers. The researchers contended that “until the graduating class of 1968, it was estimated that there were only 200 Negroes among the 10,000 graduating from American law schools annually” (Littlejohn & Rubinowitz, 1986, p. 420).

In Texas, Blacks were not allowed to attend a state law school prior to 1946. The United States Supreme Court struck deeply at the law schools’ segregation regime in 1950 when the University of Texas Law School denied Heman Sweatt’s application in accordance with the state’s constitution, which required separate schools for White and Black students. Although the state established a law school for Blacks (Texas Southern University) during the pendency of the suit, the Court found the facilities of the law school to be inferior to those of the University of Texas Law School. While the Sweatt decision affected the admissions of Blacks to predominantly White state law schools, its practical impact was far less significant. For the next two decades, the University of Texas enrolled only a token number of Blacks. Between 1950 and 1968, it was estimated that thirty-seven Blacks attended the University of Texas Law School. During this same
period, nine Black students attended the University of Houston Law School and two Black students enrolled at Texas Technological College (Littlejohn & Rubinowitz, 1986).

The picture of Black law school enrollment is bleak from the latter part of the nineteenth century to the 1960s. Most Blacks desiring to obtain a legal education either attended Howard Law School or one of the other traditionally Black law schools. For more than one hundred years, many American law schools maintained racially overt exclusionary policies. During this period, intentional racial oppression accompanied by (1) evolving admissions requirements, (2) increased tuition structures, and (3) minimal financial resources prevented most Blacks from attending law schools that were formally open to them (Littlejohn & Rubinowitz, 1986). Knapp and Grover (1994) stated that as a result of the long-standing academic and financial deprivation of Blacks resulting from racism, the percentage of minority law graduates increased to 4.2 percent in 1983 from 1.3 percent in 1973.

Blacks’ Enrollment in Law Schools during the Twenty-First Century

Of the 178 law schools accredited by the American Bar Association (ABA), there were 9,132 Black students enrolled in at least one of the nation’s law schools during the 1997-1998 academic year. Although Blacks made up seven percent of all law school enrollments; overall, the total enrollment of Black students in law school was down 4.2 percent from the previous year. In contrast, Black law school enrollments more than doubled over the past quarter-century. Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) enrolled the highest percentage of Black students among the four law schools in existence. In the 1997-1998 academic year, every accredited law school in the United States enrolled at least one Black student. In Texas, the largest producer of African-
American lawyers was Texas Southern University Thurgood Marshall School of Law. The University of North Carolina Chapel Hill (12.8%), George Washington University (12.6%), and the University of Illinois (12.4%) were among the 25 highest-ranked law schools with the highest enrollment of Black students. In contrast, Brigham Young University (0.5%) had the lowest enrollment of Black students among the 25 highest-ranked law schools in the nation. Other high ranking law schools such as New York University, Berkeley UCLA and Notre Dame had Black enrollments that were below the national average (“Vital Signs,” Summer 1998).

In the 1998-1999 academic year, the number of Black students attending the nation’s 178 accredited law schools increased to 9,271; thus, maintaining seven percent of all law school enrollments. In contrast to the previous academic year, the total enrollment of Black law students increased to 1.5 percent; therefore, reversing the 1994 downward trend in enrollment when nearly 9,700 Black students were enrolled in American law schools (“Vital Signs,” Summer 2000). Of the 180 law schools accredited by the American Bar Association (ABA) in the 1999-2000 academic year, there were 9,354 Black students enrolled representing an increase up to 7.1 percent of all law school enrollments. Although the total enrollment of Black students was up less than one percent from the previous year, the figure was still below its all time peak in 1995. However, overall, the long-term trend has been favorable because the number of Blacks enrolled in law school has increased by 36 percent since 1990. In addition, 30 predominantly White law schools have a student body that is at least ten percent Black, which is up 25 percent from 1994 (“Vital Signs, Autumn 2001). Despite the dramatic influx of Black students into White institutions, many predominantly White colleges and
universities are still concerned about the low numbers of Black students enrolled on their campuses.

Summary

Jones (1986) stated that increased attention has been given to the plight of minorities in legal education in the last decade and a half. The American Bar Association and many state bar associations have introduced studies and formed programs in an effort to establish an integrated bar. Consequently, these attempts have failed leaving minorities disproportionately represented in the legal profession when compared to their numbers in the general population. Lundwall (1994) also contends that a continuing concern of law schools for at least a quarter of a century has been increasing the representation of minorities in the legal profession. The researcher further asserted that the enrollment of minority students remains appallingly low because most schools have focused their efforts on special admissions programs or academic support programs, which consist of students who have already chosen legal careers. While these programs are helpful, the researcher stated that they do not attempt to enlarge the pool of qualified minority applicants. Thus, law schools should develop summer fellowship programs to encourage undergraduate minority students to pursue legal careers.

Adams (1993) found that African-Americans, more than other people of color, delay the decision to apply to law school until after they have completed their undergraduate studies. Yet, minority students are finding a place in today’s American law schools. Lundwall (1994) stated that when attempting to increase the number of minorities in law schools and ultimately the profession, law school administrators and others with a vested interest must consider both short term goals as well as long range
strategies when developing a solution. The researcher suggested that in addition to short
term goals, such as special admissions and academic support programs that under-prepare
minority applicants to succeed in law schools, it was time to implement and invest in
programs that encourage the best and brightest minority undergraduates to pursue a
career in law. Thus, the academic talent of minority students must be identified and
nurtured over a period of years if the objective is to produce more minority lawyers with
(1) strong academic records, (2) confidence in their ability to succeed, and (3) a desire to
complete a rigorous three years of law school.

Despite controversial debates over affirmative action admissions policies and
diversity in legal education, African-Americans are attending law schools in record
numbers. In a report from the Law School Admission Services of Newton, Pennsylvania,
the number of African-Americans attending American law schools has increased from
5,000 in 1975 to over 8,000 when the study was conducted in 1994. This influx that has
occurred over the last twenty years has quadrupled the number of Black lawyers in the
United States. The Law School Admission Services found that most African-Americans
applied to the following American law schools: (1) Georgetown University, (2) Howard
University, (3) University of Michigan, (4) New York University, and (5) the University
of California, Los Angeles. The researchers further stated that African-Americans listed
Georgetown, Howard, and UCLA as their top three choices of law schools to attend. In
U.S. News & World Report's annual survey, Yale, Harvard, and Stanford were listed as
the top three choices among Black law school applicants (“The Law Schools,” Winter
1993-1994). If these statements are true, where does this leave law schools in the state of
Texas. What factors are influencing African-American students during the law school selection process?

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is to identify the factors that affect the law school choice of prospective African-American students in the state of Texas.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study are:

1. To identify the relative factors affecting the law school choice of prospective African-American students enrolling in accredited private law schools in the state of Texas.
2. To identify the relative factors affecting the law school choice of African-American students enrolling in accredited public law schools in the state of Texas.
3. To identify the relative factors affecting the law school choice of African-American students enrolling in an accredited historically Black law school in the state of Texas.
4. To determine if there are differences in the factors affecting the law school choice of African-American students who attend accredited private law schools, public law schools and a historically Black law school in the state of Texas.
5. To describe certain demographic characteristics of African-American students enrolling in Texas law schools.
6. To determine which institutions of higher education African-American students are attending prior to enrolling in Texas law schools.
7. To determine the perceptions of African-American students in regards to the minority recruiting strategies of Texas law schools.
8. To determine the role parents, peers, family members, close friends, mentors, etc. play in the college choice process of prospective African-American law students.
9. To determine the perceptions of Texas law schools from an institutional point of view regarding the effectiveness of their minority recruiting strategies in relation to African-American students.
10. To determine the effect(s) of *Hopwood v. State of Texas* and *Grutter v. Bollinger* on the recruitment strategies of the nine Texas law schools overall.
11. To determine the effect(s) of *Hopwood v. State of Texas* and *Grutter v. Bollinger* on the recruitment strategies of each Texas law school in relation to African-American students.

**Research Questions**

To carry out the purposes of this present study, the following research questions are examined:

1. What factor(s) are the major determinants in the law school choice of African-American students enrolling in accredited private law schools in the state of Texas?

2. What factor(s) are the major determinants in the law school choice of African-American students enrolling in accredited public law schools in the state of Texas?

3. What factor(s) are the major determinants in the law school choice of African-American students enrolling in an accredited historically Black law school in the state of Texas?

4. Is there a difference in the factors affecting the law school choice of African-American students who attend accredited private law schools, public law schools and a historically Black law school in the state of Texas?

5. What are the demographic characteristics of African-American students currently enrolling in Texas law schools?

6. Which institutions of higher education are African-American students attending prior to enrolling in Texas law schools?

7. How do African-American students perceive the different minority recruiting strategies amongst Texas law schools?

8. Who helps prospective African-American law students in the college choice process? (e.g., parents, peers, family members, close friends, mentors, etc.)

9. From an institutional point of view, how do Texas law schools perceive the effectiveness of their minority recruiting strategies in relation to African-American students?

10. What effect(s) has *Hopwood v. State of Texas* and *Grutter v. Bollinger* had on the recruitment strategies of the nine law schools in the state of Texas overall?

11. What effect(s) has *Hopwood v. State of Texas* and *Grutter v. Bollinger* had on the recruitment strategies of each Texas law school in relation to African-American students?
Professional Significance of the Problem

McDonough and Antonio (1996) asserted that access to higher education and improving equality in college admissions remains a major educational policy issue because of the continued underrepresentation of many racial and ethnic groups in higher education today. Although extensive research has been conducted examining the college choice process of undergraduate students, little empirical research has been conducted on the relative factors affecting the law school choice of prospective African-American students, not only in the state of Texas, but also nationwide. By developing a college choice model for African-American students considering legal education, this study will assist researchers in understanding the importance of these factors in the decision-making process. For example, how influential are (1) minority faculty role models and mentors; (2) financial aid; (3) assurance of employment after graduation; (4) supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations; and (5) scholarships in the selection of a law school for African-American students?

Parker and Stebman (1973) reiterated that through a series of law suits brought by the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Black citizens won the right to attend predominantly White private and public institutions in the South. For example, when Heman Marion Sweatt, an African-American, was denied admissions to the University of Texas School of Law in 1946, the state of Texas established a makeshift, unaccredited “law school for Negroes” (Higginbotham Jr., 1998, p. 20). Outraged by this incident, in 1950 Thurgood Marshall argued Heman Sweatt’s case before the U.S. Supreme Court where he eloquently defended the constitutional promise of equality for Sweatt and all
African-Americans. In a unanimous opinion, the Supreme Court held that Sweatt should be admitted to the Whites-only school (Higginbotham Jr., 1998).

Several generations would pass before recognition of the seriousness of the shortage of Black lawyers would fully penetrate the minds of the legal community. For instance, in 1972, Black law students accounted for 4.3 percent of the total law school enrollment in comparison to the estimated 12 percent of Blacks in the United States population (Parker & Stebman, 1973). Additionally, of the 9,132 Black students attending law schools accredited by the American Bar Association during the 1997-1998 academic year, only 653 were enrolled in the nine law schools located in the state of Texas (“Vital Signs,” Summer 1998). According to Robert Carr (2005) of the Law School Admissions Council, of the 10,674 African-American students that applied to at least one law school in the nation during the fall 2004, Texas law schools received approximately 754 of those applicants, which is less than 7 percent. Moreover, an even smaller percentage of those students actually attended law schools in the state of Texas.

This study will be significant in that:

1. By providing insightful information on the law school choice of African-Americans, it will assist Texas law schools in gathering and utilizing information on prospective students in order to develop a cohesive and successful enrollment management system.

2. The information gathered in this study might also assist other law schools in the nation whose African-American enrollments are below the national average in developing a cohesive and successful enrollment management system.

3. The feedback received from prospective African-American students might help improve the recruitment strategies and retention rates of Texas law schools.

4. The information obtained in this study will help Texas law schools evaluate the effectiveness of their recruitment efforts and guide them in the development of new programs and policies.
5. The information gathered in this study might assist law school administrators in the state of Texas who allocate funds in determining whether to commit resources to (1) the recruitment of minority students; (2) the hiring of minority faculty; (3) curricular modifications; and/or (4) the creation or modification of institutional policies affecting student life.

6. The information gathered in this study will help Texas law schools identify which undergraduate institutions of higher education are supplying their applicant pool of African-American students, as well as identifying new undergraduate institutions that might supply a potential applicant pool of African-American students.

**Limitations**

This study will be limited in scope to the eight public and private law schools in the state of Texas that have chosen to participate. Only beginning, African-American law students enrolled in Texas law schools that offer day and/or night programs either part-time or full-time will be surveyed; therefore, the study will be limited to their responses. This study will also be limited to the responses of the seven law school administrators who chose to participate in the interview portion of the survey. The validity of the conclusions will be more or less limited or determined by the number and description of the law school respondents participating in the study. The possibility of generalization will be limited to (1) beginning African-American law students enrolled in Texas law schools that offer day and/or night programs either part-time or full-time; (2) the extent of the participating law schools; (3) the small size of the population under study; and (4) the level of the response rate. This study will be subject to all the limitations recognized in the collection of data through mailed and electronic surveys. This study will be delimited in that the majority of the responses are from participants that attend Texas Southern University Thurgood Marshall School of Law, a Historically Black College and University and the largest producer of African-American lawyers in the state of Texas.
Definition of Key Terms

The following terms will have restricted meaning and are thus defined for this study.

1. **42 U.S.C. §1981**: Title 42 of the United States Code states that “no person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance” (“Laws: Cases & Codes,” 2002).

2. **Access**: The availability of services and resources that are not only needed, but also desired without prejudice (Jackson & Nunn, 2003).

3. **Accreditation**: Within the context of higher education, the term accreditation is the process used to determine if specified educational standards are being met by institutions of higher education. In addition, the term accreditation encompasses the nature of educational programs that can be offered by institutions of higher education (Jackson & Nunn, 2003).

4. **Affirmative Action**: For the purpose of this study and within the context of higher education the term affirmative action will refer to a wide variety of student programs, such as student admissions, student recruitment, and student retention (Kaplin & Lee, 1997). Within the context of this study, and except when noted, the term affirmative action refers to programs and policies designed to redress past discrimination. The term affirmative action also refers to programs and policies designed to prevent current discrimination based on race, color, religion, gender, or national origin (Jackson & Nunn, 2003). In the Hopwood case, the affirmative action program under review focused on the admissions of African-Americans and Mexican Americans and was considered a “preferential” affirmative action program. The Law School’s program provided African-American and Mexican American applicants with a preference in the admissions process. Thus, except when noted, the term affirmative action also refers to the preferential treatment of racial and ethnic minorities in the admission process (Hopwood v. State of Texas, 1996).

5. **African-Americans**: Within the context of this study, African-Americans are being identified as “people of African decent who are born in the United States and who have ancestral lineage in the United States system of slavery. [African-Americans] also refers to people of African descent who live in the United States and its territories” (Jackson & Nunn, 2003, p. 223). For the purpose of this study, the terms Black, Negro, students of color, and people of color will be used interchangeably with the term African-Americans.
6. **Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas**: In *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas* (1954), Linda Brown was denied admissions to her local elementary school in Topeka because she was Black. In combination with several other cases, Brown’s lawsuit reached the United States Supreme Court. *Brown v. Board of Education* was a landmark case in which recently appointed Chief Justice Earl Warren broke longstanding tradition and unanimously overruled the “separate but equal” doctrine of *Plessy v. Ferguson*. For the first time in history, Justice Warren held that the *de jure segregation* in public schools violated the principle of equal protection under the law guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Responding to the legal and sociological arguments presented by the NAACP lawyers who were led by Thurgood Marshall, the United States Supreme Court stressed that the “badge of inferiority” stamped on minority children by segregation hindered their full development no matter how “equal” physical facilities might be. After hearing further arguments on implementation, the Court declared in 1955 that schools must be desegregated with “all deliberate speed.”

7. **Campus Climate**: For the purpose of this study, the term *campus climate* refers to human interactions that occur in the school, such as the fair treatment of minority students and minority faculty. In this study, the term *campus climate* is also interchangeable with the term *institutional climate*.

8. **Campus Culture**: A system of shared meaning, values, and beliefs that distinguishes one institution of higher education from another and provides a sense of identity for its students, faculty, and staff. While the culture of an educational institution is sometimes hard to pinpoint or articulate, it is deep-seated, pervasive, and expressed in a myriad of ways from dress and behavior of members to policy and governance structures. For example, the campus culture of an institution is reflected in (1) how faculty and administrative offices are arranged; (2) the assumptions that people make about each other and their roles in the school; (3) how curriculum decisions are made; (4) how campus information is shared; (5) who comes to what meetings; (6) how budgets are developed and managed; (7) how student and institutional success are measured; (8) how parking spaces are allotted; and (9) what the college brags about. In essence, members of the campus community and outsiders with whom they interact sense the college’s culture and react to the values it conveys. For the purpose of this study, the terms *campus culture* and *institutional culture* are interchangeable.

9. **Campus Environment**: The term *campus environment* refers to the internal and external forces, practices and procedures that enhance and promote diversity while creating an educational environment where learning occurs. Within the context of this study, the terms *campus environment* and *institutional environment* are interchangeable.

10. **College Choice**: Student college choice “refers to the selection of a particular college from a set of alternative colleges from which an individual student has received offerings of admission” (Hossler, Braxton, & Coopersmith, 1996, p. 19). For the purpose of this study, the term *college choice* will be defined as the process
of gathering information on various institutions of higher education, specifically law schools, and then using that information to develop a list of potential choices.

11. **Cost of Attendance (COA):** In accordance with federal guidelines, the term *cost of attendance* refers to a student’s tuition and fees, room and board, books, transportation, and miscellaneous expenses for an academic year at a postsecondary institution.

12. **De Facto Segregation:** The separation of people by race through practices and traditions without strict legal authority (Jackson & Nunn, 2003). *De facto segregation* is the opposite of *de jure segregation*.

13. **De Jure Segregation:** The sanctioning of laws that separate people by race legitimately (Jackson & Nunn, 2003). *De Jure Segregation* is the opposite of *de facto segregation*.

14. **DeFunis v. Odegaard:** When some of the “special” admissions programs began guaranteeing a specific number of seats for minority students, these programs became the center of attention. The opponents of preferential admissions programs rebelled against the idea of returning to a “quota system” (Flores & Slocum, 1997). The first of these challenges was initiated in the Supreme Court case of **DeFunis v. Odegaard (1974)**, which raised the issues of racial preferences being used in the admissions program at the University of Washington Law School. When Marco DeFunis was denied admissions, he challenged the school’s admissions policies based on illegal discrimination by filing suit in the Washington State court. DeFunis asserted that the University of Washington Law School had racially discriminated against him because he was White instead of Black, which violated the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. When the case was reviewed, the trial court agreed and ordered the University of Washington Law School to admit DeFunis.

15. **Desegregation:** The term *desegregation* is most commonly used in reference to the United States and identified as the process of ending discrimination on the basis of race. In the United States, the American civil rights movement is best identified as the cornerstone that began America’s longstanding commitment to *desegregating* school systems, both before and after the United States Supreme Court’s decision in **Brown v. Board of Education** (“Desegregation,” 2005).

16. **Discrimination:** Within the context of this study, the term *discrimination* refers to the granting or withholding of rights or privileges based on race. *Discrimination* also includes refusing to associate with individuals on the basis of race (“Discrimination,” 2005).

17. **Entering or Prospective Students:** African-American students that have not yet attended law school classes, but have been offered admissions to the law school.
18. **Equal Protection Clause:** A section of the Fourteenth Amendment, the Equal Protection Clause provides that “no state shall...deny any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws” (“Equal Protection,” 2005). Within the broadest context, the Equal Protection Clause is the United States attempt to reaffirm the idea that “all men are created equal” (“Equal Protection,” 2005).

19. **Financial Need:** For financial aid purposes, financial need is the cost of attendance (COA) less the expected family contribution (EFC). The expected family contribution (EFC) is a theoretical amount a student and family should be able to provide toward meeting a student’s cost of attendance at a postsecondary institution. It is derived from information provided on the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA), which is then applied to a formula developed by the United States Department of Education.

20. **Fourteenth Amendment:** Proposed on June 13, 1866 and ratified on July 9, 1868, the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution requires all states to provide equal protection under the law to all persons within their jurisdiction, not merely citizens. When the Fourteenth Amendment was adopted, its main intent was to ensure equal protection regardless of race, which includes protection of the right to vote (“Fourteenth Amendment,” 2005).

21. **Gratz v. Bollinger:** In 1995, Jennifer Gratz, a White applicant with an adjusted GPA of 3.8 and ACT score of 25, applied to the University of Michigan’s College of Literature, Science and Arts. When Gratz was denied undergraduate admissions, she sued the University of Michigan on the grounds that the school’s consideration of race and ethnicity in its admission decisions violated the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Similar to Grutter, the case was heard in District Court, appealed to the Sixth Court of Appeals and eventually heard by the United States Supreme Court. On June 23, 2003, the United States Supreme Court concurred with Gratz and held that the University of Michigan’s use of racial preferences in undergraduate admissions violated both the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Gratz v. Bollinger, 2003).

22. **Grutter v. Bollinger:** The University of Michigan Law School not only seeks to “admit a group of students who individually and collectively are among the most capable, but also individuals with substantial promise for success in law school and a strong likelihood of succeeding in the practice of law [while] contributing in diverse ways to the well being of others (Grutter v. Bollinger, 2003, p. 1). Yet, in December 1997, Barbara Grutter, a White Michigan resident with a 3.8 grade point average and a LSAT score of 161 filed suit against the University of Michigan Law School. Grutter alleged that the Law School discriminated against her on the basis of race, which violated the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and 42 U.S.C. §1981. Grutter further contended that the Law School rejected her application because of its use of race as a “predominant” factor, which gives applicants of certain minority groups “a significantly greater chance of admission than students with similar credentials
from disfavored racial groups” (*Grutter v. Bollinger*, 2003, p. 4). Grutter also alleged that the Law School’s compelling interest to use race in the admissions process was unjustifiable (*Grutter v. Bollinger*, 2003). Eventually, the Grutter case would be heard before the United States Supreme Court which on June 23, 2003 affirmed the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals decision. The Supreme Court held that the Law School had a compelling interest in attaining a diverse student body and ruled in favor of the University of Michigan Law School (*Grutter v. Bollinger*, 2003).

23. *Higher Education:* Within the context of this study, higher education refers to “education beyond high school” (Jackson & Nunn, 2003, p. 224); specifically, education provided by colleges, graduate schools, and professional schools.

24. *Historically Black Colleges and Universities:* There are several definitions for Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). For the purpose of this study, “these institutions are best identified as private and public two-year, four-year, graduate and professional degree institutions that were established specifically for the postsecondary education of African ancestry in the United States” (Jackson & Nunn, 2003, p. 3).

25. *Hopwood v. Texas:* In *Hopwood v. Texas* (1996), Cheryl Hopwood and three other White students filed suit against the University of Texas School of Law for reverse discrimination. In March 1996, the 5th Circuit Court of Appeals in Louisiana ruled that the University of Texas’ admissions policy discriminated against the four plaintiffs. As a result of the Appeal Court’s decision, Attorney General Dan Morales notified institutions of higher education in Texas that all affirmative action programs were illegal. Attorney General Morales also directed Texas universities to use race neutral policies in admissions decisions, scholarships and financial aid, and recruitment and retention programs.

26. *Jim Crow Laws:* After the American Civil War, most states in the South passed anti-African-American legislation. This legislation became known as Jim Crow laws, which discriminated against African-Americans with concern to attendance in public schools and the use of facilities such as restaurants, theatres, hotels, cinemas, public baths, trains, and buses. In essence, Jim Crow laws were established to reinforce racial segregation in the United States and included laws that would prevent African-Americans from doing things that a White person could do (“Jim Crow,” 2006).

27. *Land-grant Institutions:* Land given by the federal government to educational institutions through the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890. Congress designated this land to United States’ institutions for the purpose of establishing state agricultural and mechanical colleges (Jackson & Nunn, 2003). For the purpose of this study, *land grant colleges* and *land grant universities* will be used interchangeably with *land-grant institutions.*
28. **Law School:** A three-year, full-time or part-time post-baccalaureate, day and/or night program in law that is accredited by the American Bar Association.

29. **Minority Students:** Within the context of this study, and except when noted, the term *minority students* refers to students who have self-identified themselves with non-White racial groups. *Minority students* may also be identified as students of racial and ethnic groups who are not of European descent (Jackson & Nunn, 2003). For the purpose of this study, *minority students* are not identified solely as African-American students.

30. **Plessy v. Ferguson:** In the landmark case of *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1898), the United States Supreme Court ruled that “separate but equal” was the law of the land. The *Plessy* decision not only solidified the racial segregation of higher education systems, but also legally allowed public institutions to be segregated by race. As a result of the *Plessy* decision, the segregation of colleges for African-Americans developed into what are now referred to as Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs).

31. **Predominantly White Institution (PWI):** For the purpose of this study, the term *predominantly White institution* refers to “postsecondary institutions established specifically to educate Americans of European descent” (Jackson & Nunn, 2003, p. 225).

32. **Private (Law) School:** A law school that is established, conducted, and primarily supported by a nongovernmental agency.

33. **Public (Law) School:** A free tax-supported law school that is either controlled or supported by a local governmental authority.

34. **Racism:** While the term *racism* is used in various ways, the most commonly used description involves the attitudes of those who are racially prejudiced or who practice racial discrimination. Racial prejudice involves correlating an individual’s character and abilities with his/her race and using such knowledge in dealing with members of that race (“Racism,” 2006). For the purpose of this study, the term *racism* refers to “the power of one racial group to exclude individuals or other racial groups from societal rights,” such as an education (Jackson & Nunn, 2003, p. 225).

35. **Regents of the University of California v. Bakke** (1978): Although Allan Bakke, a White applicant, had a higher grade point average and MCAT score than a number of minority candidates admitted, the University of California at Davis denied Bakke admissions to the medical school twice. As a result of the medical school’s denial, Bakke filed suit on the basis of reverse discrimination. Bakke contended that the University of California at Davis Medical School violated the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution by maintaining a 16 percent minority quota system. In a closely divided decision, the United States Supreme Court held that race could be one of the factors considered in choosing a diverse student body in admissions decisions. Yet, the use of quotas in such affirmative action programs
was unconstitutional. The Supreme Court concluded that the University of California at Davis had discriminated against Allan Bakke. As a result of the decision, Bakke was admitted to the medical school and graduated in 1992 (Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, 1978).

36. **Segregation:** For the purpose of this study, segregation is defined as a formalized or institutionalized form of discrimination on the basis of race. Segregation involves spatial separation of the races, and/or the use of different institutions, such as schools established for different races (“Segregation,” 2006; “Racial Segregation,” 2006).

37. **Strict Scrutiny:** The term strict scrutiny is used by courts in the United States and is considered the highest standard of judicial review. Strict scrutiny is employed by Courts to weigh an asserted government interest against a constitutional right or policy, such as the infringement of a constitutional right, particularly those listed in the Bill of Rights, or the use of a “suspect classification,” such as race or national origin that may render a government action void under the Equal Protection Clause. There are two requirements to pass strict scrutiny. First, the Courts must determine that the law or policy is justified by a “compelling government interest.” Second, the Courts must determine that in achieving that interest, the “least restrictive means” were used (“Strict Scrutiny,” 2006).

38. **Sweatt v. Painter:** In Sweatt v. Painter (1950), Heman Marion Sweatt, an African-American was refused admissions to the University of Texas Law School. At the time Mr. Sweatt applied to the University of Texas, there were no law schools in Texas that admitted Blacks. To accommodate Mr. Sweatt’s desire to attain a legal education and to comply with the “separate but equal” doctrine of Plessy v. Ferguson (1898), he was offered admissions to an unequal law school established by the State of Texas that was open only to Blacks. Sweatt refused the offer and filed suit under the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. In the Supreme Court’s 1950 decision, Chief Justice Vinson acknowledged the educational importance of Mr. Sweatt attending racially diverse classrooms and the negative implications associated with receiving a professional education in isolation (Moreno, 2000). Consequently, the University of Texas Law School was ordered by the United States Supreme Court to admit Heman Marion Sweatt (Neely, 1997).

39. **Whites:** For the purpose of this study, the term Whites (or White) refers to a person who is of Caucasian heritage, which includes European, Middle Eastern, and North African descent. The term Whites will also be used to describe an ethnicity. Within the context of this study, the term Whites will refer to those individuals who identify themselves as White by virtue of their family’s White heritage and their own cultural identification (“White,” 2006).

40. **Writ of Certiorari:** An order by the United States Supreme Court directing the lower court to forward the records of a case for which it will hear on appeal and render a final decision. In essence, a writ of certiorari is a means of getting an
appellate court to review a lower court’s decision. When an appellate court grants a writ of certiorari, the Court is agreeing to take the appeal (“Writ of Certiorari,” 2006).

Organization of the Remainder of the Study

The remainder of this study is organized in the following manner. Chapter Two is written in seven sections, excluding the introduction and summary. Since research examining the enrollment decision process of African-American law students is non-existent, the first section examines the extensive body of research regarding the different college choice models and the college choice processes of undergraduate students. This section also examines the college selection process of African-American students and graduate students. The second section examines the factors influencing African-Americans enrollment in institutions of higher education. In the third section, a brief literature review will be conducted regarding the effects affirmative action has had on minority enrollment in law schools is reported. The fourth section provides a brief review of the factors influencing the underrepresentation of African-Americans in legal education. The fifth section provides an extensive review of the legal decisions regarding affirmative action in higher education from Plessy to Grutter. The sixth section provides an extensive review regarding policy implications in higher education from Bakke to Grutter. The seventh section addresses the debate regarding diversity in higher education, legal education, and the legal profession. Moreover, this section concludes the chapter by examining the benefits of diversity in higher education, legal education, and the legal profession.

In Chapter Three, Methodology, a general description of the methodology is provided, including a description of the research design, the respondent sample, and the
procedures for collection and analysis of the data. The procedures for collecting data will
include: (1) the survey instrument; (2) the procedure used to request a law school’s
participation; and (4) the procedure used to administer the survey.

Chapter Four, Findings and Analysis of Data, presents an analysis and
interpretation of the data. This chapter includes: (1) an overview of the chapter, (2) a
demographic analysis of the respondents by type of law school, (3) an analysis of the law
school choice factors for respondents by type of law school, gender, and academic year,
(4) a comparison of the law school choice factors for respondents by type of law school,
gender, and academic year, (5) a discussion regarding the influencers in the college
choice process of African-American students, and (6) a discussion of the open-ended
questions for law school respondents and administrators.

Chapter Five, Discussion and Recommendations, provides (1) a discussion of the
findings, (2) recommendations for law school administrators, and (3) recommendations
for future research.
CHAPTER TWO

Review of Literature

Introduction

Over the past 25 years, minority admissions to institutions of higher education appear to parallel developments occurring within the United States. Active effort to recruit, as well as financially and psychologically support minority students, removed formal barriers that resulted in admissions programs that considered race as one criterion in the selection process. However, when it appeared that the results were inadequate, various institutions and the individual schools within them took the next step by creating a “special” admissions program. This “special” admissions program involved setting aside a certain number of slots largely or entirely for minority students (Bailey & Hafner, 1978).

Critics of “special” admissions programs believe that using such methods to recruit minority students compromises the general principle of freedom. When individuals are evaluated according to race, the general principle of freedom is jeopardized. In order to validate this principle, admissions committees need to exclude race as a meaningful category in the selection process; thereby, eliminating racial injustice and the melting pot. The breaking down of these barriers will result in equal competition and individual performance that is evaluated in a straightforward manner without regard to race. Yet, ethnicity is treated in the opposite way by institutions of higher education. Instead, people are being encouraged to identify themselves by ethnic
group (Bailey & Hafner, 1978). Moreover, decisions are being made about them based on their ethnicity, which Bailey and Hafner (1978) state is necessary to build a society where it will not be necessary in the future.

Consequently, when the race criterion is eliminated from the admissions process, the results are indicative of fewer minority students enrolled in institutions of higher education. Why? One important factor is that “standardized test results tend to correlate directly with the socioeconomic level of those taking them; and so some minority groups score consistently lower than whites” (Bailey & Hafner, 1978, p. xv). Another important factor is that middle- and upper-middle class families, neighborhoods, and schools are often viewed as providing a better academic environment that promotes higher expectations of academic achievement (Bailey & Hafner, 1978).

Regardless of the reason, higher education is perceived as an important avenue to social mobility, which complicates the situation. For many occupations of relatively high status and financial reward, educational obtainment is a prerequisite because “it is assumed that in getting an education a person has passed stiff tests, mastered complex challenges, and met exacting standards of achievement” (Bailey & Hafner, 1978, p. xv). Therefore, when it comes to affirmative action, higher education is bound to pose a uniquely sensitive problem. Additionally, steps to take race explicitly into account are apt to seem more inappropriate in higher education than in other areas. In the most prestigious institutions or in professional schools such as law and medicine, this is even more likely to be the case because there is extreme competition to be admitted and because the total available places amount to far less than the demand (Bailey & Hafner, 1978).
According to Jones (1979), both in real numbers and as a percent of all students in higher education, college attendance among Black students within the last 15 years has increased dramatically. Nonetheless, given the underrepresentation of many racial and ethnic groups in higher education today, access to higher education and improving equity in college admissions remains a major educational policy issue (McDonough & Antonio, 1996). An increasing concern in the United States is the status of Blacks in the professions of medicine and law (Prater & Miller, 1989). As a remedy to past inequities, longstanding commitments to affirmative action have been controversial, recently eroded in the courts and vehemently contested in institutional policy contexts such as Bakke v. the Regents of California and Hopwood v. Texas. The purpose of these cases was to overrule university leaders, faculty, and students by eliminating special preferences for underrepresented minorities (McDonough & Antonio, 1996).

Although most institutions of higher education are working to increase their minority enrollment, Farrell (1989) states “the underrepresentation of Blacks and Hispanics is almost nowhere as visible as in the nation’s law schools” (p. 1). In a 1985 study conducted by the Department of Labor, the country had 671,000 lawyers and judges, yet only 22,143, or 3.3 percent, of the nation’s lawyers were Black and only 15,433, or 2.3 percent, were Hispanic. The underrepresentation of Blacks and Hispanics in the nation’s law schools is so dismal that every major legal group has determined that it is a problem that must be addressed and is working with law schools to develop a solution (Farrell, 1989).

Historically, the legal profession has been an area where minorities, especially Blacks, have made little progress. Some perceive this as a major problem because the
lack of Blacks in the legal profession has resulted in a small number of role models. Consequently, one reason for the decline of Black students’ enrollment may be linked to the scarcity of role models, which extends to law school faculties. Although more Blacks have been admitted to law schools, fewer have chosen to matriculate. Therefore, it is difficult to discount the possible correlation that exists between the enrollment of Blacks into law schools and the lack of Black role models and faculties in law schools. In essence, Black students do not want to attend a law school where there are no Blacks or women on the faculty (Farrell, 1989).

To achieve the goal of improving access and equity in the admissions process for minority students involves understanding (1) how to develop and implement an open and fair admissions process; (2) how to make important information available; and (3) how to offer adequate financial aid in order to facilitate unconstrained choice among institutions (McDonough & Antonio, 1996). These concerns inspired this review, which provides (1) an historical perspective of Blacks in higher education and legal education; (2) an understanding of how individuals make choices about college, and (3) an understanding of the factors that influence African-Americans in choosing a law school in the state of Texas.

Little empirical research has been conducted on law students, especially African-American law students relative to college choice. The only quantitative studies that had some bearing on the subject were completed over twenty years ago. These reviews included many resources about legal education in general that failed to provide solutions to the concerns described above (Erickson, 1988, 1990; Goldman, 1972; Moses, 1981; Packer, Ehrlich & Pepper, 1972; Thielens, 1965). Other texts were not helpful in this
endeavor because they were not empirically based (Dvorking, Himmelstein & Lesnick, 1981; Harno, 1953; Reed, 1921) or the questions asked by the researcher or empirical methods employed in the study were limited (Abel, 1989; McFarlane, 1983; Schrader & Pritcher, 1973). Furthermore, most of the literature provided little if any generalizability to law students as a whole (MacFarlane, 1993; McFarlane, 1983; Senger, 1989).

**Review of College Choice Research**

Research examining the enrollment decision process of law students, specifically African-American law students, is non-existent. Therefore, four streams of literature provide an empirical background and research base for the present study. The first two streams of literature examine the extensive body of research regarding the different college choice models and the college choice processes of undergraduate students. The next two streams of literature examine the college selection process of African-American students and graduate students in general.

*College Choice Models*

During the last decade, the interest in student college choice has been driven by several factors. First, public policy issues at the state and federal level related to student financial aid and student access fueled interest in choice research. Second, growing competition for a declining applicant pool of traditional-aged students at the institutional level also fueled interest in college choice research. Recently, not only did researchers begin testing student choice models with a large number of factors, but some of the studies also used students from more than one institution (Hossler & Gallagher, 1987).
The conceptual framework begins with Hossler and Gallagher’s (1987) three-stage developmental model of college choice. The researchers stated that individual and organizational factors interact to produce outcomes at each phase of the student college choice process. The first developmental phase is labeled predisposition. During this phase, students determine whether or not they would like to continue their education beyond high school. Therefore, attending high quality high schools, positive attitudes toward education, early information on financial aid, and institutional costs are all viewed as important factors in the selection process. It is important to note that individual colleges and universities have a modest direct impact on the student’s college choice decision during this phase. Instead, the attitudes of parents and peers have a major influence on the enrollment decision.

The second developmental phase is labeled search. During this phase, institutions and policymakers use a proactive search for students to exert a modest level of influence on the student choice process. The search phase occurs when college bound students proactively seek more information about colleges and universities. For example, what is the academic reputation of the institution and how financially feasible is it for me to attend? The third developmental stage is labeled choice. During this phase, students make their final selection from the available choice set, which range from one institution to several. It is important to note that most colleges and universities have only a minor impact on the decision-making process of students in the choice phase.

D. Chapman (1981) suggested that a student college choice model was influenced by a combination of student characteristics and a series of external influences. D. Chapman (1981) further stated that external influences could be grouped into the
following three categories: “(1) the influence of significant persons; (2) the fixed characteristics of the institution; and (3) the institution’s own efforts to communicate with prospective students” (p. 492). Korczyk (1979) developed a policy-oriented microeconomic model of college selection for undergraduates. This model examined the student’s ability and family income in relation to the prices and financial aid offers of the schools in the student’s opportunity set. Korczyk (1979) further discovered that there was little hope for broadening the range of student choice by means of student aid. The only way that financial aid could be removed as a constraint in the college choice process was if institutions slowed down the rate of price increases.

In a related study, R. Chapman (1979) developed a statistical model of the college choice process based on a marketing paradigm for institutions of higher education that analyzed the effects of price on the college choice decision-making behavior of high school seniors. R. Chapman (1979) further concluded that college quality and price were the two most important factors affecting the college choice process. Although students preferred high quality colleges, they wanted to attend them for as low a net price as possible. Therefore, “colleges should emphasize to admitted students that their school is of high quality and that students will be obtaining value for their dollar” (R. Chapman, 1979, pp. 54-55). Since these pricing decisions have a major impact on how students select a college, institutions of higher education must be thoughtful in regards to the allocation of grants and scholarships for prospective students (R. Chapman, 1979).

Maguire and Lay (1981) developed a college choice model that focused on how prospective students’ images or general perceptions affected their college choice decision. Hence, during the final selection of a college, students’ began matching their
abilities, wants and needs with the images they developed for the institutions to make a decision. Maguire and Lay (1981) further discovered that seven positive factors made the college choice decision more practicable for students. These factors consisted of financial aid, academic programs, size and location of the institution, athletic facilities, social activities, and parental preference. Maguire and Lay (1981) concluded by stating that institutions must be aware of when and what prospective students are thinking during the college choice process if they are going to attract and enroll the “best” freshman class. Maguire and Lay (1981) defined “best” in terms of enrolling a qualified and diverse student body that meets the needs and preferences of the students (p.137).

Cook and Zallocco (1983) expanded on the selection process by presenting a multi-attribute attitude model of student college choice. The objective of the study was to develop a model that universities used to predict which school a student preferred based on the attributes the student believed each university being considered for attendance possessed. Therefore, respondents were asked to evaluate seven universities based on the weight of 18 selection criteria. The results of the data concluded that students’ images of the institutions differed based on whether or not they visited the college. Additionally, the results confirmed Cook and Zallocco’s (1983) argument that “university preferences and attendance can be predicted based on the beliefs about and relative importance of attributes and characteristics of the universities themselves” (pp. 205, 208).

This model was extended when Trusheim, Crouse, and Middaugh (1990) investigated the importance of applicants’ attitudes toward competitor schools. The researchers determined that closeness to home; quality of academics; general reputation;
and quality of programs in the student’s major were the most important attributes for predicting college enrollment. Over the last decade, as the competition to attract students at the university level increased in intensity, schools began conducting admissions surveys not only to determine how applicants perceived their institutions, but also to determine what role the institution’s’ ranking played in the college choice process (Cook & Zallocco, 1983; Trusheim, Crouse, & Middaugh, 1990).

*Undergraduate College Choice Studies*

According to Bailey and Hafner (1978), the question regarding why high school students choose to attend college is not an easy one to answer. However, some theorists and researchers believe that a student’s ability, their high school records, race, religion, sex, and parents’ socioeconomic status not only have a bearing on a student’s decision to attend college and the factors influencing a student’s choice of college, but also they are interrelated in ways that are difficult to untangle. Bailey and Hafner (1978) stated that some of the factors generally identified as influencing a student’s college choice at the undergraduate level included: (1) parents, (2) the academic reputation and athletic reputation of the institution, (3) geographic location, and (4) institutions that consist of students whose intellectual abilities and interests are similar to their own. The researchers further asserted that since there is a great variety of postsecondary institutions and the lack of adequate and realistic information regarding these characteristics, the choice of which college to attend presents a difficult challenge for most students (Bailey & Hafner, 1978).

Such a difficult challenge over the past fifteen years has created a growing interest in the factors leading to a student’s selection of an institution of higher education.
According to D. Chapman (1981), the tremendous pressure placed on college administrators to find more effective ways to attract students is directly related to the sharp decline in college applications and subsequent enrollments. Therefore, many institutions of higher education are committing substantial funds to develop more sophisticated marketing strategies, better recruitment literature, and more appealing programs. These efforts are based on the belief that if colleges merely modify their institutional descriptions and/or the targeting of their recruiting, they hold the ability to affect a student’s choice of college.

While there has been an abundance of research examining the factors affecting a student’s level of educational aspiration and his/her decision regarding whether or not to attend college, little if any attention has been given to a student’s choice of which college to attend. Several explanations have been given for this lack of research. First, college administrators were not particularly worried about specific influences on a student’s choice of college during the time when college enrollments were growing. Instead, administrators were emphasizing selection rather than recruitment during the admissions process. Second, a lack of theory provided little if any guidance for investigations regarding college choice. Instead, the majority of the models developed were concerned with predicting the impact of institutional enrollments due to changes in federal student financial aid. In essence, research regarding college choice was rather late in comparison to research on students’ decision about whether or not to attend college (D. Chapman, 1981).

During the mid 1970s, administrators’ curiosity increased regarding why students select specific institutions. According to Kotler (1975), “the days when the educational
product was unanimously praised and regarded by everyone as needed and desired are gone” (p. 361). Kotler (1975) further emphasized that marketing techniques not only improved institutional image, but also retained or even improved enrollments. Therefore, institutional administrators must begin by understanding their consumers, i.e., students. This first step was important because most of the current studies on college choice were attempts to understand the consumer. For example, why do students want to buy a particular type of product, such as college?

Although previous studies revealed that a variety of reasons influence the choice of a particular institution, many of the same factors surfaced despite the institution and population under study. McDill and Coleman (1965) conducted the first of two studies that analyzed the relative effects of socio-economic background and peer influences on the selection process. McDill and Coleman’s (1965) analysis concluded that by the end of the senior year in high school, the social climate of the high school was a potent force in the shaping of the college selection process.

In contrast, Kandel and Lesser (1970) determined in a similar study that even though parents and school friends (peers) both had a major influence on the educational plans of adolescents, parents were more influential than peers. Although Kandel and Lesser (1970) differed on the relative effects of socio-economic background and peer influences on the selection process, both articles concluded that those school contexts in which college attendance was highly valued and rewarded in the adolescent social system, the more the importance of status in school increased at the expense of the contribution of the family background. Hence, the importance of social status in regards to college choice varied according to the social climate of the school (McDill &
Coleman, 1965). In 1976, Baird conducted a study to determine what role the quality factors of the institution played in the college choice decision of prospective undergraduate students.

Fenske and Boyd (1971) analyzed the extent to which state financial aid enabled a student to select a private college versus a public college. The researchers also discussed the effects of this choice on the financing and structure of an institution of higher education. Fenske and Boyd (1971) concluded that financial aid enabled a large number of students to select and to enroll in private colleges who otherwise would have enrolled in less expensive colleges. Blau (1974) investigated the factors that influence faculty and student recruitment. The researcher determined that an institution’s ability to attract good students revolved around the following factors: (1) the region of the country in which the institution is located; (2) the age of the institution; (3) whether the institution has a religious affiliation; (4) the institution’s affluence regarding revenue per student; (5) the size of the institution; (6) the extent of the institution’s graduate training programs; and (7) the institution’s formal structure, such as the number of departments and the number of administrative levels in the hierarchy.

In an effort to serve current students and attract prospective students, Gorman (1976) analyzed students’ views of the University’s recruiting methods and features. It was determined that location and/or size were the dominant motives of attending students in the selection process. The study further indicated that a good faculty, a good academic reputation, and high academic standards were important factors to attending students. Financial aid was also considered a strong motive in the selection process.
Sevier (1987) reported similar results regarding how students choose a college, particularly, a private liberal arts college. Sevier (1987) stated that “prestige, parents and large color photos may be more influential than you think” (p. 46). Sevier’s (1987) results were derived from two studies conducted between 1985 and 1987, which concluded that academic reputation ranked first among the factors that influenced a student’s college selection. In order of importance, other factors consisted of student/faculty ratio; access to faculty; campus visits; number of students; appearance of campus; availability of specific majors; geographic location; job and graduate school placement records; and correspondence from the institution. Likewise, Hayes (1989) chronicled how students chose a college based on a qualitative approach rather than a quantitative approach. The objective of the study was to better understand how college choices were made by probing for the motivation and reasoning behind students’ college choices. The study was divided into two stages. The first stage was identified as “first cut” in which students’ perceptions of the institutions were analyzed in logical quantifiable measures. The second stage was identified as “gut reaction” which revolved around campus visits.

Similar to Sevier (1987), Hayes (1989) discovered that the reputation of the college ranked first among the factors that influenced a student’s college selection. In the study, students evaluated and defined the reputation of the college by which of their former classmates attended the institution. For example, when classmates who were perceived as highly intelligent and hard working attended a given college, the academic reputation of the institution was viewed as excellent. In contrast, when classmates who were less respected for their intelligence attended a given college, the institution was
viewed as having a poor academic reputation. The students also identified the following chief influencers on their initial decision process: (1) friends and older siblings; (2) parents; (3) materials mailed to students and materials available in guidance counselors offices; and (4) guidance counselors themselves. The most important source of information was friends’ and siblings’ experiences because of similar backgrounds and interests. Holmes, Crosby and Stahl (1989) also conducted a study to evaluate the influence that distance from home; perceived quality of education; type of majors offered; tuition/housing costs; and potential campus social climate had on the students’ college selection process of public institutions.

Hunneycutt, Lewis and Wibker (1990) discussed the problems and benefits of involving marketing faculty to assist in the enrollment management process. In order to develop a more comprehensive understanding of the college selection process, the dean of admissions and a marketing professor conducted a series of studies at a public university. More than half of the students surveyed stated that the following factors were important in choosing a university: (1) curriculum desired; (2) cost; (3) closeness to home; (4) academic standards; (5) brochures; (6) campus visits; (7) high school counselors; (8) scholarships; (9) university representatives; and (10) parents and family. In an effort to maintain a satisfactory flow of students in institutions of higher education, most admissions officers recognized the importance and proper role of marketing among university officials.

The influence of student background variables on college choice has been documented extensively in a number of empirical studies. For example, Zemsky and Oedel (1983) analyzed the effect of demographic and economic events on the current
structure of college choice. The researchers concluded that the college choice process was viewed as a family affair in which the tradition of selecting a college took on a ritual air of participation in college nights, travel to distant campuses, and attendance at school-sponsored meetings. Although parents’ choices tended to reflect the limits of family income, students’ preferences were more sensitive to the opinions of peers and the need to maintain a sense of belonging. Ultimately, students’ and parents’ considerations were molded into a single choice set before graduation. However, Zemsky and Oedel (1983) noted that students still had the largest voice in which college they attended.

Galotti and Mark (1994) developed a study to analyze students’ thinking patterns during the college choice process. The researchers’ primary objective was to describe how the college decision-making process of high school students unfolds over the course of a year. Students’ reported using the following criteria during the college choice process: (1) academic factors such as admissions requirements and course offerings; (2) institutional factors such as campus atmosphere, class size and student/faculty ratio; (3) financial factors such as cost and financial aid; and (4) personal/social factors such as distance from home, parents’/friends’ advice, and peers/friends at school. Comm and LaBay (1996) conducted an exploratory study to evaluate the various types of perceived risks that students incurred during the college choice process, such as financial, social, psychological, and performance risk. The researchers determined that the following attributes/factors were ranked high in importance to students: (1) a good academic reputation; (2) high quality programs and faculty; (3) affordability; (4) an extensive choice of courses; (5) a good job placement program; and (6) well managed facilities. Comm and LaBay (1996) further asserted that once institutions ascertained what factors
were important to their target market, “colleges and universities should focus on the concept of quality as a means of reducing risk perception to the students” (p. 23).

Martin (1996) developed a study to investigate the relationship between students’ perceptions and institutional characteristics during the college selection process. Respondents ranked the following institutional characteristics as strongly affecting their college choice decision: (1) career preparation; (2) academic programs; (3) distance from home; (4) academic reputation; (5) the quality of the school’s research program; and (6) library resources. Martin further stated that in this highly competitive market, most institutions of higher education are experiencing the scarce demand for students. Consequently, “this competition for enrollments will be won by institutions who know themselves, who know their appeal, who know their potential students, and who know how to reach them with messages that are consistent with institutional goals” (Comm & LaBay, 1996, p. 22).

College Choice Studies and Ethnicity

During the past four decades, college attendance and college choice have received considerable scholarly attention. One major omission is a detailed study on college choice related to ethnicity. Litten (1982) provided evidence on how the college selection process differs for various types of students. For example, Litten (1982) noted that Lewis and Morrison (1975) found that Blacks appeared to start their college-selection process later than Whites. Additionally, Blacks appeared to consider more schools during the college selection process for a longer period of time than Whites. Lewis and Morrison (1975) further noted that Blacks were significantly more likely to be interested in
students’ social backgrounds and more likely to consider financial aid as a very important factor in the college selection process.

Tinto (1987) found that social atmosphere was an important determinant in college persistence. Therefore, orientation programs should provide incoming students with an accurate glimpse of the social and intellectual communities which exist on campus. Suen (1983) asserted that the attrition rate of Black students on predominantly White campuses was substantially higher than White students due to strong feelings of alienation and social estrangement. The study further concluded that academic variables were the major factors in the college attrition of Black students. Pascarella (1985) stated that the attrition rate of Black students is strongly tied to academic problems and poor grade performance. The author further stated that social integration was a strong predictor of degree attainment for Black students.

Crosson (1988) stated that many factors affect the complex process of college choice and individual degree attainment, such as: (1) faculty and staff behavior and attitudes; (2) financial aid; (3) admissions and recruitment; (4) curricular and academic programs; (5) student life; (6) the prevailing culture and climate of the campus; and (7) the dynamics between various subcultures and the dominant campus culture. The researcher further asserted that the college selection process and degree attainment of minority students were adversely affected by negative racial climates. In addition, campus climates that were perceived to be negative “can affect an institution’s ability to attract minority students” (p. 381). Crosson (1988) concluded that racial climates on many college and university campuses were unhealthy. As a result of these unhealthy
climates, “many minority students perceive predominantly white campuses as hostile to their interest and needs” (p. 381).

The increase in racial incidents on college and university campuses has higher education administrators deeply concerned across the country. The two primary concerns are (1) putting an end to racial incidents; and (2) educating the affected campus communities about civility and diversity. These racial incidents and how they are handled can have serious consequences on college campuses. One possible consequence is that students of color choose not to attend institutions that have highly publicized racial incidents (Oteri & Malaney, 1990).

Coccari and Javalgi (1995) conducted a study to assess the needs and wants of students of different races and backgrounds. The objective was to determine if the choice criteria differed among White, Afro-American, and Hispanic students during the college selection process. Although the study clearly revealed that differences exist among students of different races with respect to needs and wants in selecting a college, the findings strongly indicated quality faculty as the most important decision factor in considering a college. The findings also revealed that financial aid and costs were more important factors in selecting a college for Afro-Americans and Asian/Pacific students than for their White counterparts. For a college that is striving to competitively attract a larger number of students of different races and backgrounds, faculty members’ excellence in teaching and research, financial aid, and costs play an important role.

During the college decision process, many adolescents and their families are faced with an important and difficult life decision. Often, this is the first major financial, educational, social, and vocational decision for which they accept total responsibility.
The complexity of choosing a college forces students to seek out and integrate information from various sources. Therefore, it is important for researchers to continue studying the college choice process both in practical and theoretical contexts (Galotti & Mark, 1994).

*Graduate School Admissions Studies*

Once the decision to attend a graduate or professional school has been made, the college selection process assumes major importance. Similar to those of undergraduate students, many factors influence a graduate student’s college choice decision. Some of these factors include (1) expense; (2) geographic location; (3) admissions requirements; (4) availability of financial aid; (5) size of the institution; and (6) campus atmosphere. According to the National Board of Graduate Education (NBGE), factors that students applying to a graduate program should consider include (1) the placement experience of recent graduates; (2) the prospect of financial aid while enrolled in the institution; (3) information concerning labor market prospects in the discipline of interest; and (4) the attrition rates of the institution. In addition, the size and prestige of the institution should be carefully considered in the college choice process. Not only are smaller institutions viewed as less prestigious, but also as offering bleak or limited job prospects. In contrast, larger institutions are viewed as more prestigious and as having larger endowments at their disposal to assist graduate students financially (Bailey & Hafner, 1978).

Olson and King (1985) stated that the available body of research, which discusses the multiple factors that influence the college selection process of prospective graduate students, is non-existent. Underlying reasons for this lack of emphasis in the graduate selection process revolves around (1) the open admissions movement, which aimed at
increasing the number of bachelor degree holders; and (2) the philosophy that graduate education is for the elite, thus only the “cream of the crop” should receive a graduate degree. Since graduate enrollments and resources to support graduate education have been stagnant in most public institutions, interest in examining the factors that influence the graduate college selection process has been scarce.

Olson and King (1985) conducted an exploratory study to develop a model of college choice regarding prospective graduate students. The objective of the study was to establish a preliminary baseline of data based on two dimensions of the graduate students’ decision process. The first dimension involved the initial consideration of institutions. The second dimension involved the ultimate decision to enroll in one particular institution. Additionally, the researchers assumed that the ultimate decision to enroll in one institution over another might be affected by intervening variables. The preliminary model of graduate students’ choice specified four major factors as influencing the initial consideration of a graduate school: (1) geographic location; (2) personal contact with faculty; (3) the reputation of the department; and (4) educational costs.

Olson and King (1985) also reported that the following factors were most important to prospective graduate students when making the ultimate decision to enroll at a particular institution: (1) a positive interaction with university personnel during the decision process, and (2) personal reasons, such as marriage, employment of spouse, children in the school system, and size of the community. The researchers further indicated that there were significant differences among the factors related to the initial consideration of an institution, such as (1) the amount of the graduate assistantship and
stipend; (2) the influence of one’s undergraduate advisor; (3) the cost of attendance, such as tuition and fees, room and board, books, transportation and miscellaneous expenses; and (4) whether the respondent had a previous degree from the university. Employment in the community or surrounding area represented the strongest determinant in a student’s ultimate decision to enroll in a graduate institution.

Malaney (1987) stated that the decrease in the number of students between the ages of eighteen and twenty-two increased interest in student recruitment at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. In a study of over 1,000 new graduate students, the researcher found that students pursued a graduate education more frequently to fulfill their desire to learn more and to achieve personal satisfaction rather than to accomplish job related goals. Findings also indicated that students chose a particular institution primarily because of its good academic reputation. The next two factors that graduate students considered most important were financial aid and geographic location. Malaney (1987) stated that in order for institutions to develop an adequate recruiting strategy, administrators must first understand what motivates students. For example, females were concerned more about geographic location, while males were concerned more about the reputation of the department and the knowledge base of the undergraduate faculty. Likewise, geographic location was the primary concern for White students, while financial aid was the primary concern for non-White students.

Kallio (1995) reported that graduate students’ decisions were affected by some of the same factors influencing undergraduate students. The following factors were found to influence both undergraduate and graduate students’ college choice decisions: (1) the academic reputation of the institution; (2) program quality and size; (3) price; (4)
financial aid; (5) residency status; (6) contact with faculty; and (7) individual student characteristics, such as academic ability and achievement. The researcher further asserted that graduate students differed from undergraduate students regarding work and spouse considerations. For example, the education and career plans of a spouse or partner had a major influence during the college selection process of a graduate student.

Factors Influencing African-Americans Enrollment in Institutions of Higher Education

“Why students in general choose the colleges they do remains a mystery, even after extensive research; the question will not quickly or easily be answered when rephrased to ask why black students in particular choose or do not choose to attend a predominantly white institution” (Jones, 1979, p. 1) Unfortunately, the likelihood of finding the answer to this question is implausible (Jones, 1979). A more improbable question entails why Black students in particular choose to attend a Texas law school? Previous studies revealed that a variety of reasons influence the choice of a particular institution both at the undergraduate and professional level. While the most influential factors varied depending upon the institution and the population under study, many of the same factors surfaced, such as (1) academic reputation of the institution; (2) geographic location; (3) financial aid; (4) social atmosphere; (5) total cost of attending; and (5) the number of minority faculty, staff, and administrators.

Factors Influencing African-Americans Enrollment at the Undergraduate Level

Currently, African-Americans are considered the largest minority group in the nation, representing approximately 12.5 percent of the total United States population. It is estimated that by the year 2010, the African-American population will increase by 31
percent. Over the past four decades, the number of African-Americans of college age increased dramatically. Between 1982 and 1992, African-Americans experienced small increases in both the number of students enrolling in college and the number of degrees conferred. Yet, the educational attainment of African-American students still lags behind the national average.

In 1991, approximately 12 percent of the African-American adults between the ages of 18 and 25 completed four or more years of college when compared to the national average of 21 percent. However, this figure was insignificant when compared to the number of White students between the ages of 18 and 25 who completed four or more years of college. The figures also indicated that from 1982 to 1992 more African-American women (33 percent) enrolled in college than African-American men (17 percent). In 1991, there were 1.3 million African-Americans attending institutions of higher education. While the majority of them attended either community colleges (43 percent) or comprehensive universities (30 percent), 17 percent were enrolled in doctoral-granting institutions; six percent were enrolled in baccalaureate colleges, and four percent were enrolled in specialized institutions of higher education (Otuya, 1994).

McDonough and Antonio (1996) stated that the “college choice variables at the undergraduate level provide a general picture of students’ relative college preferences” (p. 15). Generally, most students reported three primary reasons for attending college: (1) to make more money; (2) to get a good job; and (3) to prepare for graduate or professional school. Additionally, most undergraduate students listed academic reputation and the assurance of being admitted to top graduate or professional schools as primary determinants in the college selection process. In contrast, African-Americans,
more than any other subgroup, attend college in hopes of obtaining economic mobility. During the college selection process, the idea of attending a top graduate or professional school was not a primary consideration for most African-American students. Instead, African-American students were more concerned about receiving financial aid from the institution and being recruited as an athlete (McDonough & Antonio, 1996).

According to Sevier (1992), the four college choice items of most interest to African-American undergraduate students were reputation of the college, availability of a specific major, total cost of attending, and availability of financial aid. Conversely, these students were less interested in factors relating to size of the library, family ties to the college, computer resources, religious activities, volunteer programs, and study abroad programs. To a lesser degree, African-American students were interested in: (1) the availability of counselors and peer tutors of similar ethnic backgrounds; (2) faculty and administrators of the same ethnic background; (3) the opportunity to explain their cultural heritage to others; (4) social activities geared specifically toward their interests; (5) campus clubs/organizations that support the cultural heritage of African-Americans; (6) the opportunity for internships with diverse ethnic populations; and (7) the opportunity to study with specific cultural groups in cities with diverse ethnic populations.

Jones’ (1979) study indicated that the majority of African-American students acknowledged their institutions as having a “good reputation in their home communities – a factor presumably influencing their college choice” (p. 6). Other factors also indicated that enrollment decisions were not solely based on the encouragement of parents, teachers, counselors, or alumni. Nor did it appear that the respondents chose an institution either to be with friends or to remain close to home. Three-fourths of the
respondents stated that financial aid was the most important factor in the college selection process.

The majority of the financing for these respondents came primarily from federal grants and loans, college or university grants and loans, parents’ earnings or savings, and/or a combination thereof. In addition, respondents reiterated the importance and need for increasing the number of minority faculty, staff, and administrators; as well as the need for sponsoring more minority-oriented cultural and social events on campus. Most of the respondents viewed Black faculty and administrators as generally more supportive of Black students’ activities and needs. In contrast, the faculty as a whole (the majority presumably White) was viewed as less than helpful, a bit biased, and less than knowledgeable about minority contributions in their fields of study (Jones, 1979).

According to Thomas (1998), the differential pattern of college attendance and college choice among Black students stemmed from family and background characteristics such as socio-economic status. For example, Blacks had an equal or higher probability of attending college as White students when the controlling factors were income and academic performance. Hence, the rising costs of college and the different options available for financing a college education increased the importance of a family’s socio-economic status. The researcher stated that for students of color, their family’s financial resources were the primary determinant between wanting to go to college and actual enrollment.

Financial aid was an important factor in the college choice process because many Black families had fewer assets and access to the finances needed for higher education. Thomas (1998) further contended that another crucial element in the decline of Black
enrollment rates during the 1980s was the shift from grants to loans at a time when the poverty level of minority families was steadily increasing. The lack of knowledge and/or misinformation about financial aid programs at the local, state, and federal levels also complicated the situation and created a downward spiral in Black enrollment rates.

Thomas (1998) and Otuya (1994) acknowledged that Black females were more likely to attend college than Black males because of the: (1) differences in achievement levels, grades, and educational aspirations; (2) family structure; (3) different employment opportunities for men and women; and (4) different experiences and expectations in school. Thus, parental involvement in the college selection process emerged as a significant predictor of Black female students. While a direct relationship existed between ethnicity, gender, socio-economic status, high school program, and test scores, the most important predictor of Black students’ enrollment in a four-year institution was socio-economic status. In essence, Black students from less affluent backgrounds were less likely to continue their education beyond high school (Thomas, 1998).

In conclusion, McDonough, Antonio, and Trent (1997) developed an African-American College Choice Model that provided insight into the decision-making process of African-Americans, particularly, “why students choose Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs)” (p. 10). The study indicated that geographic location was the most powerful predictor of why African-American students attended an HBCU. A second predictor in the college selection process of African-American students at HBCUs was personal affiliations, such as friends, parents, and role models. African-American students also had a tendency to select an HBCU to become more cultured. Other predictors that were important in the college selection process included the student’s
religious affiliation, the social reputation of the school, and the desires of relatives (McDonough, Antonio, & Trent, 1997).

In contrast, being recruited by an athletic department, the desire to live close to home, and the college’s academic reputation were the top three reasons African-American students chose to attend a predominantly White institution (PWI). African-American students also attended predominantly White institutions because they were offered financial aid, they were advised to attend by a high school counselor, and the institution offered a special academic program of interest to the student. It was important to note that the PWI factors were more closely associated with either financial concerns or the academic reputation of the institution. It was also important to note that the attraction of HBCUs was different and appeared more closely tied to the social aspects of the institution and family concerns (McDonough, Antonio, & Trent, 1997).

Factors Influencing African-Americans Enrollment at the Graduate Level

Although doors to select colleges and universities have opened to students of color, the issue of race and education that fueled the Civil Rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s has not vanished. Dissimilar to thirty years ago, the battles for educational equality are nonviolent. For Black students pursing graduate degrees, twenty-first century battles for educational equality consist of battles that are quiet, yet intense. Prior to 1970, the number of Blacks in graduate education was nominal and the challenges Blacks faced attempting to enter graduate programs failed to make many research agendas (Ellis, 2001). Brown (1988) indicated that there has been a recent decline in Black participation at the graduate level in higher education. According to Black and Hispanic students, one of the major reasons institutions of higher education have
difficulty recruiting and retaining minority students is the lack of faculty role models. Brown (1988) contended that the presence of Black faculty was the most important factor in determining whether Black students attended graduate and professional schools.

During the 1980s, African-Americans suffered a 20 percent decrease in graduate enrollments. Yet, from 1990 to 1995, more African-Americans earned doctorates than in previous years. Nevertheless, the overall percentage of African-Americans earning doctoral degrees remained low (Thompson, 1999). According to Carter and Wilson (1993), in Texas, the proportion of African-Americans enrolled in graduate education declined slightly from 6.2 percent in 1980 to 5.3 percent in 1990. The researchers further stated that “the actual number of African Americans pursuing advanced degrees in 1990 remained abysmally low, and the number completing degrees declined” (Carter & Wilson, p. 27). Between 1982 and 1992, the number of African-Americans actually earning doctoral degrees declined nine percent in the state of Texas. In contrast, the number of Asian Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans actually earning doctoral degrees increased by approximately 50 percent. In 1992, African-Americans were identified as the minority group least likely to be planning postdoctoral study (Ottinger, Sikula & Washington, 1993).

In the early 1980s, Black students remained highly underrepresented in graduate and professional schools nationwide. Despite the major affirmative action efforts employed in the 1970s, not only were Black student enrollments in graduate education declining, but they also remained stagnant in professional schools. While knowing the status and conditions of African-Americans in higher education is important, identifying the factors that affect the success of Black students in higher education is equally
important. Therefore, the enrollment and degree attainment of African-Americans can be classified into three categories: institutional, environmental, and motivational (Thomas, 1987).

Institutional Factors. Institutional factors are those external to what Black students bring to the higher education environment. These institutional characteristics include higher education recruitment and retention practices, the availability and types of financial aid offered to Black students, and academic support. Institutional recruitment practices and admissions policies are major determinants in whether or not Black students succeed in enrolling in a college. For example, “the social class and racial composition of recruitment and admissions officers, their knowledge and perceptions of Black students, and their experiences in dealing with Black students clearly shape the recruitment of Black students” (Thomas, 1987, p. 276). In addition, the weight assigned to various admissions criteria and the differences in recruitment strategies equally affect “who goes to college” (Thomas, 1987, p. 276).

Brown (1987) contends that other factors govern the access of minority students to graduate education. The enrollment of minorities in higher education is increasingly being determined by their performance on standardized achievement tests such as the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) and the Graduate Record Examination (GRE). Even though the standardized test scores of Blacks increased overall in the 1980s, Black students’ scores were still below the national average (Thomas, 1987). In the last two decades, the admissions standards to public colleges and universities have increased in approximately 30 states that use the SAT and GRE as criteria in the selection and
admissions process. Unfortunately, rising admissions standards often occur at the expense of minority students (Brown, 1987; Jaschik, 1987).

Robert H. Atwell, the president of the American Council on Education, pleaded with colleges and universities to cease using standardized tests in the admissions process. Mr. Atwell asserted that standardized tests discriminate against students who work hard, yet score poorly on the tests. Additionally, standardized tests have a tendency to reward students who pay little attention to their studies, but perform well on the tests. Mr. Atwell concluded by implying that “society should value the people who work hard, not just score well” (Jaschik, 1987, p. A32).

Not only does poor performance on standardized achievement tests increase Black students difficulty of entering graduate schools, but also affects the types of financial aid that will be awarded to the students. At the graduate level, graduate assistantships, stipends, and scholarships are awarded based on the Graduate Record Examination (GRE). When Black students perform poorly on standardized tests, they are ineligible for these types of financial aid, which often impedes their ability to enroll in a doctoral program (Thomas, 1987; King & Cheypator-Thomson, 1996). According to Trent and Copeland (1988), financial support that covered the costs of graduate school was an important factor in the assessment of African-Americans’ access to and completion of doctoral programs.

In comparison to loans, grants were perceived as having a positive effect on the college admissions and retention of Black students because it was money that did not have to be repaid. Conversely, loans had a negative effect because many Black students had above-average family obligations and debts. Unfortunately, as the costs of tuition
and obtaining a graduate degree increases, the availability of grant aid is decreasing due to limited funding from the federal and state governments. Obviously, the types of financial aid that students receive influence not only Black students’ choice of college, but also their choice of major in graduate and professional schools. For example, the cost of attendance (tuition and fees, room and board, books, transportation and miscellaneous expenses) is greater for Black students pursuing medical and law degrees. Therefore, Black students attending medical and law schools are more likely to incur more loan debt than students pursuing other majors (Thomas, 1987).

Thomas (1981) stated that the lack of financial aid was a major impediment for Black students seeking advanced graduate and professional degrees. Historically, both federal and state governments have provided less financial support to low-income graduate students than undergraduate students. This shortage of state and federal financial aid has created negative effects on the enrollment of Blacks in graduate programs and the college selection process. Thomas (1987) believes that the decline in grant aid and the reliance on loans to fund higher education degrees increases the probability that for many Black students, undergraduate, graduate and professional education will cease to be an option in the future. For three decades, several factors have affected the college selection process of African-American students in relation to graduate programs. The primary determinants were the availability of financial aid, lower tuition costs and academic support (Thompson, 1999; Talbot, Maier & Rushlau, 1996; King & Cheypator-Thomson, 1996).

Environmental Factors. Environmental factors consist of campus climate, role models/mentors, and family support. These outside factors influence the enrollment
decisions and degree attainment of African-American students considering graduate education (King and Cheypator-Thomson, 1996). Although Black students have won access to White institutions, they discovered that White campuses were often hostile environments (Farrell, 1988). Wilson and Justiz (1988) contended that minorities were deterred from pursuing graduate degrees due to a hostile environment and prohibitive costs. On predominantly White campuses, some graduate students reported suffering from depression, loneliness and alienation, which were major variables related to the attrition rate of Black students. Some of these symptoms stemmed from being the only Black student in the program and from experiencing subtle racism on campus (King, 1994; Wilson & Justiz, 1988; Exum, 1983; Beckham, 1988; Fleming, 1984). Mary Frances Berry, a member of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, further stated that campus climate “will influence the choices that Black students make on whether to go to college and what college to attend, [therefore], colleges and universities ought to be about the business of educating people in [a] more civilized behavior” (Farrell, 1988, p. A37).

In a study conducted by King (1994), it was determined that a supportive advisor was crucial to the success of a Black doctoral student. Yet, there are few minority professors, students, administrators, organizations or activities on predominantly White campuses. Not only must Black students struggle with coursework and research, but they must also struggle to find a place in a culture that is not their own. Hence, each of the respondents stated that the presence and support of African-American mentors might have contributed to a more positive doctoral experience. It was their belief that not only would a Black professor be more nurturing, but also would exhibit a greater concern for and understanding of Black students’ problems. In addition, minority role models would
lend support and guidance because they would be aware of African-American students’ specific needs. They would model the behaviors African-American students would need to adopt in order to be successful in a doctoral program. One African-American respondent stated “that a strong support system prevented her from sinking into emotional depression and academic mediocrity” (p. 3).

Sadly, most institutions of higher education are inadequate at meeting the needs of minority students. These inadequacies stem from White institutions rejecting the notion that Blacks and other minorities indeed have special needs that must be addressed in order for them to successfully meet the academic demands of the university. For example, African-Americans need (1) a sustained sense of self-worth and self-esteem; (2) encouraging and supportive minority faculty, administrators, and student peers, (3) a campus climate that celebrates diversity, and (4) adequate financial assistance to ensure that financial aid is not an overwhelming barrier to a graduate and professional education (Beckham, 1988; Farrell, 1988; Green, 1989).

Motivational Factors. Two widely recognized and crucial ingredients in the attainment of educational success are ambition and the drive to achieve excellence. Yet, individuals who possess these two ingredients still experience wide differences in their levels of accomplishment. Thus, we must take into account the intensity of their achievement-motives to understand why some people are more successful than others. “Achievement is [a] task-oriented behavior that allows the individual’s performance to be evaluated according to some internally or externally imposed criterion, that involves the individual in competing with others, or that otherwise involves some standard of excellence” (Spence & Helmreich, 1983, p. 12). It is believed that motivational factors
prompt individuals to achieve goals. These factors consist of attitudes, beliefs, and values (King & Cheypator-Thomson, 1996).

Achievement motivation is a multidimensional phenomenon that can be intrinsic or extrinsic and consists of “stable dispositional tendencies to approach success or to avoid failure” (Spence, 1983, p. 4). Not only do individuals who are jointly motivated by intrinsic and extrinsic motives choose their jobs or plan their whole educational careers, but they also maximize the probability that they will obtain the monetary rewards or the kinds of recognition and prestige to which they aspire. For example, an individual may choose to become a physician instead of a biologist with a Ph.D. because M.D.’s are considered “real doctors” and because they tend to be more highly regarded by many segments of society. Additionally, “real doctors” earn higher incomes than “mere” doctors of philosophy (Spence & Helmreich, 1983). According to Murray (1938), the need to achieve is best described as follows:

[The desire] to accomplish something difficult. To master, manipulate, or organize physical objects, human beings, or ideas. To do this as rapidly, and as independently as possible. To overcome obstacles and attain a high standard. To excel one’s self. To rival and surpass others. To increase self-regard by the successful exercise of talent” (p. 164).

The author further contended that fame; glory; ambition; and power were all sentiments of achievement. Fame and glory were sentiments of achievement not only because they were viewed as life-giving breath and living blood; but also because until a man was famous, he had not lived. In addition, men who stood out from the rest were viewed not only as being powerful, but also ambitious. Murray (1938) concluded by stating that “only ambition will bring a man’s mind into full activity” (p. 165).

Cohen (1985) referred to intrinsic motivation as activity in which people sought out and conquered challenges to fulfill a genuine need to be competent and self-
determining. For example, “the question of self-determination could be expressed as, Why am I doing this?” (Pittman & Boggiano, 1992, p 4). When extrinsic incentives such as social approval or monetary compensation were present, the willingness to embark on an achievement-oriented activity, such as the pursuit of a graduate or professional degree, increased at any given moment (Pittman & Boggiano, 1992). Deci and Ryan (1992) further contended that extrinsic motivation plays an increasingly critical role in learning and achievement, especially, as children grow older and enter institutional settings. Thus, an individual’s sense of competence and self-determination can be influenced by environmental factors, such as campus climate.

Yet the question still remains, what effect does the absence of extrinsic incentives have on an individual’s willingness to undertake certain activities, such as graduate or professional study? Deci and Ryan (1992) found that not only do intrinsically motivated people choose the activities in which they engage, but also they choose how to carry out those activities, which leaves them feeling self-determined and further enhances their intrinsic motivation. In contrast, Pittman and Boggiano (1992) asserted that extrinsically motivated people exhibit achievement-oriented behavior based upon some of the following external incentives: (1) social approval; (2) the obtainment of a graduate or professional degree; (3) a promotion; (4) tenure; or (5) monetary compensation.

Factors Influencing African-Americans Enrollment at the Professional Level (Law School)

According to Ehrenberg (1996), statistical information regarding the origins of recent African-American graduates attending American law schools was unavailable. Publicly, however, unpublished data were provided by the Law School Admission
Services. These data pertained to the number of African-American law school applicants entering top schools for the past decade. In reviewing these data, it was determined that Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) played a major role in educating African-American students seeking a legal degree. During the early 1980s, it is estimated that 50 percent of America’s Black lawyers and 80 percent of America’s Black judges were educated at Historically Black Colleges and Universities because these institutions were the only options for most Black students.¹

Of the 188 American Bar Association accredited law schools, only four were currently located at Historically Black Colleges and Universities. These law schools included: Howard, North Carolina Central, Southern, and Texas Southern University. Moreover, these law schools are known for having a long history of producing African-American lawyers. It was estimated that 12 percent of all African-American law students were attending Historically Black Colleges and Universities in the fall of 1993. Yet, “the proportion of law school students who are African-American is higher among first- and second-tier law schools than it is nationwide” (Ehrenberg, 1996, p. 118). Additionally, the Black graduates of these schools had the highest post-law school earnings, which was a major factor in choosing a law school. A second factor involved leadership in the legal profession. One way to measure a law school’s success was to examine its record of producing leaders in the profession, such as judges. A third factor involved financial pressures that had the ability to limit these graduates’ selection process and completion of the program (Ehrenberg, 1996).

¹ Yet today, a smaller percentage of academically strong Black students are matriculating at Historically Black Colleges and Universities. This is a result of major predominantly White universities opening their doors to Black students.
While little empirical research has been conducted in regards to African-American law students and the college choice process, Mort and Moskowitz’s (1994) interviews of 19 American Law Schools indicated that the following factors were important to African-Americans in selecting a college: (1) scholarships; (2) supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations; (3) assurances of employment; (4) wide-ranging curriculums that provide more job choices after graduation; and (5) Black processors that would be potential mentors. The article further stated that there was considerable evidence to support the choice of Harvard Law School as the best law school for Blacks, and if this is the case, where does this leave law schools in the state of Texas. Harvard was chosen as the best law school primarily because it had a strong Black student enrollment, five Black faculty members, and a powerful alumni network that virtually guaranteed graduates access to powerful positions in the law community. In essence, almost every Black law graduate from Harvard was hired by government agencies, such as the prosecutor’s office, judicial clerkships, or government service positions.

According to Mort and Moskowitz (1994), Harvard was graduating more than 50 Black lawyers each year. In addition, the majority of these lawyers went into private practice or government service. During the 1993-1994 academic year, Harvard reported that 75 Black students received financial aid, which was a major factor in the college selection process. When the researchers surveyed Black law firms and majority law firms with Black partners, there was a general consensus that Harvard Law School was the premiere training place for successful African-American lawyers. Those institutions that experienced some success in awarding law degrees to students of color credited a
number of incentives for running a good law program. These incentives included: (1) financial aid; (2) sensitivity to minority needs; (3) minority faculty as role models and mentors; (4) a variety of support systems; and (5) a firm commitment to diversity.

**Affirmative Action and Minority Enrollments in Law Schools**

After years of struggle for civil rights and countless efforts by professional organizations and schools to increase minority opportunities, minority enrollment in law schools increased substantially in the mid-1960s. In the mid-1970s, the enrollment of minorities in law schools peaked just before the *Bakke* decision in 1978. Although the majority of the White public never accepted some of the more far-reaching affirmative action practices, these practices and the compromises articulated in the case of the *Regent’s of the University of California v. Bakke* assisted in providing some support and extra opportunities for Black Americans in education and employment. Both proponents and opponents asserted that the *Bakke* decision would determine the extent of minority enrollment in professional schools. It was also believed that the *Bakke* decision would validate affirmative action and increase the speed of civil rights progress for years to come.

Yet, in 1997, there was a dramatic change in the political climate for affirmative action. One United States Court of Appeals barred the use of race in law school admissions decisions. In the state of California, an amendment was passed “to bar race, sex, color, ethnicity, and national origin as considerations in either discriminating against, or granting preferential treatment to, any individual or group in the operation of the State’s system of public employment, public education or public contracting” (Welch & Gruhl, 1998, vii). As a result of the *Bakke* decision, the Regents of the University of
California barred racial preferences in the admissions process at the university. The altered legal and political climate also caused other institutions of higher education to review their admissions practices. Yet, despite the strong community of voices that opposed preferential treatment based on race, Black Americans continued to favor affirmative action. The Bakke decision and its impact on the enrollment of minority students in professional schools continued to be an important issue (Welch & Gruhl, 1998).

*African-American Trends and Access in Professional Schools (Law School)*

For more than two decades, the Supreme Court’s 1978 Bakke decision provided the legal foundation for policies that permitted the integration of professional schools. The controlling opinion of Justice Powell upheld race-conscious admissions on the premise that they supported the important goal of producing a diverse student body. A student body that not only embraced different experiences, but also provided many points of view that enriched the discussions and learning experiences on college campuses. Yet, despite how valuable and important the goal seemed to many academics within the university community, very little was done by the academic world to demonstrate not only how diversity works, but also what a difference it makes on college campuses. In addition to the challenges presented from opponents of civil rights, in 1996, affirmative action was outlawed by a federal court of appeals in the state of Texas. The Texas Appellate Court upheld its decision by claiming that there were no educational benefits to student diversity on college campuses. Today, not only are there a number of lawsuits, but also referendum campaigns around the country that consider the impact of diversity on college campuses as an important legal and political issue (Orfield & Whitla, 1999).
Since the 1960s, vast changes occurred regarding the level of access to college for minority students. The percentage of Blacks enrolling in college between 1972 and 1996 after completing high school rose from 44.6 percent to 56.0 percent. During the same period, the percentage of White students enrolling in college increased from 49.7 percent to 67.4 percent. Although the smallest racial gap between Black and White students occurred in the mid-1970s, the gap began to widen after the *Bakke* decision. Additionally, colleges became less accessible during the 1980s when states began implementing changes to scholarship opportunities and institutional policies.

In 1971, the percentage of young Black adults between the ages of 25 and 29 that had obtained college degrees was 11.5 percent, compared to 22.0 percent of young White adults. Although the percentage of Black students increased to 17.9 percent in 1998, the percentage of White students with college degrees increased to 34.5 percent. In 1971, the gap between Blacks and Whites was 10.5 percent. Yet, in 1998, the gap between Blacks and Whites increased to 16.6 percent. Initially, the enrollment rate of Black students decreased in the 1980s, but then began to increase. There were also substantial changes in professional schools. In 1995, the enrollment of Black students in law schools increased to 7.5 percent, compared to 1 percent in 1960. Yet, the ultimate goal of equal access was still nominal in higher education, even before the implementation of college civil rights policies (Orfield & Whitla, 1999).

According to Neely (1997), nominal gains occurred between 1986 and 1996 in the number of professional degrees conferred to students of color. Most of the degrees conferred to students of color were at professional schools of business and medicine, instead of law schools. During the 1986-1987 academic year, African-Americans earned
4.8 percent of the Juris doctorates awarded from law schools. From 1992 to 1993, African-Americans earned 5.6 percent of the Juris doctorates awarded, compared to 85 percent earned by Whites. In 1997, the enrollment of minorities in law school constituted 18.9 percent compared to 10 percent in 1986. African-Americans represented 7.2 percent of the minorities enrolled in law school in 1997 compared to 4.8 percent in 1986. In today’s law schools, minority students are still finding a place.

Lundwall (1994) asserted that the enrollment of minority students has remained appallingly low for one reason. Law schools have failed to enlarge the applicant pool of qualified minorities. The researcher contended that if administrators of law schools focused on minority students that had not already chosen legal careers, they would increase their chances of enlarging the law school applicant pool of minority students. Based on a study conducted by the Law School Admission Council, Adams (1993) discovered that Blacks, more than any other minority group, delay the decision to apply to law school until after graduation. This delay in the decision process increases the difficulty for African-American students to acquire the skills needed to perform well on the Law School Aptitude Test (LSAT). According to the survey, 39 percent of the respondents that considered law school while enrolled in college deferred the decision to apply until after graduation for three primary reasons. First, African-American students desired to explore other options, which delayed the law school application process. Second, African-American students’ inability to pay for law school delayed the application process. Third, African-American students wanted time off between their undergraduate and graduate degrees, which also delayed the law school application process. Although the numbers of minority law students nationwide indicated a positive
trend, these numbers did not reflect the racial diversity of the general population (Fontaine, 1995).

*African-American Trends and Access in Texas Law Schools*

There are nine law schools located in the state of Texas – Baylor University School of Law; South Texas College of Law; Southern Methodist University Dedman School of Law; St. Mary’s University School of Law; Texas Southern University Thurgood Marshall School of Law; Texas Tech University School of Law; Texas Wesleyan University School of Law; University of Houston Law Center; and the University of Texas School of Law. Nationwide, there were 9,132 African-Americans attending the 178 law schools accredited by the American Bar Association during the 1997-1998 academic year. When compared to the number of Blacks enrolled nationwide, African-Americans represented 7.2 percent of the law school enrollments in Texas (Vital Signs, Summer 1998).

During the 1998-1999 academic year, there were 9,271 African-Americans enrolled in law schools nationwide. African-Americans comprised of 6.6 percent of all law school enrollments in the state of Texas. The total percentage of Black students enrolled in Texas law schools decreased slightly from the previous year (Vital Signs, Summer 2000). While the number of African-Americans enrolled in law schools nationwide increased to 9,354 in 1998, the percentage of Blacks enrolled in Texas law schools continued to decrease. The total enrollment of Black students in Texas law schools constituted 6.54 percent of the population during the 1999-2000 academic year. Yet overall, the enrollment trends of African-Americans enrolled in law school has been favorable. Compared to 1990, the number of Blacks enrolled in law school increased by
36 percent nationwide. It is also important to note that the highest enrollment of Black students occurred at the five Historically Black Colleges and Universities (Vital Signs, Autumn 2001).

The Civil Rights Act opened the doors of many institutions of higher education to African-Americans. Additionally, a growing Black middle-class not only increased opportunities, but also the demand for higher education by Blacks in the mid-1960s. Yet, the increased demand for African-American students occurred at a time when the admissions to law school became more difficult. The increase in competition further diminished the chances of Black students being admitted to law school. Ironically, this increase in demand was unrelated to race (Welch & Gruhl, 1998). Fontaine (1995) asserted that today’s problems were more subtle than explicit. Historically, the law school admissions process had been perceived as the means by which the privileged White continued to thrive while the disadvantaged minority continued to struggle socially, as well as economically (Olivas, 1992).

Factors Influencing the Underrepresentation of African-Americans in Legal Education

Admissions, Law School Aptitude Test (LSAT), and Financial Aid

Littlejohn and Rubinowitz (1986) contended that pervasive racial discrimination in education was one of the primary factors preventing Blacks from attending law school. The researchers further asserted that educational discrimination and the legacy of racism dated back to the antebellum period, “when many southern states imposed a criminal penalty on anyone teaching a Black person to read, while northern states maintained segregated and unequal schools” (Littlejohn & Rubinowitz, 1986, p. 422). The Jim Crow
era resulted in pervasive, *de jure segregated schools*, which resulted in Black schools being minimally funded and vastly inferior to White schools. Consequently, inferior schools led to few Blacks meeting the academic qualifications for law school. Even when Blacks met the academic requirements to attend law school, employment discrimination made it financially implausible for them to attend because a degree in higher education involved out-of-pocket expenses that few Blacks could afford (Littlejohn & Rubinowitz, 1986).

As society continued to make it more difficult for Blacks to secure the education and income needed to attend law school, law schools also began increasing their admissions requirements. In 1870, Dean Langdell of Harvard Law School was determined to transition legal education from a two-year undergraduate program to a three-year graduate program. In an effort to bring admissions requirements for the law curriculum in line with other undergraduate programs, some law schools not only implemented graduating from high school as an admissions requirement, but also required some college training, which resulted in a substantial drop in overall enrollment. In addition, law schools began using aptitude tests during the admissions process. The first number of law schools to implement and use admissions testing occurred in the 1920s. By 1947, twenty-two law schools contributed funds to develop and implement the Law School Admission Test (LSAT). Law schools began using the LSAT not only in the admissions process, but also as a predictor of first-year grades and student’s ability to succeed in law school. While the LSAT became a dominant force in law school admissions testing, the evolution of the LSAT also led to law schools’ disproportionately
rejecting Black applicants because they consistently scored lower on the test than Whites (Littlejohn & Rubinowitz, 1986).

The ABA and the AALS stated that the purpose of raising law schools’ standards was to improve the overall quality of the legal profession, as well as the quality and quantity of legal education. Yet, others maintained that the increase in standards was two-fold. First, it allowed the ABA and the AALS to maintain an exclusive and elite profession because the increased standards made it extraordinarily difficult for racial and ethnic minorities, as well as immigrants to secure a legal education. Second, the admissions standards were increased “to primarily keep Jews, Blacks, and immigrants out of the legal profession” (Littlejohn & Rubinowitz, 1986, p. 425). Regrettably, the observers were correct in their observations. Littlejohn and Rubinowitz (1986) asserted that “rising standards put law schools out of the reach of most Blacks. Not only did they lack formal education requirements because of racist educational systems, they did not have the resources to pay for increasingly lengthy and expensive legal training” (p. 425).

Historically, the progression of African-Americans in legal education and in the legal profession has made few inroads. Approximately 30 years ago, Linn (1975) concluded that people of color were grossly underrepresented in the legal profession. Simien (1986) further stated that “unlike women and other minorities, Blacks are so underrepresented in law school student bodies that there is no realistic possibility that their numbers in the bar will significantly increase in the foreseeable future” (p. 360). Almost twenty years later, one question remains in regards to Simien’s prediction, was he correct? Simien (1986) attributed the underrepresentation of Blacks in law schools and in legal education not only to current admissions practices, but in particular, to the heavy
emphasis law schools placed on LSAT scores. Based on a study conducted by the Law School Admission Council, Adams (1993) contended that Blacks, more than other minority groups delayed the decision to attend law school until after they had completed their undergraduate studies. Thus, LSAC officials asserted that the delay in the decision to apply to law school made it more difficult for Blacks to acquire the skills necessary to do well on admissions tests.

While the admissions procedures at most law schools had been designed to select the best qualified individuals from the applicant pool, Hathaway (1984) also argued that the LSAT should not have been employed to make precise admissions decisions. The researcher further argued that correlations between the LSAT score and student performance over the course of the Juris Doctor program indicated that the test was an inaccurate predictor of academic success for members of racial minority groups. Hathaway (1984) stated that while the LSAT and undergraduate grade point average (UGPA) were insufficient and unreliable in regards to the ranking of applicants and in determining the probable success of a student attending law school, both variables still played a limited but important role in the admissions process. Despite Simien’s (1986) prediction about African-Americans and Hathaway’s (1984) bleak odds about minorities in general, all minority groups have slowly increased their numbers in law school.

Romero (1984) stated that since the late 1960s, minority students were admitted to law schools through affirmative action programs. Thus, the implementation of affirmative action programs resulted in a significant number of minority students matriculating in American law schools. For example, of the 68,386 students enrolled in American law schools from 1969-1970, nearly 3,000 or 4.3 percent were members of
minority groups. Additionally, from 1982-1983, the number and percentage of minority students increased to 11,611 or 9 percent of the total law school population. There was a 6.3 percent increase in the percentage of minority applicants enrolled as first year law students from 1969 to 1983. Romero (1984) concluded with the following comments:

Law schools should not submit to the pressures and prestige, accreditation, stigma, or figures of merit that look only to academic aptitude in the admissions process or minority applicants will be admitted in only token numbers. Nor can law schools ignore the problem of an applicant pool that includes an insufficient number of minority applicants whose credentials are competitive in terms of LSAT scores. Law schools have a moral and professional obligation to diminish the influence of the LSAT and to give weight to other factors that admit an increasing number of minority students to law school and the legal profession. If racial and ethnic diversity is important in the profession, law schools should be willing to take a chance on the ‘higher risk’ students. The higher risk is justified by the fact that most minority students accepted through the CLEO program have succeeded in graduating from law school, passing a bar examination, and in serving society in a variety of legal positions. Law schools have both a social and moral obligation to take calculated risks and accept minority applicants who are ‘equipped to study law’ (p. 436).

_African-Americans, Racism, and Affirmative Action in the Legal Profession_

Tybor (1985) stated that the American Bar Association was studying ways to resolve the problems faced by minorities in the legal profession. The researcher further asserted that racism was alive and well in the legal profession, which made it more difficult for Black lawyers in the legal profession. In addition to Blacks and other minorities, the number of women entering the legal profession increased dramatically in recent years despite the fact that the profession remains largely White. In 1985, there were 650,000 lawyers nationwide; yet, Blacks represented only 3 percent (16,000-19,000) of the population, which was described as both “abysmal” and “obnoxious” (Tybor, 1985, p. 6). Tybor (1985) concluded by stating that opportunities in the most lucrative areas of the legal profession, such as large, private law firms, were shrinking for
minorities, especially Blacks. For example, the National Law Journal cited a 1984 study that concluded only 1.5 percent (51 out of 7,805) of the partners in the nation’s largest law firms were African-American (Tybor, 1985; Ranii, 1984).

Rose (1989) contended that while minority enrollment in law schools increased both during and after the adoption, enforcement, and acceptance of federal equal employment and education laws, the issue of causation was one of the most difficult elements to determine in the study of history. Carter and Wilson (1993) further asserted that the changes in the enrollment patterns of minority law students, as well as the employment patterns of minority lawyers in the legal profession were too well delineated, too dramatic, and too broad to have occurred by chance alone. Yet, efforts to create diversity in the legal profession have been less than successful over the past decade because affirmative action as a policy was unclear in scope and intent.

Neely (1986) stated that while the chances of minority students being accepted by an American law school have increased greatly since the Civil War era; the enrollment of minority students remains appallingly low. During the late 1960s, unavoidable pressures and student unrest forced institutions of higher education to increase the enrollment of minority students in professional education. The enactment of other federal legislation in addition to the availability of federal financial assistance also gave rise to a national policy of equal educational opportunity. Neely (1986) further asserted that while these forces generated a new spirit of commitment to Blacks and other minorities; the law schools quick reaction to make changes lacked regard for long-term concerns. Thus, affirmative action policies implemented by law schools resulted in short-term reactive institutional measures, instead of carefully calculated remedies that could be adopted to
address the complex problem of minority underrepresentation. Although these laws were intended to remedy America’s history of unfair treatment toward African-Americans; instead, they were haphazard, inappropriate in the area of minority recruitment, and relatively ineffective in regards to achieving educational and economic equality in legal education and the legal profession.

Knapp and Grover (1994) contended that while minorities rose to prominence in the government and made substantial gains in the sciences and in business, the representation of minorities in the legal profession continued to lag behind, which was outrageous in a society that professed to embrace freedom and liberty, yet at the same time practiced slavery. The researchers further asserted that racial discrimination in the legal profession had for the most part mirrored the events prevailing in American society, and only recently had those barriers begun to recede. According to Knapp and Grover (1994), some scholars stated that law firms were among the most racially segregated institutions in America. Jordan (1992) further argued that the partners of corporate law firms were the most racially segregated group in the legal profession. Davis (1996) stated that 97 percent of the partnerships in the nation’s 250 largest law firms were composed of White males. Nichols (1994) asserted that while employment opportunities for minority lawyers appeared to be more plentiful in the areas of government, public interest organizations, and solo practice; it was important to acknowledge that large law firms usually offered generous salaries and were viewed as highly prestigious. In conclusion, Congressman George W. Crockett, Jr. made the following observations about Blacks in legal education and the legal profession when he addressed the National Bar Association in 1984:
Black students are discouraged from participating in legal education because they are aware that black lawyers are generally not financially successful; and black students have a negative image of the black lawyer because they are aware that his exclusion from country clubs and other places where important decisions are made hinder his professional and intellectual growth thus preventing him from successfully pursuing his profession (Neely, 1986, p. 563).

While the Reconstruction period provided an opportunity for Congress to enact corrective legislation regarding the issue of slavery, during the post-Reconstruction era, patterns of segregation and discrimination in employment were formed, maintained and remained unaltered until the early 1960s. Not only were Blacks excluded from traditionally “White” jobs such as law, but they were also limited to lower paying and less desirable jobs. Until the mainstream of American society came to grips with the concept of equality of opportunity adopted in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and inherent in the Declaration of Independence and the fourteenth amendment, racial, political and economic integration of the minority racial communities was implausible. Thus, “the question of whether the political, economic, and social system in this country can incorporate persons of different color with the same success that it has with persons of different national origin remains unanswered” (Rose, 1989, p. 1123).

In a 1999 issue of the Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, it was stated that an education at elite law schools was important because it was often an essential path to power and position in the United States. The article further stated that severe reduction and in some instances the near elimination of Blacks from first-year entering classes at law schools was an unrecognized point in the debate over affirmative action and would have a secondary and critical effect in the legal profession. For example, the demise of affirmative action in legal education would result in African-Americans no longer being considered for the coveted positions that new associates were competing for at the
nation’s leading law firms. This was a critical juncture for affirmative action and Blacks in law school because major law firms recruited almost all of their new associates from the nation’s top-tier law schools. The article further contended that “a widespread decline in the use of affirmative action in law school admissions would severely restrict the number of Black law school students moving through the academic pipeline of the top-ranked law schools” (“Ending Affirmative Action,” 1999 Spring, p. 129).

Prejudices, Stereotypes, and Fears in Legal Education and the Legal Profession

In recent years, American lawyers felt an urgency to enhance the legal profession’s standing in the eyes of the public, which was seemingly unparalleled in the profession’s long history (Hengstler, 1993). While the ABA made improving the standing of the legal profession in the eyes of the public as one of their highest priorities, racial stereotyping was still prevalent in the legal profession because it was a stubborn practice introduced early and learned well by White Americans. It was difficult for many Caucasians to disassociate cultural stereotyping of a group from a member of that group by the time they assumed positions of authority. When acted out in the workplace, their negative perceptions disrupted legitimate efforts to create diversity. Thus, it is imperative that many Caucasians are not only trained to recognize their hidden biases, but also that adults are trained to be racially sensitive to the needs of minorities in general because the alternative could be detrimental to a society in which the majority of the population will consist of minorities (Bromberg, 1993).

Historically, the educational training for people of color was inferior to those of Whites (Brown v. Board of Education, 1954). Yet, many law school decision-makers were reluctant to adopt an admissions policy that gave minority candidates preferential
treatment based upon their race. This reluctance stemmed from a fear that such practices might produce (1) racial tensions, (2) feelings of displacement, and (3) claims of reverse discrimination. In addition, law school administrators were reluctant to admit minorities with lower LSAT scores and cumulative grade point averages because a high average or median LSAT score was considered a prestigious factor. Thus, not only were law schools measuring their level of prestige by the quality of their student bodies, but also by the quality of their students’ average or median LSAT score. In legal education, the LSAT score is used indirectly in the accreditation process, which also increases the incentives of law schools to admit applicants on the basis of high LSAT scores. Consequently, the high importance placed on LSAT scores in evaluating applicants resulted in a reduction in the number of minority students admitted to predominantly White law schools because their LSAT score(s) were often unacceptably low (Romero, 1984). Bromberg (1993) further stated that other law school decision-makers were reluctant to create an institution that was racially diverse because of the fear that racial diversity would alienate conservatives and other constituents who were hostile toward affirmative action programs, which could affect alumni gifts. While these feelings might have been real, they might also have been misplaced.

Rockwell (2003) stated that for over 30 years, opponents of affirmative action for people of color overlooked one important American reality; the role of affirmative action in the lives of White men. The researcher further contended that in the United States, minority programs were only a small part of the spectrum of preferential policies. Thus, affirmative action for African-Americans and Latinos was under attack, not affirmative action itself. Yet, Olivas (1997) asserted that some White men had a tendency to assume
that their success was directly associated with their own merits, while the successes of minorities were directly related to bending the rules. Rockwell (2003) contended that the idea of “preference” was indeed a basic concept in American society. The researcher further indicated that it was time to evaluate the extent to which White males were intertwined with policies of preference, such as (1) tax breaks for corporations; (2) subsidies for middle-class homebuyers, (3) mass transit subsidies for White suburbs, (4) bank bailouts for squandering bank executives; and (5) price supports for corporate firms, which were all determined on the basis of need and preference. Thus, in the last seventy years, the major beneficiaries of affirmative action policies were White males instead of minorities.

Rockwell (2003) stated that the extension of affirmative action to minorities and women created the continuum of counterattacks and hostile responses, not affirmative action itself. Hence, the White men whose families were the recipients of free medical care, unquestioned access to higher education through the G.I. Bill, and social uplift of the New Deal and Fair Deal needed to support affirmative action for those who were still left out, instead of (1) being smug; (2) taking advantage of the breaks that were afforded to them in life; and (3) denying affirmative action for the most oppressed society. The researcher concluded by stating that not only was affirmative action a part of the fabric of American life; but also that we were all bound together in a vast network of affirmative action and mutual support systems that we as White males took for granted. Thus, “it is hypocritical and profoundly wrong to call affirmative action for minorities ‘racism in reverse,’ while treating affirmative action for bankers, farmers, [and] White men of power, as entitlements” (Rockwell, 2003, p. 2). In 1995, it was obvious that affirmative
action had done everything except adversely affect White males because 97 percent of the senior managers at Fortune 1000 companies were White males. During the same year, Deloitte & Touche offered 80 percent of their new partnership positions to White males (Rockwell, 2003; Kaufman, 1996).

While many argued that the fears of White men were exaggerated, Kaufman (1996) reported that between 1991 and 1995 the opposition among White males to affirmative action peaked from 44 percent to 67 percent. Carter and Wilson (1993) asserted that the anger and backlash of White men toward affirmative action was fueled by their perception of lost position rather than reality. Kaufman (1996) stated that in reality the rise of women and minorities in some companies slowed down or even halted. Yet, many companies took the concerns of the White male seriously by changing their affirmative action programs to accommodate White male anxiety. Kaufman (1996) further contended that companies began scaling back diversity programs in response to White male backlash. Moreover, recent Supreme Court decisions limiting the use of affirmative action in education and a changing political climate convinced many White males that the threat posed by affirmative action had passed. Thus, the anger among most White men dwindled because they perceived affirmative action as less of an obstacle in the workplace and because most companies were no longer emphasizing diversity in the workplace. Hence, while some White men remained enraged about affirmative action because they believed that it continued to put them at a disadvantage, others came to accept that diversity and competition for jobs or promotions in the workplace were inevitable.
Legal Decisions on Affirmative Action in Higher Education: From Plessy to Grutter

During the mid-1960s, many law schools were implementing affirmative action programs. The objective of these programs was to provide socioeconomically disadvantaged minorities with an equal opportunity to attain a legal education. Yet today, not only have law school politics and political developments seriously compromised these programs, but also the pace at which minority students enroll in law school. The political economy of legal education has been greatly influenced by politics and race, which has created an overwhelmingly middle- to upper-income White student body. The obligation of many law schools to educate and serve a diverse student body that reflects the general population continues to be overshadowed by this overwhelmingly White student body. Additionally, the lack of minorities in the legal profession continues to diminish the progression of people of color in the political process, which perpetuates political powerlessness. Thus, whether or not minorities, especially African-Americans will continue to enter the legal education pipeline in proportion to their numbers in the general population is questionable. Some individuals in legal education contend that the debate over admissions standards and affirmative action lies between a law school’s obligation to produce a diverse student body and the political economy (Neely, 1997).

The first affirmative action programs implemented in selective universities and professional schools were voluntary rather than required by a court order or administrative directive. While courts possessed the power to impose race-conscious remedies in cases where universities and professional schools were deemed guilty of intentional segregation, lawsuits and findings of this kind were rare outside the South. Aside from southern institutions, the dispute over race and the degree to which it should
be taken into account has long been of contention. As a result, federal courts created challenging standards to maintain racially targeted civil rights remedies.

There have been serious battles over such remedies in past decades. Civil rights remedies include (1) affirmative action employment; (2) minority contracting; (3) voting rights; and (4) school desegregation. During the past several years, the battles have increased in bitterness regarding “the continuation or abandonment of policies and practices aimed at maintaining integration in the nation’s selective colleges and universities” (Orfield & Whitla, 1999, p. 3). The case of *Plessy v. Ferguson* was the first in a series of such battles (Orfield & Whitla, 1999).

*Plessy v. Ferguson (1898)*

Moreno (2000) contends that we can trace the roots of contemporary affirmative action in higher education back to the *de jure* and *de facto* segregation of African-American students. In the 1898 case of *Plessy v. Ferguson*, the Supreme Court ruled that “separate but equal” was the law of the land, even though the United States was viewed as a racially segregated caste system. The *Plessy* decision not only solidified the racial segregation of higher education systems, but also legally allowed public institutions to be segregated by race. The segregation of colleges for African-Americans developed into what we now refer to as Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). While public education systems were being fully expanded both physically and in student enrollment, African-American students were being excluded from public institutions. The expansions were being funded by the Morrill Land Grants of 1862 and 1890 even though the 1890 Morrill Act prohibited payments of federal funds to states that denied
Blacks admission to tax-supported institutions (The Morrill Act of 1890, Public Law # 95-113).

In 1954, the legal doctrine of “Separate but Equal” set forth in *Plessy* was overturned in *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas*. According to the Supreme Court, racial segregation in K-12 schools was unconstitutional. The Supreme Court further concluded that the “Separate but Equal” doctrine inherently led to separate and unequal educational opportunities. Four years earlier, the Supreme Court had overturned legal segregation in higher education during the landmark case of *Sweatt v. Painter*. Some believe the *Sweatt* decision laid the legal foundation for current affirmative action decisions (Moreno, 2000).

*Sweatt v. Painter (1950)*

In *Sweatt v. Painter (1950)*, Heman Marion Sweatt, an African-American, was denied admission to the University of Texas Law School. Mr. Sweatt was denied admission based on Texas state law, which forbade African-Americans from admission to that law school. To accommodate Mr. Sweatt’s desire to attain a legal education and to comply with the “Separate but Equal” doctrine of *Plessy v. Ferguson (1898)*, he was offered admission to an unequal “colored” law school established by the State of Texas. Sweatt refused the offer and filed suit under the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. According to Orfield and Whitla (1999), “the Supreme Court recognized that associations, contacts, and exchanges with other students were a vital part of the preparation for a profession and could not possibly be equal within segregated institutions” (p. 4). In the Supreme Court’s 1950 decision, Chief Justice Vinson wrote:
Moreover, although the law is a highly learned profession, we are well aware that it is an intensely practical one. The law school, the providing ground for legal learning and practice, cannot be effective in isolation from the individuals and institutions with which the law interacts. Few students and no one who has practiced law would choose to study in an academic vacuum, removed from the interplay of ideas and the exchange of views with which the law is concerned. The law school to which Texas is willing to admit petitioner excludes from its student body members of the racial groups which number 85% of the population of the State and include most of the lawyers, witnesses, jurors, judges, and other officials with whom petitioner will inevitably be dealing with when he becomes a member of the Texas Bar. With such a substantial and significant segment of society excluded, we cannot conclude that the education offered petitioner is substantially equal to that which he would receive if admitted to the University of Texas Law School (Sweatt v. Painter, 1950, pp. 633-634).

Not only did Chief Justice Vinson’s opinion acknowledge the educational importance of Mr. Sweatt attending racially diverse classrooms, but also the negative implications of receiving a professional education in isolation (Moreno, 2000).

Chief Justice Vinson noted that the University of Texas possessed a far greater degree of qualities, such as the reputation of the faculty, experience of the administration, standing in the community, position and influence of the alumni, and traditions and prestige than the “colored” law school (Orfield & Whitla, 1999). Compared to the “colored” law school, the University of Texas Law School had (1) more full-time and part-time faculty; (2) more students; (3) a vast number of library volumes; (4) a law review; (5) practice courtroom facilities; and (6) scholarship funds. Thus, the Supreme Court concluded that the “colored” law school was inferior to its White counterpart because it lacked the abundance of resources that were enjoyed by the established Texas law school. Consequently, the University of Texas Law School was ordered by the Supreme Court to admit Heman Sweatt (Neely, 1997).

However, Sweatt’s admission to the University of Texas Law School failed to dismantle the admissions barriers for minorities in legal education (Neely, 1997). At the
height of being subjected to racial slurs not only from students, but also from professors; cross burnings; and tire slashings, Sweatt withdrew from the law school in 1951 without graduating (Harbour, 2000). Through *de jure* and *de facto* segregation, students of color continued to be excluded from equal educational opportunities at both the higher education and K-12 level. Most state institutions continued to resist integration and interpreted the *Sweatt* decision as applying only to legal education. The enrollment of African-Americans in law schools continued to be non-existent because most were unable to overcome admission hurdles (Moreno, 2000). The *Sweatt* decision was based on the foundation that not only should students confront different ideas on campus, but also learn how to relate to students from different backgrounds at both the undergraduate and professional level. Thus, when administrators of institutions of higher education enroll a diverse student body, they contribute in a positive manner to the diversity of society (Orfield & Whitla, 1999).

*Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas (1954)*

While the *Sweatt* decision promoted a diverse student body in law schools, African-Americans continued to be subjected to educational practices that were far inferior to Whites. Prior to the *Brown* decision, real constitutional equality was perceived as a myth by African-Americans (Neely, 1997). *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas (1954)* overturned the legal doctrine of “Separate but Equal” in *Plessy* and affirmed Justice Vinson’s opinion in *Sweatt v. Painter*, which laid the legal foundation for contemporary affirmative action programs in university admissions (Moreno, 2000). In the *Brown* case, the plaintiffs were African-American children who attended an elementary school in Topeka, Kansas.
The United States District Court’s Ruling in Brown. The children brought a class action suit in the United States District Court against the following states: Kansas, South Carolina, Virginia, and Delaware. All of these states maintained segregated public school systems. The children’s challenge was based on the premise that the segregation of public schools violated the Fourteenth Amendment and should be deemed illegal and unconstitutional. When the three-judge District Court convened, the Justices agreed that “segregation in public education has a detrimental effect upon Negro children, but denied relief on the ground that the Negro and White schools were substantially equal with respect to buildings, transportation, curricula, and educational qualifications of teachers” (Brown v. Board of Education, 1954). As a result of the District Court’s decision, the case was directly appealed to the United States Supreme Court.

The United States Supreme Court’s Ruling in Brown. In addressing the question whether segregation of races in public schools constituted a denial of equal protection of the laws, the United States Supreme Court, Mr. Chief Justice Warren, held that:

The opportunity of an education, where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms. The segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race, even though the physical facilities and other tangible factors may be equal, deprives the children of minority group of equal educational opportunities, and amounts to a deprivation of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution. The doctrine of “separate but equal” has no place in the field of public education, since separate educational facilities are inherently unequal (Brown v. Board of Education, 1954).

In the following year, the United States Supreme Court announced that all schools should desegregate “with all deliberate speed” (Brown v. Board of Education, 1955).

Flores and Slocum (1997) contended that the implication from the Brown decision was clear: “If blacks and whites were to share similar roles and responsibilities, they
must have similar or equal educational opportunities” (p. 87). Yet, Brown’s promise was questioned in the following decade. The ambiguity of the Courts’ directive regarding “all deliberate speed” allowed schools to delay the desegregation process (Brown v. Board of Education, 1955). These interminable delays resulted in 98 percent of all students of color continuing to attend all-Black schools. It was not until Congress passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that a significant change would occur regarding the education of African-Americans. This change occurred because the federal government threatened to cease all federal aid to school districts that promoted segregated schools (Welch & Gruhl, 1998). Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 stated that:

No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance (Civil Rights Act of 1964).

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 not only applied to all public colleges and universities, but also to some private institutions. Consequently, during the 1960s and 1970s states were forced to dismantle de jure segregation policies in public postsecondary institutions (Harbour, 2000).

*DeFunis v. Odegaard (1974)*

Flores and Slocum (1997) further contended that many Blacks were left ill-prepared to compete with Whites for college admissions as a result of the segregated public school systems that were being challenged in the Brown decision. African-Americans were also left ill-prepared to compete with Whites due to the de facto segregation of track systems, gerrymandering, and other divisive public school programs. Some questioned whether the Courts’ qualified directive to act “with all deliberate speed” was justifiable in the admissions process. Thus, many institutions at the undergraduate
level developed “open-enrollment” admissions programs. These programs admitted all who applied. Other institutions of higher education developed preferential admissions programs that specifically benefited African-Americans. The purpose of these admissions programs was to (1) address the issue of past discrimination; (2) guarantee racial balance; and (3) remedy the underrepresentation of minorities in higher education (Flores & Slocum, 1997; Neely, 1997).

When some of the “special” admissions programs began guaranteeing a specific number of seats for minority students, these programs became the center of attention. The opponents of preferential admissions programs feared the challenges that would emerge at institutions of higher education who chose to implement a “quota system” (Flores & Slocum, 1997). The first of these challenges was initiated in the Supreme Court case of DeFunis v. Odegaard (1974), which raised the issues of racial preferences being used in the admissions program at the University of Washington Law School (DeFunis v. Odegaard, 1974). According to the Law School’s admissions procedure,

all applications of black students were assigned separately to two particular committee members: a first-year black law student on the committee and a professor on the committee who had worked the previous summer in a special program for disadvantaged college students considering application to the Law School (DeFunis v. Odegaard, 1974, p. 323).

While the minority applications were considered competitive with one another, neither the subcommittee nor the full committee directly compared them to the remaining applications. Hence, under this admissions procedure, thirty-seven minority applicants were admitted to the University of Washington Law School while DeFunis was put on a waiting list until he was ultimately denied admission (DeFunis v. Odegaard, 1974).
The Washington State Trial Court’s Ruling in DeFunis. When Marco DeFunis was denied admission, he challenged the school’s admissions policies based on illegal discrimination by filing suit in the Washington State court. DeFunis asserted that the University of Washington Law School had racially discriminated against him because he was White instead of Black, which violated the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. When the case was reviewed, the trial court agreed and ordered the University of Washington Law School to admit DeFunis (DeFunis v. Odegaard, 1974).

The Washington State Supreme Court’s Ruling in DeFunis. The law school appealed the trial court’s decision to the Washington State Supreme Court, which reversed the trial court’s decision. According to the State Supreme Court, the Law School had a “compelling interest” to produce a racially balanced student body. In order to accomplish this goal, the Law School could discriminate on the basis of race (DeFunis v. Odegaard, 1974). Even though the trial court’s decision was overturned by the Washington State Supreme Court, the Law School allowed DeFunis to remain in school while he appealed the case to the United States Supreme Court. The completion of DeFunis’ law school studies made the issue a moot point by the time the case came before the United States Supreme Court (Harbour, 2000). The case was never decided because the Supreme Court “held that the preferential admissions issue was moot and therefore refused to decide the constitutional question” (Neely, 1997). Yet, Justice Douglas, who disagreed with the majority, wrote the following dissenting opinion:

The educational choices confronting a university admissions committee are not ordinarily a subject for judicial oversight; clearly it is not for us but for the law school to decide which tests to employ, how heavily to weigh recommendations from professors or undergraduate grades, and what level of achievement on the
chosen criteria are sufficient to demonstrate that the candidate is qualified for admission (*DeFunis v. Odegaard, 1974*, pp. 325-326).

Based on Justice Douglas’ review of the case, while the test scores of the minority applicants accepted to the Law School were lower than those of White applicants, the minorities were not unqualified applicants (*DeFunis v. Odegaard, 1974*). Thus, had the decision been reviewed by the Supreme Court, Douglas would have concluded not only that the Law School’s admissions practices were constitutional, but also that its practices were valid under the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. In the *DeFunis* decision, it is important to note two facts regarding the case. First, the United States Supreme Court refused to review the merits of the case. Second, Justice Douglas contended that the Law School adopted the affirmative action program in an effort to achieve a “reasonable representation of minority groups in the student body” (Harbour, 2000, p. 30-31). Four years later, this would not be the case for Allan Bakke (Flores & Slocum, 1997).

*Regents of the University of California v. Bakke (1978)*

In *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke (1978)*, the University of California at Davis denied Allan Bakke, a White applicant, admission to medical school. Bakke had also been denied admission to twelve other medical schools despite the fact that his qualifications were significantly higher than most of the other students admitted, both minorities and Whites. Thus, under the Fourteenth Amendment, Bakke challenged the medical school’s right to not only take race into consideration in the admissions process; but also the medical school’s right to set aside one-sixth (16 out of 100) of its entering class for the sole occupancy of racial minorities. Bakke contended that the
preferential admissions policies of the University of California at Davis violated the Fourteenth Amendment.

While the decision was close, the Court agreed that the “special” admissions program at Davis’ medical school was unconstitutional and violated Bakke’s constitutional right to equal treatment under the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Therefore, the University of California at Davis was ordered to admit Bakke into its medical school program. It is important to note that the Court was so fragmented between supporters and opponents of race-conscious policies that Justice Lewis Powell, a conservative Virginian, decided the case (Orfield & Whitla, 1999).

While Justice Powell ruled that the use of “quotas” was unconstitutional, he asserted that the use of race in creating a diverse student body was a “plus” factor. Thus, the use of race for educational purposes was permissible (Moreno, 2000).

Orfield and Whitla (1999) asserted that Powell’s opinion upholding Bakke was the best roadmap to what the judicial system might consider as a “compelling interest” when analyzing race-conscious policies. The researchers defined a “compelling interest” of the institution not only as one that is “narrowly tailored” to achieve that interest, but also cannot be achieved by another method. Powell stated the following when making his decision:

The attainment of a diverse student body clearly is a constitutionally permissible goal for an institution of higher education. Academic freedom, though not a specifically enumerated constitutional right, long has been viewed as a special concern of the First Amendment. The freedom of a university to make its own judgments as to education includes the selection of its student body (Orfield & Whitla, 1999, p. 4).

He also quoted the 1957 Court decision of Sweezy v. New Hampshire, which stated: “It is the business of a university to provide that atmosphere which is most
conducive to speculation, experiment and creation. It is an atmosphere in which there prevail ‘the four essential freedoms’ of a university to determine for itself on academic grounds who may teach, what may be taught, how it shall be taught, and who may be admitted to study” (Orfield & Whitla, 1999, p. 4). Justice Powell further asserted: “The atmosphere essential to the quality of higher education is widely believed to be promoted by a diverse student body as the Court noted in Keyishian, is not too much to say that the ‘nation’s future depends upon leaders trained through wide exposure’ to the ideas and mores of students as diverse as this Nation of many peoples” (Orfield & Whitla, 1999, p. 4). While the policies laid out in Sweatt and Bakke promoted the idea of using race to promote an intellectually rich and robust academic environment that engaged in diverse ideas, beliefs, and perspectives, these policies were subsequently challenged in the case of Hopwood v. State of Texas (Moreno, 2000).

**Hopwood v. State of Texas (1996)**

In an effort to diversify its student body, the University of Texas Law School developed a race-blind admissions system. Under this program, students were segregated by the Law School based on their Texas Index (TI), which consisted of the student’s Law School Admissions Test (LSAT) and their undergraduate grade point average. Law School applicants were placed in one of three admissions categories: (1) presumptive admit, (2) discretionary zone, and (3) presumptive deny. White applicants were admitted through the regular admissions process (presumptive admit) if they had a Texas Index of 199.5 or higher. In contrast, Black or Mexican American applicants were admitted through the regular admissions process if they had a Texas Index of 189 or higher.
White applicants with a Texas Index of 192 or lower were rejected admissions (presumptive deny) by the Law School. While Black or Mexican American applicants’ Texas Index had to be 179 or lower to be rejected admissions by the Law School. All other students whose Texas Index ranged from 193-138 were placed in the “discretionary zone” on a wait list. In accordance with their race-blind admissions process, the University of Texas Law School admitted six percent of its White applicant pool and 100 percent of its Black and Mexican American applicant pool. At the time these admissions practices were implemented; Black and Mexican American students represented eight percent of the Law School’s entering class in 1992, which fell short of the Law School’s enrollment goal of five percent Black students and 10 percent Mexican American students.

The Law School’s race-blind admission practices also involved maintaining racially segregated review systems. The files of minority applicants were reviewed by the entire minority subcommittee. In contrast, the files of White applicants were divided into bundles of thirty, in which each bundle was reviewed by single subcommittee members. Not only were racially segregated waiting lists maintained by the Law School, but these applications were also color-coded to identify the applicant’s race.

In 1992, a White applicant by the name of Cheryl Hopwood was denied admission to the University of Texas Law School. When the Law School developed an admissions process that evaluated African-American and Mexican American students separate from White students, Cheryl Hopwood, and three other plaintiffs, who were placed in the “discretionary zone,” filed suit. The plaintiffs argued that the Law School’s three-tiered admissions process prevented them from competing against all other
applicants, thereby, violating Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment (Hopwood v. State of Texas, 1996). In May 1994, the case was tried before Judge Sam Sparks in the Federal District Court for the Western District of Texas. On August 19, 1994, Judge Sparks’ decision was released after hearing both sides of the case (Hopwood v. State of Texas, 1994).

The Federal District Court’s Ruling in Hopwood. Before rendering his decision, Judge Sparks reviewed the history of public education in Texas at both the elementary and secondary level and noted that the history of official discrimination was well documented in history books, case law, and in the record of the Hopwood trial. Judge Sparks stated that, “the problem of segregated schools is not a relic of the past….as of May 1994 desegregation law suits remain pending against over forty Texas school districts” (Hopwood v. State of Texas, 1994, p. 554). Moreover, the situation in Texas’ higher education system was just as dismal (Harbour, 2000). Judge Sparks further asserted that, “Texas’ system of higher education has a history of state sanctioned discrimination” when he recounted the 1950 United States Supreme Court case of Sweatt v. Painter (Hopwood v. State of Texas, 1994, p. 554). It was noted that decades after the Sweatt decision, Blacks and Mexican Americans in the Texas higher education system continued to be discriminated against (Harbour, 2000).

Once Judge Sparks reviewed the history of higher education in Texas, the University of Texas Law School’s admissions policy, and the legal claims of the plaintiffs, he applied the two-part strict scrutiny test. Thus, it was determined that the Law School had two compelling interests to justify its narrowly tailored affirmative action program. First, based on the Bakke decision, the Law School was within its right
to implement an affirmative action program to diversify its student body. Second, the Court held that the University of Texas School of Law could use affirmative action in admissions and throughout the Texas public education system to remedy past discrimination. However, Judge Sparks also held that the affirmative action program would yield adverse effects to White and nonpreferred minority students (Hopwood v. State of Texas, 1994).

It was concluded by the Court that the plaintiffs’ rights were violated by the Law School under the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, which rendered the affirmative action program unconstitutional. Yet, the Law School was not ordered by Judge Sparks to admit the plaintiffs. Judge Sparks held that the plaintiffs failed to provide sufficient evidence that they would have been admitted to the Law School under a constitutional admissions program. Moreover, Judge Sparks refused to prohibit the Law School from using race as a criterion in future admissions programs (Hopwood v. State of Texas, 1994). Cheryl Hopwood and the other plaintiffs would appeal Judge Sparks' decision to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

The Fifth Circuit Court’s Ruling in Hopwood. On March 18, 1996, Judge Sparks’ 1994 ruling was overturned by the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. The Court held that any consideration of race in the admissions process violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Thus, Judge Sparks’ conclusion that the Law School had a compelling interest in operating its affirmative action program was deemed unjustifiable. The Court asserted that the use of race-based affirmative action programs at the University of Texas Law School to achieve educational diversity was unconstitutional because it violated the Equal Protection Clause. The Court further
prohibited the University of Texas from using affirmative action programs to remedy past racial discrimination in student admissions (*Hopwood v. State of Texas, 1996*). The panel of the Fifth Circuit Court held that:

> the University of Texas School of Law may not use race as a factor in deciding which applicants to admit (1) in order to achieve a diverse student body, (2) to combat the perceived effects of a hostile environment at the law school, (3) to alleviate the law school’s poor reputation in the minority community, or (4) to eliminate any present effects of past discrimination by actors other than the law school (*Hopwood v. State of Texas, 78 F. 3d at 962*).

The Court’s ruling resulted in the elimination of all affirmative action programs involving race and ethnicity in student admissions at public universities in Texas. Not only did the Fifth Circuit Court’s decision affect institutions of higher education in Texas; it also applied to institutions in Louisiana and Mississippi.

**The United States Supreme Court’s Ruling in Hopwood.** After the 1996 panel of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that the University of Texas’ affirmative action plan was unconstitutional, the Law School began modifying its admissions program to comply with the Court’s decision. Once the deficiencies were remedied, the University of Texas School of Law petitioned the Supreme Court twice for a review. In June 1996, the United States Supreme Court declined to review the decision, which officially ended all affirmative action programs in student admissions to public universities in Texas (*Hopwood v. Texas, U.S. Sup. Ct. 1996*).

Commentators were stunned by the Fifth Circuit’s decision in *Hopwood* for two reasons. First, the decision made by the lower federal court in August 1994, which approved the use of race-based preferential affirmative action programs, was reversed (Harbour, 2000; Chapa & Lazaro, 1998; *Hopwood v. State of Texas, 1994*). Second, the decision of the Fifth Circuit Court directly contradicted the nation’s position regarding
race-based affirmative action in higher education. In accordance with the *Bakke* decision, it was believed that the nation was strongly committed to race-based affirmative action programs in student admissions (*Bakke v. Regents of the University of California, 1978; Olivas, 1996; Harbour, 2000*). Yet, the battle regarding affirmative action programs in student admissions would continue to resurface. In 2003, the *Hopwood* decision would be overturned by the United States Supreme Court in the landmark case of *Grutter v. Bollinger*.

*Grutter v. Bollinger (2003)*

The University of Michigan Law School is ranked among the Nation’s top law schools and receives approximately 3,500 applications each year. Of this number, the Law School admits an entering class of approximately 350 students each academic year. During the admissions process, the Law School not only seeks to “admit a group of students who individually and collectively are among the most capable, but also individuals with substantial promise for success in law school and a strong likelihood of succeeding in the practice of law [while] contributing in diverse ways to the well being of others” (*Grutter v. Bollinger, 2003, p. 1*). From a broader perspective, the University of Michigan’s Law School seeks “a mix of students with varying backgrounds and experiences who will respect and learn from each other” (*Grutter v. Bollinger, 2003, p. 1*).

*The University of Michigan Law School’s Admissions Policy.* In 1992, Dean Jeffrey Lehman appointed a faculty committee to develop and implement a written admissions policy that accomplished the above objectives. Specifically, the task of the
Law School was to develop an admissions policy that would ensure a diverse student body that complies with the *Bakke* ruling on the use of race in student admissions. Academic ability and the flexible assessment of an applicant’s talent, experiences, and potential to contribute to the learning environment were the hallmarks of the Law School’s admissions policy. In accordance with the new policy, admissions officials evaluated each applicant based on the following criteria: (1) the student’s personal statement; (2) letters of recommendation; and (3) the student’s essay explaining the ways in which he/she would contribute to the life and diversity of the Law School. The admissions process also involved reviewing the students’ undergraduate grade point average and their Law School Admissions Test (LSAT) score. While both of these elements were viewed as imperfect predictors of academic success by admissions officials, the policy stressed that “no applicant should be admitted unless we expect that applicant to do well enough to graduate with no serious academic problems” (*Grutter v. Bollinger*, 2003, p. 2).

It was clearly stated in the admissions policy that students with the highest possible scores were not guaranteed admission to the Law School. The policy also clearly stated that students with the lowest test scores were not automatically disqualified as an applicant. Admissions officials were strongly encouraged to look beyond cumulative grade point averages and test scores to include other criteria, such as “soft” variables that were important to the Law School’s educational objectives. “Soft” variables consisted of “the enthusiasm of recommenders, the quality of the undergraduate institution, the quality of the applicant’s essay, and the areas and difficulty of undergraduate course selection” (*Grutter v. Bollinger*, 2003, p. 2). Admissions officials
were also instructed to “assess the applicant’s likely contributions to the intellectual and social life of the institution” (Grutter v. Bollinger, 2003, pp. 2-3). In essence, the Law School’s policy aspires to “achieve that diversity which has the potential to enrich everyone’s education and thus make a law school class stronger than the sum of its parts” (Grutter v. Bollinger, 2003, p. 3).

According to admissions officials, the policy was established to reaffirm the Law School’s longstanding commitment to racial and ethnic diversity with special reference to the inclusion of students from groups which have been historically discriminated against, like African-Americans, Hispanics and Native Americans, who without this commitment might not be represented in our student body in meaningful numbers. By enrolling a ‘critical mass’ of [underrepresented] minority students, the Law School seeks to ensure their ability to make unique contributions to the character of the Law School (Grutter v. Bollinger, 2003, p. 3).

Unlike the University of Texas Law School admissions policy, this policy neither defines diversity on the sole basis of race and ethnicity, nor is it perceived as insensitive to the competition of all students applying for admission to the Law School. Instead, the policy attempts to assist admissions officers in producing classes that are both diverse and academically outstanding. The policy further seeks to lead admissions officers in producing a student body who promises to continue the Michigan tradition of making outstanding contributions to the legal profession (Grutter v. Bollinger, 2003).

The Petitioner’s Complaint. In 1996, Barbara Grutter, a White Michigan resident with a 3.8 grade point average and a LSAT score of 161, applied to the University of Michigan Law School. Initially, Grutter was placed on a wait list, until she was subsequently denied admission to the Law School. In December 1997, Grutter filed suit in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan alleging that the
Law School discriminated against her on the basis of race. Grutter contended that the Law School violated the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and 42 U.S.C. §1981. She further asserted that the Law School rejected her application because of its use of race as a “predominant” factor, which gives applicants of certain minority groups “a significantly greater chance of admission than students with similar credentials from disfavored racial groups” (Grutter v. Bollinger, 2003, p. 4). Grutter also alleged that the Law School’s compelling interest to use race in the admissions process was unjustifiable (Grutter v. Bollinger, 2003).

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan’s Ruling in Grutter. On December 22, 2000, the District Court heard oral arguments from the Law School regarding how the educational benefits of a diverse student body were compelling. The District Court also heard arguments regarding the use of race as a “predominant” factor in the Law School’s admissions process and whether the use of race and ethnicity constituted a race-based double standard. Once the testimony was concluded, the District Court held that the Law School’s use of race as a “predominant” factor in the admissions process violated the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and 42 U.S.C. §1981, which was unlawful. Under strict scrutiny, the District Court held that:

the Law School’s asserted interest in assembling a diverse student body was not compelling because the attainment of a racially diverse class…was not recognized as such by Bakke and is not a remedy for past discrimination (Grutter v. Bollinger, 2003, p. 8).

Thus, the District Court ruled in favor of Barbara Grutter and forbade the Law School from using race as a criterion in its admissions decisions. The District Court’s decision
would be appealed by the University of Michigan’s Law School to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals.

The United States Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals’ Ruling in Grutter. On May 14, 2002, the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals reversed the decision of the District Court. Chief Circuit Judge Martin held that Justice Powell’s opinion in the Bakke decision regarding diversity as a compelling state interest in student admissions was a binding precedent. The Court of Appeals also stated that the Law School’s use of race as a “potential ‘plus’ factor” was narrowly tailored. The Law School’s admissions policy was also narrowly tailored because it not only resembled the Harvard admissions program described approvingly by Justice Powell, but also was the framework Justice Powell used in rendering his opinion in the Bakke decision. The Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals held that:

The Law School’s narrowly tailored use of race in admissions decisions to further a compelling interest in obtaining the educational benefits that flow from a diverse student body is not prohibited by the Equal Protection Clause, Title VI, or §1981 (Grutter v. Bollinger, 2002, p. 2).

Yet, on December 2, 2002, the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted. The writ of certiorari, 537 U.S. 1043 (2002), was granted to resolve the disagreement among the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals regarding one question that was considered of national importance: “Whether diversity is a compelling interest that can justify the narrowly tailored use of race in selecting applicants for admission to public universities” (Grutter v. Bollinger, 2003, p. 9). On April 1, 2003, the case of Grutter v. Bollinger was argued before the United States Supreme Court.
The United States Supreme Court’s Ruling in Grutter. On June 23, 2003, the opinion of the United States Supreme Court was delivered by Justice O’Connor. After extensive review of the University of Michigan Law School’s admissions policy, the Supreme Court affirmed the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals decision. The Court held that the Law School had a compelling interest in attaining a diverse student body. Justice O’Connor made the following statement regarding the Law School’s admissions policy:

Our conclusion that the Law School has a compelling interest in a diverse student body is informed by our view that attaining a diverse student body is at the heart of the Law School’s proper institutional mission, and that good faith on the part of a university is presumed absent a showing to the contrary. As part of its goal of assembling a class that is both exceptionally academically qualified and broadly diverse, the Law School seeks to enroll a critical mass of minority students. The Law School’s interest is not simply to assure within its student body some specified percentage of a particular group merely because of its race or ethnic origin. That would amount to outright racial balancing, which is patently unconstitutional. Rather, the Law School’s concept of critical mass is defined by reference to the educational benefits that diversity is designed to produce. These benefits are substantial (Grutter v. Bollinger, 2003, p. 17).

The Supreme Court further asserted that the benefits of diversity were important and laudable because diversity promoted livelier, more spirited classroom discussions. In addition, classrooms that contained students with a variety of backgrounds provided more enlightening and interesting classroom discussions. Thus, based on numerous studies, a diverse student body (1) promotes better learning outcomes; (2) better prepares students for an increasingly diverse workforce and society; and (3) better prepares students to be professionals (Grutter v. Bollinger, 2003).

The Supreme Court also concluded that education was the foundation of good citizenship and played a pivotal role in sustaining our political and cultural heritage. Thus, the diffusion of knowledge and access to public institutions of higher education
must be made available to all individuals regardless of race or ethnicity. Justice O’Connor made the following statement in her opinion:

The United States, as amicus curiae, affirms that ensuring that public institutions are open and available to all segments of American society, including people of all races and ethnicities, represents a paramount government objective. And, nowhere is the importance of such openness more acute than in the context of higher education. Effective participation by members of all races and ethnic groups in the civil life of our Nation is essential if the dream of one Nation, indivisible, is to be realized. Moreover, universities, and in particular, law schools, represent the training ground for a large number of our Nation’s leaders (Grutter v. Bollinger, 2003, pp. 19-20).

Justice O’Connor affirmed the Sweatt decision by stating that if law schools are isolated from the individuals and institutions with which the law interacts, these institutions cannot and will not be effective. Thus, it is imperative that access to legal education and the legal profession is inclusive of talented and qualified individuals of all races and ethnicities because these educational institutions provide the education and training necessary to succeed in America.

Justice O’Connor held that the Law School in good faith provided workable race-neutral alternatives to achieve a diverse student body. Thus, the Supreme Court agreed with the Court of Appeals that the Law School’s admissions program did not maintain a quota system, but instead, workable race-neutral alternatives that were narrowly tailored. The Justices further concluded that nonminority applicants were not unduly harmed by the Law School’s admissions program (Grutter v. Bollinger, 2003). Justice O’Connor concluded her opinion by making the following statement:

In summary, the Equal Protection Clause does not prohibit the Law School’s narrowly tailored use of race in admissions decisions to further a compelling interest in obtaining the educational benefits that flow from a diverse student body. Consequently, petitioner’s statutory claims based on Title VI and 42 U.S.C. §1981 also fail. The judgment of the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, accordingly, is affirmed (Grutter v. Bollinger, 2003, pp. 31-32).

One cannot address the Grutter decision without mentioning its companion case Gratz v. Bollinger. In 1995, Jennifer Gratz, a White applicant with an adjusted GPA of 3.8 and ACT score of 25, applied to the University of Michigan’s College of Literature, Science and the Arts. Two years later in 1997, Patrick Hamacher, a White applicant with an adjusted GPA of 3.0 and ACT score of 28, also applied to the University of Michigan. Both applicants were denied undergraduate admission, which led Gratz and Hamacher to file suit against the University of Michigan on the grounds that the school’s consideration of race and ethnicity in its undergraduate admissions decisions violated the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The case was heard before the District Court who ruled in favor of Gratz. The District Court held that while the policies in effect in 1999 and 2000 were narrowly tailored, the admissions policies for years 1995-1998 were not narrowly tailored and therefore unconstitutional. The case was appealed to the Sixth Circuit Court who reversed the District Court’s decision. After the Grutter decision, Gratz and Hamacher petitioned to the United States Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari, which was granted.

In a 6-3 decision announced by Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist, the Supreme Court ruled that the University of Michigan’s point system was too mechanistic and unconstitutional. The Court held that the University of Michigan’s practice of allotting 20 points, or one-fifth of the total points needed for admission to all minority undergraduate applicants violated the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Supreme Court further held that the admissions policy was not narrowly tailored and did not provide the
individualized consideration Justice Powell contemplated in the landmark case of the *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*. In conclusion, Chief Justice Rehnquist wrote, “because the University’s use of race in its current freshman admissions policy is not narrowly tailored to achieve respondents’ asserted compelling interest in diversity, the admissions policy violates the Equal Protection Clause” (*Gratz v. Bollinger*, 2003). While the *Grutter* decision reaffirmed the use of race as a “positive” factor in admissions decisions because it serves as a “compelling interest” in achieving a diverse student body, it is important to note that in *Gratz v. Bollinger*, the companion case to *Grutter*, the Supreme Court rejected the argument that diversity constitutes a compelling interest in achieving a diverse student body.

*Policy Implications in Higher Education from Bakke to Grutter*

Since the United States Supreme Court’s fragmented decision in *Bakke*, Justice Powell’s opinion has served as the cornerstone for constitutional analysis of race-conscious admissions policies. Across the nation, both public and private universities have modeled their admissions programs based on Justice Powell’s guidelines for permissible race-conscious admissions (*Grutter v. Bollinger*, 2003). Yet, the *Hopwood* ruling forced dozens of college presidents to gather at Harvard University to discuss the future of affirmative action in student admissions. While college presidents reaffirmed their support of and commitment to race-conscious admissions, decisions regarding what could or should be done to defend affirmative action programs were inconclusive (Neely, 1997). Thus, one question remained after the *Hopwood* ruling: “Whether moderate forms of race-based admission policies will make it through the Supreme Court?” (Neely, 1997, p. 53)
When arguments in support of diversity were rejected in the Hopwood decision, it became evident that any effort to assert a compelling interest in fostering a diverse student body would be viewed by the Fifth Circuit Court as an exercise in futility. This dramatic decision had two major impacts on universities maintaining race-conscious admissions programs. First, the Hopwood decision eliminated the only justification that colleges could use for implementing affirmative action programs in student admissions. Second, any positive race-conscious efforts implemented on the part of colleges would be considered illegal in a court of law (Orfield & Whitla, 1999). Thus, universities and professional schools began modifying their admissions policies to avoid future threats of legal action.

Policy Implications after the Bakke Decision

While the Bakke decision satisfied almost no one, for at least a decade, it had an aura of settled law. In the following decade, the impact of Bakke was largely supported in a legal setting. Yet, in a political and public opinion setting, the support for affirmative action programs was mixed. In the context of higher education, minority students decided whether to apply to universities, especially professional schools, and admissions officers decided whether to admit them.

The enrollment of minorities in professional schools was shaped by several factors, not just the desire for African-Americans and Hispanics to attend medical or law school. First, the enrollment of African-Americans and Hispanics was affected by the number of these students graduating from college. Consequently, these numbers not only shaped the resources of the minority population, but also the resources of the larger society which was willing to invest in supporting the undergraduate education of minority
students. Second, the overall levels of competition for places in professional schools and the efforts schools put forth to recruit, admit, and retain students of color also affected the enrollment of minorities. Third, the enrollment of minorities in professional schools was affected by the impact of any government policy, which in this case, the Bakke decision was no exception (Welch & Gruhl, 1998).

Financial Aid. According to Welch and Gruhl (1998), Blacks and Hispanics need financial aid in order to continue their education beyond high school. While there were several types of financial assistance, federal aid based on need was the most common type of aid available to minority students. Thus, it was believed that the increase and decrease in federal aid was directly related not only to the rise and fall of minority enrollment in undergraduate institutions, but also the pool of potential professional school applicants. Welch and Gruhl (1998) further contended that the decision to pursue postgraduate work was directly correlated to the availability of federal aid. In the 1970s, federal financial assistance increased dramatically and then shifted in a downward spiral that continued for more than a decade. The drastic change in financial aid occurred immediately before and after the Bakke decision. Thus, the availability of federal aid to students, specifically African-Americans and Mexican Americans, was progressively more limited in the decade after Bakke.

A sharp contrast also existed between the increasing cost of attendance and the increased reliance on loans rather than grants in regards to federal aid. During the 1980s, this contrast discouraged lower-income students regarding their ability to finance a college education. Minority students, specifically Blacks and Hispanics, were hit disproportionately hard as federal student aid continued to shrink. Welch and Gruhl
(1998) referred to an extensive study conducted by Moulton (1988) that revealed a positive correlation between Black students enrollment in higher education and the total federal financial aid available to them. Moulton (1988) concluded that when African-American students were offered more loans than grants or work-study opportunities, a negative correlation existed in regards to their enrollment in higher education. Analysts further asserted that this negative correlation existed because Black and Hispanic students had access to fewer resources from their families and their work. Unlike White students, they were less likely to have the kind of family resources needed to consider pursuing a large loan to finance an education, especially a postgraduate education (Welch and Gruhl, 1998).

African-Americans and Mexican Americans lacked the socio-economic resources needed to pursue a professional education at the time of the Bakke decision. The lower income status and financial resources of Blacks and Hispanics were barriers to the pursuit of a professional degree. While more Blacks were obtaining a high school education and closing the gap that existed between them and White students, still fewer Blacks and Hispanics were earning college degrees. The increase in single-parent families also limited the opportunities of many people of color because they were deprived of both the income and the parental resources necessary to acquire a professional degree. During the decade following the Bakke decision, these disadvantages did not diminish. In fact, the recession of the 1980s and growing income inequalities often closed the door to higher education for many people of color. The decline in federal student aid further closed the door to higher education for African-Americans and Hispanics. Thus, students who successfully completed an undergraduate degree were faced with additional barriers as
they contemplated attending a professional school, such as law or medicine. They were also faced with increased competition for places in professional schools, such as medicine and law (Welch & Gruhl, 1998).

The Changing Nature of Law School Admissions Processes. While the Civil Rights Act opened the doors for Blacks to many institutions of higher education, the irony was that African-Americans demand for higher education came at a time when admission to law and medical school had become more difficult. Yet, the controversy over Bakke continued to escalate because many professional schools were trying to increase the opportunities of Blacks in higher education. These opportunities were viewed as crucial given the increased competition of law and medical school admissions. In order to assess the impact of the Bakke decision, the admissions policies of professional schools must be examined before the decision was rendered (Welch & Gruhl, 1998).

In a study conducted by Welch and Gruhl (1998) regarding affirmative action and minority enrollments in medical and law schools, there was a general consensus that “some, but not many, schools did have quota systems before Bakke (p. 70). Respectively, medical and law school admissions officers defined “some” as approximately five to seven percent in regards to schools that had quotas. If these percentages were accurate, then the rumors of quotas were more widespread than originally thought, which led to the modal response of “some” schools having quotas. The researchers further stated that the assessment made by one reporter after the Bakke decision regarding whether few institutions had pre-Bakke quotas was consistent with the percentages mentioned above. “He noted that in the years between the time that Bakke filed his suit and the time the
Supreme Court ruled on the case, quotas have all but disappeared” (Welch & Gruhl, 1998, p. 71). Thus, it was estimated that less than a dozen institutions still used a quota system that set aside a certain number of admission slots for minorities (Welch & Gruhl, 1998).

Welch and Gruhl (1998) stated that comments to the open-ended questions varied, which made it difficult to define a quota.

One law school respondent said, The admission officer at a large [M]idwestern state university told me in 1973 that his school took the best 20 black students [who] appl[ied]. I think this policy was typical at the time. Another remarked that the goal was to have [a student body] proportional to the population of the state…for groups that had known serious underrepresentation in the legal profession. But another law respondent declared, Before Bakke was decided most lawyers in the law school admissions process that I know believed a quota was not defendable, and another remarked that they were rarely able to fill their quotas with qualified students (Welch & Gruhl, 1998, p. 71).

While most admissions officials denied having quotas, they did admit to having goals for minority students, despite the fact that the line between a ‘quota’ and a ‘goal’ were not always clearly noticeable. One law school admissions officer stated that the term ‘quota’ was too strong, so it was replaced with a softer term ‘de facto quota.’ A second law school admissions officer questioned whether the term ‘expectancy’ was similar to a ‘quota.’ A third law school admissions officer stated that instead of ‘quotas,’ his institution had ‘flexible goals’ for minority students. In fact, 35 percent of the law schools surveyed had ‘goals’ in addition to its five percent ‘quota.’ The researchers contended that if past quotas existed, law school officials would have admitted that they were present because quotas were not illegal before the Bakke decision. In conclusion, the researchers estimate that approximately 10 percent of the professional schools surveyed still had some form of a quota system, even though they might have been described as “goals” for minorities (Welch & Gruhl, 1998).
Even though racial quotas were outlawed by the *Bakke* decision, affirmative action practices were validated, which gave positive weight to the use of race and ethnicity in student admissions. For the institutions of higher education attempting to increase the number of minorities in professional schools specifically, this validation provided legitimacy to these institutions’ efforts. Unlike medical schools, only a small number of law schools had affirmative action offices and officers who were responsible for diversifying their student bodies and faculties. These law schools not only had administrative officers responsible for the recruitment and retention of minorities, but some also had committees that provided advice and oversight, or a combination of both (Welch & Gruhl, 1998).

While special recruitment and retention efforts for minorities were a routine feature in the organizational terrain of law schools, it was evident that the efforts made by these schools were a result of internal pressures to diversify the student body. When admissions officials of the law schools that participated in the study were questioned about the pressure state and federal governments were placing on their institutions to include race in making admissions decisions, the respondents stated that both the federal and state governments exerted little pressure. One respondent stated that “[if these actions] apply to any school, I’d like to know. In my view, the federal government has not been aggressive in pressuring schools to admit minorities” (Welch & Gruhl, 1998, p. 80). Most respondents felt that the pressure from the federal government was mild because the exertion came from filling out affirmative action forms and through mass mailings. Few schools were individually pressured by the federal government to admit more students of color. In addition, few institutions of higher education reported
receiving threats from the federal government to withhold funds or initiate legal actions (Welch & Gruhl, 1998).

There was a general consensus among respondents that state or local governments exerted more pressure on schools than the federal government. The sources of pressure from state and local officials and agencies were quite diverse, including (1) legislators and governors; (2) state councils of higher education; (3) state scholarship agencies; (4) legislative committees that oversaw higher education; and (5) the state supreme court. Accreditation agencies, such as the Law School Admission Council (LSAC) and the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar, were nongovernmental agencies that pressured law schools to recruit and retain more minority students. Not only were these groups the most salient source of pressure and support, but also these accreditation groups continue to be active in studying minority recruitment and providing information to individual schools. In 1986, a comprehensive report on minority students and access was prepared by the Law School Admission Council for the Affirmative Action Committee of the Section of Legal Education and Admission to the Bar of the ABA. In the report, the qualifications of minorities admitted to law school were examined and associated with the graduation rates of those various levels of qualifications. The Law School Admission Council also charts the enrollment trends of minorities (Welch & Gruhl, 1998).

Welch and Gruhl (1998) contended that even though the Bakke decision was rendered over a quarter of a century ago, it was evident that the decision was relevant to medical and law school admissions officers. A decade after the Bakke decision, most officials either supported or at least maintained a neutral opinion regarding the Bakke
decision. Yet, 63 percent of the law school officials claimed that the *Bakke* decision had no affect on their admissions policies. One respondent in the Welch and Gruhl (1998) study stated that “we have always upheld affirmative action” (p. 74). While another respondent stated that the affirmative action policy of his institution had not been changed since 1968. Thus, the majority of the schools reported that the *Bakke* decision reaffirmed instead of changed their admissions policies. Yet, opponents of the decision feared that public attention and professional school actions would focus more on the Supreme Court’s decision to outlaw quotas instead of its decision affirming the use of race as a positive factor in the admissions process. If emphasis were placed on outlawing quotas, opponents believed that not only would efforts to recruit minorities cease, but also that opportunities for minorities would diminish. Fortunately, there are more proponents of the *Bakke* decision who believe that it worked to increase the admissions of minority students instead of limiting the admissions of minority students (Welch & Gruhl, 1998).

Welch and Gruhl (1998) contended that this belief was particularly strong among law school respondents because twice as many of them believed that the *Bakke* decision opened the doors wider for students of color. In 1989, Blacks were given extra consideration during the admissions process in over 95 percent of the law schools in the nation. Regardless of these differences, the message was clear, “most admissions officials believed that *Bakke* legitimized existing practices rather than changed them, and where it did change [admissions] practices, it improved them” (Welch & Gruhl, 1998, p. 76). Hence, the message that race could be used as a positive factor in the admissions process had been heard (Welch & Gruhl, 1998).
Policy Implications after the Hopwood Decision

While the Bakke decision validated the use of race as a positive factor in the admissions process, in the case of Hopwood v. State of Texas, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals disagreed. The Court held that when the University of Texas denied admission to four White applicants on the basis of race, the Law School violated the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Unlike the Bakke decision, the Court held that the Law School could not use affirmative action to remedy past discrimination incidents at the institution and that the Law School’s interest in diversity was insufficient to support an affirmative action plan (Kaufman & Gonzalez, 1997).

The following opinion was summarized by the Court:

In summary, we hold that the University of Texas School of Law may not use race as a factor in deciding which applicants to admit in order to achieve a diverse student body, to combat the perceived effects of a hostile environment at the Law School, to alleviate the Law School’s poor reputation in the minority community, or to eliminate any present effects of past discrimination by actors other than the Law School (Hopwood v. State of Texas, 1996).

Even though the decision was appealed to the United States Supreme Court, the case was never heard because the Court denied certiorari. The Justices concluded that although the case involved issues of public importance, the case had already been decided by the lower courts (Kaufman & Gonzalez, 1997).

Inequities in Higher Education in Texas. Prior to the Hopwood decision, the system of funding higher education in Texas had already come under fire. The primary issue centered on the appropriation of state funding among the different regions. In addition, state sanctions barring African-Americans from equal access to public higher education were less than subtle. In Texas, two segregated Negro colleges were established to prevent African-Americans from attending institutions of higher education
that were predominantly White. These two institutions were Prairie View A&M and Texas Southern. Since Texas did not offer graduate or professional programs at the two Negro colleges, the first two African-Americans to attend the University of Texas at Austin (UT) were graduate or professional students (Chapa & Lazaro, 1998).

The first African-American student to attend the University of Texas School of Law was Heman Marion Sweatt. In 1950, the United States Supreme Court ordered the Law School to admit Sweatt under the “separate but equal” clause. In response to the Court’s ruling, the state of Texas established a “separate but equal” law school at Texas Southern University and developed a makeshift law program for African-Americans. Even though by the mid-1960s mandated segregation may have been eliminated from the Texas higher education system, to this day, campus segregation is still in existence (Chapa & Lazaro, 1998).

In 1980, Texas was found in violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) of the United States Department of Education. The Office for Civil Rights (OCR) found that

Texas had failed to eliminate the vestiges of its segregated higher education system and was in violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. 2000d…In 1983, just eight years before respondents [Hopwood et al.] applied to the Law School, Texas agreed under threat of federal action, to formulate an acceptable plan to desegregate its higher education system, including the law school (Chapa & Lazaro, 1998, pp. 55-56).

In an effort to assist Texas in desegregating its graduate and professional programs, the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) provided the following two suggestions to schools. First, institutions of higher education must consider each applicant’s entire record. Second, even though they may not meet all of the traditional admission requirements, schools
must admit African-American and Hispanic students who demonstrated the potential for success.

In comparison to publicly funded educational opportunities available to White students, those offered to minorities students were vastly inferior at the time Hopwood was filed and decided. The specifics of the Hopwood case resulted in a ruling that ignored these immense disparities. The ruling also prevented schools from developing an effective means to minimize these disparities. Ultimately, one factor led to the termination of affirmative action in Texas - the Law School’s flawed implementation of an admissions system that was adopted under pressure to desegregate (Chapa & Lazaro, 1998).

The Effect of Hopwood on Higher Education in Texas. The impact of Hopwood must also be considered in context with Texas’s current and future demographics. While 57 percent of the general population was White non-Hispanic, this group represented only 48 percent of the school-aged population in 1995. Projections show that the Hispanic population will continue to grow rapidly, eventually, making it the majority population. Within a decade, there are assumptions that Hispanics will become the largest group of the school-aged population.

Students entering the University of Texas in the fall 1997 were the first to be recruited and admitted under Hopwood. From 1996 to 1997, a significant decrease occurred in the number of applicants applying to the University of Texas. Some attribute this decrease in applicants to a change in application procedures. While previous applications did not require an essay, the 1997 application required three short essays. There was a general consensus that the casual applicant was discouraged by the essay
requirement. In 1997, the proportion of African-Americans applying to the University of Texas was 88 percent of the proportion that applied in 1996 (see Table Q.1). The proportion of African-Americans actually admitted was also significantly less in 1997. Chapa and Lazaro (1998) contended that this decrease in the applicant pool and the number of students being admitted was likely a direct effect of *Hopwood*.

In 1997, the total number of African-American applicants applying to the University of Texas School of Law also decreased compared to 1996. While the number of law school applications decreased nationwide, “the fact that the proportion of African American applicants in 1997 dropped by 30 percent from 1996 is certainly a *Hopwood* effect” (Chapa & Lazaro, 1998, p. 62). Fortunately, not all of the Texas law schools suffered the same fate as the University of Texas. The University of Houston’s Law School was able to sustain its proportion of admitted African-Americans. To accomplish this goal, the University of Houston Law School implemented the following strategies.

First, the interim chancellor, William P. Hobby, took a high-profile position for affirmative action and publicly challenged Attorney General Dan Morales’ interpretation of *Hopwood*. Ultimately, Chancellor Hobby generated an immense amount of publicity for the University of Houston system, even though the law remained the same. Second, the University of Houston’s admissions procedures were revised by its law faculty. The revisions included minimizing the weight given to standardized test scores. Finally, the Law School probably admitted some of the minority applicants that either chose not to apply or were denied admission to the University of Texas Law School.

The total number of African-American applicants at Texas Southern University’s Thurgood Marshall School of Law also declined after the *Hopwood* decision. Texas
Southern University Thurgood Marshall School of Law is a historically Black college and university created by the state of Texas in response to Sweatt’s application to the University of Texas Law School. Even though this Law School is the largest producer of African-American lawyers, the ban on using race as a “positive” factor in the admissions process also applied to Historically Black Colleges and Universities. Chapa and Lazaro (1998) suggested that the changes in the admissions procedures of Texas Southern were directly related to the Hopwood decision and its decline in African-American applicants. Texas Tech Law School also enrolled fewer African-American students after the Hopwood decision. Given the drop in African-American students admitted to these four major Texas law schools, the Hopwood decision might have contributed to the declining number of African-American lawyers by as much as one-third of the current total in Texas (see Tables Q.1-Q5) (Chapa & Lazaro, 1998).

*Implications of the Hopwood Decision.* After the Hopwood decision, there were fewer minority students than ever prior to entering the University of Texas Law School in the fall 1997. The number of minority applicants decreased because news of the Hopwood decision had a chilling effect on potential applicants. As grade point averages and test scores were given greater weight in the admissions decisions, a smaller proportion of minority applicants were being admitted to Texas law schools. Unfortunately, this was also the case at many institutions of higher education nationwide. In addition to the declining number of minority students admitted to law school, even fewer minority students matriculated at Texas law schools. Nationally, the chilling effect of Hopwood made Texas institutions less attractive to potential minority applicants (Chapa & Lazaro, 1998).
The *Hopwood* decision also made it more difficult for Texas institutions to make competitive financial aid offers. Even though most discussions regarding minority access to higher education were focused on barriers to the admissions process, lack of financial support was also a barrier to higher education for students of color. In Texas, there were tremendous financial obstacles associated with attaining a more diverse student body in higher education. Chapa and Lazaro (1998) stated that

one of the most troubling consequences of *Hopwood* is that, although the decision arguably represents the law in three Fifth Circuit states, only Texas has responded by changing its higher education policies. Because of Attorney General Morales’s formal opinion, Texas colleges and universities no longer offer targeted or enhanced financial aid packages to minority applicants. Universities in no other state are restricted by this limitation. Because of the uneven playing field, one of the first effects of *Hopwood* will be a decrease in the overall attendance of top minority high school graduates from Texas at colleges or universities in the state, simply because they can – and probably will – get better offers from institutions in other states (p. 68).

To remedy this situation, the researchers recommended that allocations for scholarships and fellowships be increased for all Texas students. Thus, the Texas Legislature would develop its own system of “portable” scholarships that could be used at any Texas college or university the student chose to attend. Chapa and Lazaro’s (1998) recommendation stemmed from an Illinois program that awards scholarships to its top graduates from every high school. The researchers further contended that such a system would not only minimize the financial obstacles to higher education, but also “create an incentive for Texas’s best minority students to finish their education in Texas” (Chapa & Lazaro, 1998, p. 69). In conclusion, there are no simple solutions to attaining diversity in higher education. This remains a complex problem that requires careful analysis and monitoring to level the playing field in higher education for all students regardless of race.
The effects of *Hopwood* are varied and likely to persist until the Supreme Court rules in a test case affecting all fifty states. In Texas, a bill was filed with the state legislature to reinstate affirmative action in public colleges and universities. The request for this bill was based on the premise that race may be used as a “positive” factor in admissions where diversity was still being affected by past discrimination. Similar to Proposition 209 in California and Initiative 200 in Washington, a second bill was filed to extend the ban on affirmative action regarding all state agencies. The reliance on standardized tests as admissions criteria was one of the important issues acknowledged in the *Hopwood* case. Proponents of affirmative action believe that standardized tests are poor predictors of academic success. Since the *Hopwood* decision, minority applications have decreased in Texas (Glenn, 1999).

*Policy Implications after the Grutter Decision*

The recent round of assaults on affirmative action began eight years ago with the Federal Court of Appeals’ decision in *Hopwood v. Texas*. In the latter half of the 1990s and the initial years of the present decade, the assault on affirmative action in college and university admissions has made it the largest issue in American higher education. The University of Michigan’s unwavering conviction in defending its undergraduate and Law School admissions policies in the cases of *Gratz v. Bollinger* and *Grutter v. Bollinger* respectively led to the ultimate conclusion that diversity was an indispensable educational value (Killenbeck, 2004). Bell, Coleman and Palmer (2005) contended that the *Grutter* decision resolved the central question that has annoyed judges and litigants for almost a decade: Whether Justice Powell’s 1978 opinion in *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke* was correct in concluding that the use of race as a “positive” factor in
college admissions decisions was a compelling interest based on the educational benefits of diversity.

Limitations to the Grutter Decision. In the Grutter decision, Justice Powell’s decision in Bakke was reaffirmed by the Supreme Court; although, the Court’s decision left as many questions as answers. First, the Michigan decision was limited to college admissions decisions. Thus, the Court’s decision failed to address the use of race as a “positive” factor in (1) financial aid and scholarship programs; (2) recruitment practices; (3) outreach programs; and (4) retention practices. The use of race as a “positive” factor in these programs and practices is vital in achieving a diverse student body. Under federal law, this limitation is important because “context matters” according to the Supreme Court when evaluating race- and ethnicity- conscious policies.

Institutions of higher education seeking to obtain the educational benefits that flow from a diverse student body are left with one central question. “How can we evaluate the full range of our diversity-related practices in light of what the court in the Michigan cases said – and what it didn’t say?” (Bell, Coleman, & Palmer, 2005, p. B9). In essence, what strategies should colleges and universities implement under “strict scrutiny” in its race-and-ethnicity- conscious practices to ensure that they are not dead on arrival? In order to answer these questions, institutions must develop a plan that incorporates both “big picture” principles and policy specific research and evaluation. Thus, one major point emerges from the Supreme Court’s decision: Process matters (Bell, Coleman, & Palmer, 2005).
Race and Diversity Practices in the Post-Grutter Era. The Court also emphasized the importance of periodic reviews and evaluations of race- and ethnicity-conscious admissions practices. Thus, higher education officials implementing and maintaining diversity programs should use the following evaluation strategies. First, not only must higher education officials define their diversity goals, but also exhibit a demonstrable commitment to these goals. In order for this strategy to be implemented effectively, officials must receive support from the highest levels of the institution. If diversity goals are to be “compelling,” they must reflect the institutions’ overall mission.

Second, despite relevant research and experience, higher education officials must establish a process of review that encompasses numerous perspectives. These perspectives must consider all practices designed to achieve diversity. Thus, it would be insufficient to evaluate any one program in a vacuum. For example, “an evaluation of a financial-aid program must include a review of other kinds of programs that might further the diversity objectives associated with the financial-aid program” (Bell, Coleman, & Palmer, 2005, p. B9). Third, benchmarks of success must be established, as well as a basis for meaningful evaluation to determine whether diversity programs meet those benchmarks. In conclusion, the University of Michigan’s success in defending its law school admissions policy stemmed from the following practices: (1) its emphasis on the educational benefits of a diverse student body; (2) its demonstration of a clear institutional commitment to diversity; (3) its establishment of a review process that involved varied perspectives regarding diversity; and (4) its establishment of a method to determine what made good educational sense in conjunction with institution-specific goals (Bell, Coleman, & Palmer, 2005). The University of Michigan’s policies and
practices were narrowly tailored to achieve the diversity that was a “compelling interest” of the state.

_Beyond Admissions: Financial Aid Programs in the Post-Grutter Era._ When the Supreme Court justified the use of race-conscious admissions policies as a “compelling interest” in achieving student body diversity, it also justified the use of other race-conscious programs in higher education. Legal Scholars associated with the Civil Rights Project of Harvard University noted that financial aid and other support programs, such as retention, recruitment and outreach, were important to ensure that a diverse student body was enrolled and maintained during the academic year. Yet, under the _Grutter_ decision, uncertainty existed concerning financial aid and the permissibility of race-exclusive scholarships that targeted minorities. Legal scholars further contended that two questions had been raised in the aftermath of the _Grutter_ decision regarding financial aid. First, “should a race-conscious financial aid policy be subject to the same narrow tailoring analysis of an admissions program?” (Joint Statement, 2003, p. 21) Second, “are race-exclusive scholarship[s] and preparation programs constitutional?” (“Joint Statement,” 2003, p. 21).

Some higher education officials were concerned that the language in _Grutter_ might jeopardize the use of race as a “positive” factor in financial aid programs. Similar to admissions decisions, there have been ongoing disputes regarding race-conscious financial aid programs, despite the existence of limited federal court guidance. In 1990, it was concluded that the use of race-conscious scholarships in higher education violated Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The United States Department of Education’s Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights made this determination. While no one challenged
this position, the General Accounting Office released a study showing that institutions awarded only a small percentage of scholarships on the basis of race or ethnicity. In 1994, the Department of Education presented a dissenting opinion regarding race-based financial aid. The Department of Education asserted that race-based financial aid programs did not violate Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 when used to remedy past discriminations or promote diversity (Weir, 2001; Joint Statement, 2003).

*Podberesky v. Kirwan* (1992; 1994) was one of the few instances in which a federal court addressed the issue of minority scholarships. In this instance, the University of Maryland developed a scholarship program specifically for African-American students to remedy the effects of past discrimination. Since the institution’s scholarship program failed to promote diversity, it violated Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Review of the scholarship program was based on the standards of race-conscious programs intended to remedy the present effects of past discrimination. In the *amicus* brief, the Court stated in a footnote that using the rationale of educational benefits invalidated the scholarship program because it failed to consider other types of diversity in addition to ethnicity.

Some legal scholars contended that federal courts should focus on the nature of the interest, such as the different benefits or burdens attached to the interest. For instance, there was a much stronger interest attached to an admissions decision versus a recruitment visit because the benefits were greater in the admissions context. Likewise, scholarships and financial aid programs often constituted a stronger interest than other non-admissions policies “because the assistance may, in some instances, determine whether an individual can attend the university at all” (Joint Statement, 2003, p. 22).
Thus, other race-conscious programs in higher education must comply with the Court’s narrow tailoring requirements. In the context of admissions, these programs must (1) have sufficient flexibility; (2) consider race-neutral alternatives; (3) consider burdens on non-minority students; and (4) have time limits (Joint Statement, 2003).

The underlying values of diversity in higher education were reaffirmed by the Grutter decision. Grutter also reaffirmed the value of racial integration in American society. The Michigan case provided institutions of higher education with clear guidelines regarding inclusive admissions policies. According to the Supreme Court, “race unfortunately matters” (Joint Statement, 2003, p. 26). Hence, the issue of affirmative action will continue to divide our country, despite our nation’s broad commitment to equal educational opportunity. While one set of legal questions has been settled by the Michigan decision, we can expect more to arise in our courts and legislatures in the future (Joint Statement, 2003).

*The Debate: Diversity in Higher Education, Legal Education, and the Legal Profession*

For over a quarter of a century, a continuing concern for law schools has been increasing minority representation in the legal profession. Despite the continuing concerns, the enrollment of people of color remains appallingly low (Lundwall, 1994). White (2000) argued that without affirmative action, not only would the integration of American higher education come to a halt; but also that resegregation would accelerate with each generation. This conclusion was based on the premise that the successes or failures of each generation were built on the successes and failures of the preceding generations. For instance, from 1964 to 1990, the integration of American higher
education accelerated with the implementation of affirmative action policies. It was reasonable to predict that with the discontinuation of affirmative action policies, the segregation of American higher education accelerated with each generation. White (2000) concluded that student-body diversity might be the only avenue that could withstand judicial assault. Thus, it was imperative that institutions of higher education offer compelling evidence that diversity was essential to the achievement of higher education’s mission.

The rationale of diversity hangs by a thread as perceived by federal judges. While some federal judges were willing to acknowledge the continued vitality of diversity, they did so grudgingly and in a qualified way. On the other hand, some federal judges were not only ready, but also were willing to proclaim that the Bakke decision was no longer a good law and that diversity was an insufficient compelling interest in higher education, legal education, and the legal profession. It was clear that proponents of affirmative action relied on assertions that diversity served positive educational purposes. However, judges were quick to dismiss such assertions because they wanted “compelling evidence,” instead of “rank speculation.” Hence, the bar had been raised and the burden of proof was on “the institutional defenders of affirmative action to prove convincingly – to skeptical judges – that diversity is essential to the achievement of higher education’s mission” (White, 2000, p. 19). As the debate concerning affirmative action and diversity continues in higher education, proponents and opponents of diversity continue to struggle with the following questions: (1) “Do students benefit from attending an institution with a racially diverse student body? (2) Does society benefit? (3) Does affirmative action
stigmatize its intended beneficiaries? (4) Is affirmative action fair to non-minorities? (5) Are there more equitable ways of achieving diversity?" (White, 2000, pp. 20-21).

Proponents of Diversity in Higher Education, Legal Education, and the Legal Profession

Orfield (2001) stated that affirmative action in college admissions was under full-scale attack in the courts. While affirmative action was designed to resolve a variety of serious racial problems, the researcher contended that its survival might depend on one question – “whether or not the educational value of diversity is sufficiently compelling to justify [the] consideration of race as a factor in deciding whom to admit to colleges and universities” (Orfield, 2001, p. 1). Concerns of racial justice, the training of leaders for future communities and the professions, and the purging of campuses with racists attitudes influenced university admissions policies. For over a quarter century, race-conscious admissions policies rested with the Bakke decision, which emphasized the educational benefits of diversity on college campuses (Orfield, 2001).

In the Bakke decision, Supreme Court Justice Lewis Powell cast the deciding vote regarding affirmative action admissions policies. Justice Powell identified only one legitimate justification for the consideration of race in the college admissions process – “that diverse student bodies produce better education and more stimulating campus communities,” which was the reason why the courts traditionally gave universities plenty of leeway in choosing their students (Orfield, 2001, p. 1). While the movement for diversity peaked on college campuses in the mid-1970s, before the Bakke decision, proponents of diversity established and implemented the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which required federal action against discrimination. When colleges chose not to comply with the new civil rights requirements, the federal government cut their financial aid funding.
Even with the major cutbacks in financial aid and the *Bakke* decision, Whites were slow to change their opinions and open up campuses to students of color (Orfield, 2001).

Rudenstine (2001) stated that over the past decade, few issues aroused more controversial debate than the importance of diversity in higher education. Yet, while the debate was often framed by the competing interests of different groups, it was imperative that “educational value” be remembered as the fundamental rationale for student diversity in higher education. The researcher contended that students benefit in countless ways when afforded the opportunity to live and learn among peers whose perspectives differed from their own. In addition, students were challenged to explore ideas and arguments at a different level when they were immersed in a diverse educational environment. Bowen and Bok (1998) conducted a study with White and Black students regarding the effects of diversity and found that “the vast majority believe that going to college with a diverse body of students made a valuable contribution to their education and personal development” (p. 255). The researchers’ qualitative inquiry led them to the following conclusion: “There is overwhelming support for the proposition that the progress made over the last thirty years in achieving greater diversity is to be prized, not devalued” (p. 255). Yet, Rudenstine (2001) stated that we should not romanticize diversity as we assess its values; but instead, remember that the character of American society was shaped from its beginning by our collective willingness to carry forward unprecedented experiments in diversity.

Lundwall (1994) stated that after the *Bakke* decision, additional factors were considered by admissions committees choosing to diversify their student bodies. Some of these factors included the race or ethnic background of students who met traditional
admissions requirements. Although special admissions programs continued to be controversial, proponents of diversity argued affirmative action admissions policies were valid because a number of studies found that grades and Law School Admissions Test (LSAT) scores were insufficient predictors in determining the success of a law student. Chang (2001) contended that diversity not only promoted more interaction, but also promoted socialization across racial lines, which was associated with (1) increased classroom discussions of the issues, (2) better retention rates in college, and (3) a higher satisfaction with the college experience.

Milem (2001) asserted that when campuses embraced diversity their professors were more apt to use different teaching styles because of the diverse student population. Professors were also more likely to include diversity in their lesson plans. Hurtado (2001) further found that students benefited from diverse classrooms in terms of (1) increased leadership skills, (2) increased awareness of other cultures, and (3) an increased ability to work collaboratively with students of different races. Milem (2001) and Hurtado (2001) concluded that increasing campus diversity increased economic productivity for both groups. It also created economically valuable skills for positioning in the marketplace, which seemed impossible to measure in conventional research. In essence, diversity did make a difference, but those differences were neither automatic nor uniform (Orfield, 2001).

*Opponents of Diversity in Higher Education, Legal Education, and the Legal Profession*

Since the *Hopwood* decision in 1996, when the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit ruled that race could not be considered as a factor in the law school admissions process of the University of Texas, the controversy surrounding the topic of
diversity significantly intensified. Subsequent legal decisions and public referenda banning the use of race-conscious admissions policies created a climate of turbulence and doubt within the higher education community. The four main arguments from critics of affirmative action in university admissions to promote diversity included the following:

1. Affirmative action programs were important during an interim stage as a step toward greater equality of opportunity and the creation of a “level playing field”; but we have not reached a point where discrimination has been so significantly reduced that African Americans (or other historically underrepresented groups) no longer face serious obstacles of this kind.

2. Affirmative action programs, while well-intentioned, are focused on the wrong target. Instead, our attention and resources should be devoted to solving more basic social and economic difficulties, by investing in children’s health, improved schools, better housing, and school-to-work transitional programs.

3. Affirmative action programs run the risk of stigmatizing and thus injuring the very people they are designed to assist and protect.

4. Affirmative action programs are inherently unfair because they deny admissions to students with high test scores (or grades) in favor of students with less impressive “objective” records (Rudenstine, 2001, pp. 39-43).

Lundwall (1994) stated that reverse discrimination and resentment of nonminority students were often traditional arguments of individuals who opposed diversity and special admissions programs. In addition, some opponents believed that special admissions programs and diversity had a negative impact on minority students instead of the positive impact that was intended, thus “the minority victory won in the admissions office is lost in the classroom” (Lundwall, 1994, p. 150). The contention that special admissions programs were ineffective stemmed from the fact that minority students either withdrew from the law school or failed classes which hindered their opportunity to graduate (Lundwall, 1994). Cross (1993) stated that in today’s society, there were few educational policy makers who did not express serious concerns and doubt about affirmative action admissions programs and diversity.

Cross (1993) further indicated that individuals who opposed diversity had four primary arguments. First, the preferential admission of racial minorities led to the unfair
exclusion of many White students who were better qualified. Thus, White students were forced to attend their second- or third-choice law schools. Second, affirmative action admissions policies led to (1) a double standard in grading, (2) a lowering of standards in relation to the awarding of scholarships, and (3) a general corruption of the merit system in academe. Third, minorities were actually harmed by affirmative action admissions policies because it caused them to (1) create an attitude of entitlement, (2) undermine the work ethic, and (3) in many cases, reinforce a culture of dependency. Fourth, opponents believed that affirmative action usually hurts the most gifted Black students based on the premise that as long as these policies existed, the world would still perceive them as undeserving beneficiaries of grades and degrees that they did not rightfully earn. Despite these arguments, policies of preferential admissions persisted in American law schools and institutions of higher education across the United States (Cross, 1993).

Critics of affirmative action expressed their personal opinions favoring admissions policies based on traditional academic criteria (Orfield and Whitla, 2001). Opponents of affirmative action stated that racial inequality should be solved somewhere other than law schools, such as secondary schools or undergraduate institutions. One student commented, “It’s good to be diverse but you don’t want to have unqualified students. I think that it needs to start earlier, at grade school” (Orfield & Whitla, 2001, pp. 170-171). Several students also expressed their views on how affirmative action harmed minorities. For example, one student said, “It is damaging to everyone to put other people in schools that they would not have been admitted to otherwise” (Orfield & Whitla, 2001, p. 171).
Yet, other students were conflicted over diversity and affirmative action admissions policies. One student commented, “It is a really hard question and it is really hard to answer. Affirmative action … [is] not really a great solution to the problem, but I don’t think there is a better one out there to use” (Orfield & Whitla, 2001, p. 171). While some students offered other solutions to the problem, such as emphasizing poverty in admissions as an alternative or supplement to the existing policies, or using a class-based scale rather than a racially based scale, one student concluded the discussion with this comment, “Race is an inappropriate and unfortunate proxy for socioeconomic class” (Orfield & Whitla, 2001, p. 171). While law students reflect the majority of the nation’s diversity, it was clear from Orfield and Whitla’s report that some students had alluded to positive and powerful educational experiences from interacting with students of other race. However, it was also clear that some students had not had these experiences, which often subjected the topic of diversity to a great deal of criticism and unwarranted speculation.

**Black Law Schools and Diversity in Legal Education and the Legal Profession**

The concept of Black law schools, affirmative action, and diversity also presents several challenging opportunities for Black legal educators. First, Black legal educators are afforded the opportunity to provide quality legal education to a multiethnic and diverse student body. Second, Black legal educators are given the opportunity to establish creative and innovative roles in legal education. While it would be ideal if the Black community could state in good faith that Black law schools were not needed because White law schools were supplying the Black community with enough Black lawyers committed to diversity and the affirmative action concept of helping the Black
community overcome underrepresentation in America’s economic mainstream; this was not the case (Weeden, 1986).

Over the centuries, it was clearly documented that not only was the freedom and the equality of the Black race maintained by the dedication of Black lawyers, but also that White law schools were ineffective in training a significant number of Black lawyers to overcome the continuous problem of the underrepresentation of Blacks in law schools and the legal profession. Thus, in order to assist America in its commitment to affirmative action, Black law schools were desperately needed. Professor Charles E. Daye, Professor of Law at the University of North Carolina, asserted that “black law schools have demonstrated that their affirmative action goals of admitting ‘culturally disadvantaged students usually minorities, mostly blacks – in order to diversify the legal profession’ are highly successful” (Weeden, 1986, p. 400).

While Black law schools served an important role in remedying the severe underrepresentation of minorities in the legal profession, the Bakke decision clearly stated that affirmative action diversification was only permissible when all applicants for admissions were given an equal chance to compete for every available seat in the entering class. Thus, racial discrimination for the sake of racial discrimination was wrong. Additionally, “white students with a demonstrated compassion for the poor, or a history of overcoming disadvantages and any other exceptional personal talents which suggest that the white applicant would make a contribution to educational diversity should be welcomed at black law schools” (Weeden, 1986, p. 403). The Court’s decision in the Bakke case was based on the perception that if a rich White male with decent grades was committed not only to joining the fight against racial discrimination, but also to a multi-
ethnic legal profession, then he would probably be able to bring something to a historically Black law school that a Black student might not offer. More importantly, neither a White nor Black student should expect admittance to a traditionally Black law school based on the premise that no other law school would offer admittance to such a student (Weeden, 1986).

In Wygant v. Jackson Board of Education, Black law professors understood the benefits of a diverse student body at traditionally Black law schools. For instance, Black law professors grasped the concept and benefit of diversity in that minority law professors served as role models for both minority and nonminority law students at Black law schools. Prior to attending a predominantly Black law school, most nonminority students were denied the opportunity to experience the excellent teaching skills of a Black professor at the university level. Hence, when excellent Black law professors taught both Black and White students, the American society at large benefited because the best offense for affirmative action was excellence. Moreover, when White students engaged in intellectual discussions and learned the legal profession in a predominantly Black or minority situation where emphasis was placed on professional excellence and social sensitivity by the Black law professor, they were more likely to acquire not only a new profound respect for Black professionals in particular, but also a new profound respect for the status of Black citizens in general. A White graduate from a Black law school was more likely to dispel the stereotype that Blacks were incompetent professionals because of the multiethnic diversified high quality learning process he/she experienced at a historically Black law school. Professor Pollitt concluded by stating that
the legal profession needed law schools both Black and White that were committed to three goals: (1) diversity; (2) innovation; and (3) public service (Weeden, 1986).

**Benefits of Diversity in Higher Education, Legal Education, and the Legal Profession**

On June 23, 2003, a quarter century after the *Bakke* decision, the United States Supreme Court decided and affirmed in *Grutter v. Bollinger* that diversity was fundamentally important to institutions of higher education and the legal profession in the United States. Willert (2003) stated that the Supreme Court’s decision in *Grutter* could have positive and wide-ranging benefits for the legal profession and legal organizations, such as the Defense Research Institute. The researcher further asserted that the leadership and face of corporate American was changing similar to the population of the country. The offices of chief operating officers and boardrooms were continuously being filled with women and people of color. While the change had been slower than some had hoped and others had expected, the change was occurring. In addition to the changing face of corporate America, the expectations and attitudes of corporate America were also changing. Thus, it was unacceptable and insufficient for corporate law firms that represented corporate America to lack diversity.

Willert (2003) contended that society had an expectation of law firms representing corporate America to reflect the diversity of the corporation’s applicant pool and customer base. Therefore, law firms must look to law schools that embraced the concept of diversity in order to meet the demands of their clients in corporate America. Willert (2003) further stated that corporations and law firms were not the only entities that would benefit from the *Grutter* decision. Individual defendants would also experience the benefits of the *Grutter* decision. For example, the face of jurists and
Jurors were increasingly more diverse; therefore, the idea of a jury of one’s peers had taken a different meaning. Hence, an effective advocate for clients with a diverse jury was an essential component for those who not only stood in front of a jury; but also who were breaking down cross-racial stereotypes. Willert (2003) asserted that “by affirming the right of colleges and universities to consider ethnicity as a factor in admissions policies, the Supreme Court had insured that those who used the judicial system would benefit from truly effective advocacy” (p. 31). If the Grutter decision was implemented appropriately, it would effectively improve the civil justice system by expanding the number of diverse perceptions that were brought into the courtrooms of America (Willert, 2003).

The concept of diversity that was emphasized and encouraged in the Grutter decision was about more than the aesthetics of university and law school classrooms. First, the decision enhanced the skills and professionalism of those who served as defense counsel. Second, the Grutter decision had the potential of increasing the strength of the civil defense trial bar by making it stronger than the sum of its parts. Third, “the decision is an affirmation of the importance of differences in all aspects of American life – from the classroom, to the courtroom, to the boardroom” (Willert, 2003, p. 31).

**Summary**

The manner in which an educational institution designs its admissions policies involves many factors. The admission of students who will promote the academic mission of the school is the primary goal of an admissions policy. Admissions officers abide by several guidelines when recruiting and admitting students. First, they want to recruit and admit students who are qualified and eager to learn. Second, they want
students who are able to contribute to the broader education of the entire student body. Third, admissions officers want to recruit and admit students who are able to contribute to society after graduation in both their personal and professional lives. Prior to the Grutter decision, most colleges, universities, graduate and law programs referred to the Bakke decision for guidance in creating race-conscious admissions policies that promoted a diverse student body (McCutchen, B., Morrison & Foerster, White, H. E. & McAuliffe, 2004).

Given the underrepresentation of many racial and ethnic groups in higher education today, access to higher education and improving equality in college admissions remains a major educational policy issue (McDonough & Antonio, 1996). Prater and Miller (1989) contends that the status of Blacks in the professions of medicine and law is an increasing concern in the United States. While most institutions of higher education are making inroads to increase their minority enrollments, the underrepresentation of Blacks and Hispanics in the nation’s law schools is so dismal that every major legal group has concluded that it is a problem that must be addressed. Thus, legal groups are working with law schools to develop a solution to this problem. While more Blacks have been admitted to law schools, fewer have chosen to matriculate (Farrell, 1989).

Farrell (1989) contends that Black students do not want to attend a law school where there are few if any Blacks or women on the faculty. What are the factors influencing African-American students enrollment in Texas law schools? After extensive research, the question pertaining to why students in general choose the colleges they do remains a mystery (Jones, 1979). In addition, the most influential college choice factors will vary depending on the institution and the population under study. Yet, many of the
same college choice factors continue to surface, such as (1) academic reputation of the institution; (2) geographic location; (3) financial aid; (4) social atmosphere; (5) total cost of attending; and (6) the number of minority faculty, staff, and administrators.
CHAPTER THREE
Methodology

Introduction

The topic of college choice at the undergraduate level has garnered increased interest in recent decades; however, little empirical research has been conducted on law students, specifically African-American law students in relation to college choice (Erickson, 1988, 1990; Goldman, 1972; Moses, 1981; Packer, Ehrlich & Pepper, 1972; Thielens, 1965; Hossler & Gallagher, 1987; Litten, 1982). Increased interest in college choice has been driven by several factors during the last twenty-five years: (1) the increased competition for a declining applicant pool of traditional-aged college students, (2) the aspiration to effectively and efficiently distribute federal and state financial aid funds, (3) the declining number of African-American students pursuing degrees in higher education from 1977 to 1987, and (4) the use of college choice findings by individual institutions, state agencies, and federal agencies when developing policies related to higher education (Hossler & Gallagher, 1987).

While research examining the decision process of African-American law students has been non-existent, research regarding college choice at the undergraduate level revealed several important variables that influenced the selection process. Litten (1982) stated that the variables which received the greatest amount of attention could be grouped into the following categories: (1) student background; (2) high school attributes; (3) parental attributes; (4) student performance; and (5) environmental factors. At the
undergraduate level, these categories were utilized in the development of several three-stage models that explained the college choice process (Hossler & Gallagher, 1987; Litten, 1982). Despite the lack of research regarding African-American law students and the college choice process, Mort and Moskowitz’s (1994) indicated the following factors were important to African-Americans when selecting a law school: (1) scholarships; (2) supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations; (3) assurances of employment after graduation; (4) wide-ranging curriculums that provide more job choices after graduation; and (5) Black professors who would be potential mentors and role models. The article further stated that Harvard Law School was the best choice for African-American students who desired to obtain a legal education. Law schools that experienced some success in awarding law degrees to students of color attributed the following incentives to operating a prestigious law program: (1) financial aid; (2) sensitivity to minority needs; (3) minority faculty as role models and mentors; (4) a variety of support systems; and (5) a firm commitment to diversity. Thus, the following question still remains: If Harvard Law School is considered the best choice for African-Americans who are striving to obtain a law degree, where does this leave Texas law schools in their plight to recruit more African-American students? The problem of this study was to identify the factors that affect the law school choice of prospective African-American students in the state of Texas.

Research Questions

To carry out the purposes of this present study, the following research questions were examined:
1. What factor(s) are the major determinants in the law school choice of African-American students enrolling in accredited private law schools in the state of Texas?

2. What factor(s) are the major determinants in the law school choice of African-American students enrolling in accredited public law schools in the state of Texas?

3. What factor(s) are the major determinants in the law school choice of African-American students enrolling in an accredited historically Black law school in the state of Texas?

4. Is there a difference in the factors affecting the law school choice of African-American students who attend accredited private law schools, public law schools and a historically Black law school in the state of Texas?

5. What are the demographic characteristics of African-American students currently enrolling in Texas law schools?

6. Which institutions of higher education are African-American students attending prior to enrolling in Texas law schools?

7. How do African-American students perceive the different minority recruiting strategies amongst Texas law schools?

8. Who helps prospective African-American law students in the college choice process? (e.g., parents, peers, family members, close friends, mentors, etc.)

9. From an institutional point of view, how do Texas law schools perceive the effectiveness of their minority recruiting strategies in relation to African-American students?

10. What effect(s) has *Hopwood v. State of Texas* and *Grutter v. Bollinger* had on the recruitment strategies of the nine law schools in the state of Texas overall?

11. What effect(s) has *Hopwood v. State of Texas* and *Grutter v. Bollinger* had on the recruitment strategies of each Texas law school in relation to African-American students?

*Population*

*Pilot Study*

There are nine law schools in the state of Texas that are accredited by the American Bar Association. Of the nine Texas law schools, eight chose to participate in the study in the 2004-2005 academic year. The eight law schools that chose to participate
in the study include: (1) Baylor University School of Law, (2) South Texas College of Law, (3) St. Mary’s University School of Law, (4) Texas Southern University Thurgood Marshall School of Law, (5) Texas Tech University School of Law, (6) Texas Wesleyan University School of Law, (7) the University of Houston Law Center, and (8) the University of Texas School of Law. These law schools were determined to be a representative sample because they comprised of both public and private law schools in the state of Texas. In addition, one of the Texas law schools is not only a historically Black college and university, but also one of the largest producers of African-American lawyers in the state of Texas.

The population for the pilot study consisted of African-American students who had been admitted and were attending law schools that offered day-programs and/or night programs in the state of Texas for the 2004-2005 academic year. The number of incoming African-Americans attending these eight law schools totaled 189 students. Of the 189 students attending these Texas law schools, 157 African-American students chose to participate in the study, which constituted 83% of the total population for the 2004-2005 academic year.

The Population for both Academic Years

The population for the remainder of the study consisted of African-Americans who had been admitted to Texas law schools that offered day-programs and/or night programs in the 2005-2006 academic year. The number of incoming African-American law students attending the eight Texas law schools totaled 175 students. Of the 175 African-American law students enrolled in Texas law schools, 142 students chose to participate in the study, which constituted 81% of the total population for the 2005-2006
academic year. Overall, 364 African-American students were admitted and enrolled in Texas law schools when both academic years were combined. Of the 364 African-Americans attending Texas law schools; 299 chose to participate in the study, which constituted 82% of the total population for both academic years (2004-2005 and 2005-2006).\(^1\) In addition, seven of the eight law school administrators chose to participate in the interview portion of the survey, which constituted a response rate of 87.5%.

**Research Design**

This study is a nonexperimental exploratory design, intended to identify the factors influencing the law school choice of prospective African-American students in the state of Texas. As a descriptive study, the research embodies a quantitative approach as the primary method, using a qualitative follow-up to evaluate and interpret the quantitative results. This approach may be referred to as “qualitative primary, quantitative first” (Glatthorn, 1998, p. 34).

**Procedures for Collection of Data**

The initial phase of this study consisted of a pilot study to test the reliability of the survey, as recommended by Newman, Klien, Weis, and Benz (1980). The pilot study was also conducted (1) to determine the time required to complete the survey; (2) to obtain demographic information regarding African-American students, their peers, family influences, and their undergraduate education(s); (3) to determine the clarity of each question; (4) to determine whether the survey questions were appropriate for the law

---

\(^1\) In accordance with FERPA privacy guidelines, a breakdown of each law school’s enrollment of African-American students was not provided. Instead, the overall enrollment figures of the law schools have been provided in an effort to maintain anonymity of the law schools and the African-American students who chose to participate in the study.
school setting; (5) to determine if questions needed revising; and (6) to enhance the validity of the study. De Vaus (1986) indicated that the overall reliability of the survey scales should be at least 0.7. Data were collected at each participating institution via mail surveys, paper surveys, and/or electronic surveys.

The survey was based on Kotler’s (1975) description of the expectancy value model, where students chose the institution that had the highest weighted score following a cost/benefit analysis of the opportunities derived from the institutions in question. The study was conducted to establish preliminary baseline data on factors influencing two dimensions of the decision process by entering African-American law students: (1) the initial consideration of institutions; and (2) the ultimate decision to enroll in a particular institution. The assumption was that there might be intervening variables, which affect the ultimate choice to enroll in one institution over another.

*The Structure of the Survey*

The survey was divided into three sections as shown in Appendix A. The *first section* included questions designed to capture background information about the student. The questions focused on demographic variables related to: (1) marital status; (2) age; (3) gender; (4) undergraduate degrees earned; (5) undergraduate major; (6) career goals; (7) household income; and (8) peer influences. The first section also included three open-ended questions designed: (1) to determine how other individual(s) affected their law school selection choice; (2) to ascertain students’ perceptions regarding the recruiting strategies of the Texas law schools they had chosen to attend; and (3) to obtain students’ suggestions regarding ways in which Texas law schools could improve their strategies.
The third question also allowed students to inform law schools of what they were doing well in regards to their recruiting strategies.

The second section was structured to accomplish two primary objectives. First, the section included questions designed to capture factors influencing the initial consideration of an institution. The questions focused on variables relating to the importance a student placed on: (1) the reputation of the institution, program, and faculty; (2) the degree of a student’s personal involvement with various personnel in the institution during the decision process; (3) the educational and living costs coupled with the availability of financial aid; and (4) the communications process with the institution. Second, the section focused on variables influencing the ultimate decision to enroll at one particular institution. This part was composed of questions designed to ascertain: (1) the speed with which the application was processed and the student was accepted into the program; (2) the student’s present or previous enrollment in the institution and/or current employment in the community; (3) the student’s interaction with key university personnel at the critical juncture of the decision process; and (4) the student’s personal reasons for attending law school, including input from significant others, personal life-style, and value preferences. The third section focused on the size and scope of the financial aid package. In addition, students were encouraged to list other law schools they were interested in attending, as well as elaborating on why they were interested in these law schools but ultimately did not attend the institution. The final open-ended question provided students with an opportunity to make additional comments.
The Procedure Used for Requesting a Law School’s Participation

Through research, prior experience in working with law schools, discussions with the Chair and committee members of the dissertation, as well as discussions with the administrators of several law schools and the Law School Admissions Council, it became evident that law schools guard the data about their student populations. Therefore, it was suggested that some law schools might be reluctant to participate in the study. When determining which law schools to solicit for participation in the study, it was determined that Texas had a sufficient balance between public, private and Historically Black Colleges and Universities among the nine law schools that resided in the state. In order to increase the probability of each Texas law school participating, a letter and prospectus briefly explaining the intent of the study was sent to Mr. Kelly Frels, President of the State Bar of Texas.

In soliciting the participation of Texas law schools, an e-mail also was sent to the dean of each law school briefly explaining the study and requesting a meeting to further discuss the probability of his/her law school participating in the study as shown in Appendix B. The deans were able to respond by e-mail or by telephone if further discussion was warranted before establishing a final meeting date. For law school deans who had not responded to the initial e-mail requesting a meeting, a follow-up was sent a week later as shown in Appendix J. Additionally, a second follow-up was conducted by telephone two weeks later. The contact information for each dean was available on the law school’s website.

Of the nine Texas law schools, seven agreed to an initial meeting to discuss the possibility of his/her law school participating in the study; while one agreed to participate
in the study based on the information in the e-mail. A third follow-up was conducted by telephone (1) to confirm the date, time and place of the meeting, and (2) to confirm which administrator(s) would be attending the meeting for the purpose of compiling a packet for each administrator. At the meeting each administrator(s) was provided a packet that contained the following documents: (1) a brief copy of the proposal that had been submitted to and approved by Baylor University’s Committee for Protection of Human Subjects in Research; (2) a copy of the Law School Selection Survey; (3) a copy of the Interview Protocol Form for the Deans/Administrators as shown in Appendix C; (4) a copy of the Informed Consent Form approved by Baylor University’s Committee for Protection of Human Subjects in Research as shown in Appendix D; (5) a copy of the Cover Letter that would be sent to the Law School Administrators who chose to participate in the study as shown in Appendix E; (6) a copy of the Instructions for Administration Sheet for the 2004-2005 and the 2005-2006 academic years as shown in Appendix F; (7) a copy of the Administrator’s Information Sheet for both academic years as shown in Appendix G; (8) a copy of the letter submitted to Mr. Kelly Frels, President of the State Bar of Texas as shown in Appendix H; (9) a Reply Form which provided options for the dean to indicate whether or not the law school would participate in the study as shown in Appendix I; and (10) a self-addressed, stamped, priority mail envelope.

During the meeting with each dean and authorized administrator(s): (1) the purpose of the study was discussed in detail; (2) concerns about maintaining the anonymity of the law school’s enrollment data and the anonymity of the students were addressed in detail; and (3) the procedure(s) in which the survey would be administered, as well as possible dates for administering the survey was discussed in detail. As a
method of encouraging participation, there was an agreement to provide each law school with an individualized report of the results for that institution. It was also agreed that a final copy of the report would be forwarded to each participating law school. In reporting the results of these surveys in this paper and any subsequent reports, there was an agreement established to not identify the results by law school and to keep the results of each law school confidential.

As a result of the extensive discussions regarding the survey and the agreements made above, seven of the eight remaining law schools agreed to participate in the study. Only one Texas law school declined to participate in the study. Upon agreement, the dean of each law school completed the reply form and returned it to the researcher either at the end of the meeting, or in the self-addressed, stamped, priority mail envelope that was provided by the researcher. The researcher was also provided with contact information for each administrator who would be assisting in the administration of the survey for both academic years. The same administrators were responsible for completing the *Interview Protocol Form* for the law school.

*The Procedure Used for Administering the Mail Survey*

Of the eight Texas law schools that chose to participate in the survey, one law school requested to complete the survey by mail for both academic years. For the law school that selected to participate in the study by mail, a packet was sent to the dean three weeks before the survey was to be administered for each academic year. The following items were enclosed in the packet: (1) a cover letter expressing appreciation to the law school administrators for participating in the survey as shown in Appendix E; (2) copies of the *Law School Selection Survey*; (3) copies of the *Informed Consent Form* approved
by Baylor University’s Committee for Protection of Human Subjects in Research; (4) the Instructions for Administration Sheet; (5) the Administrator’s Information Sheet; (6) pencils; and (7) a self-addressed, stamped, priority mail envelope. The number of surveys mailed was determined based on the information provided by the law school in the Reply Form.

The Instructions for Administration Sheet was created based on the following premises. First, it provided each law school administrator with a detailed, standard format for administering the survey. Second, the instruction sheet assisted the administrator in keeping with the ethical standards of Baylor University’s Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research by continuing to emphasize to the students that participation in the study was not only voluntary, but also they could choose not to answer the survey or any question on the survey. The administration of the survey was supervised by a member in the Dean of Admissions Office.

In order to gather information about non-attendees during the administering of the survey and non-participants, an Administrator’s Information Sheet was created. The information was tracked using simple addition. The Administrator’s Information Sheet was also designed to document any problems or irregularities that occurred during the administration of the survey. There were no irregularities reported during the administration of the survey. The surveys were collected at the end of a 15-30 minute period and returned to the researcher via priority mail.

Upon receipt, the completed surveys were checked for completeness, neatness, and any untranscribed answers. Other obvious errors to the survey were also corrected. Since the form consisted of five pages, the surveys were numbered accordingly and
stapled to prevent the separation of each participant’s survey. Although the surveys were identical, they were coded to distinguish between students who were enrolled in day programs and students who were enrolled in night programs. In order to maintain the anonymity of each participant, there was not a place for the respondents to write their names. The respondents were also encouraged in the instructions to refrain from writing their names on the survey and to refrain from separating the survey.

Once the surveys had been reviewed for inconsistencies, they were manually entered into the Zoomerang website by the researcher. The Zoomerang website was the instrument used to administer the electronic version of the survey. The Zoomerang data file was checked again by hand against the mailed surveys for any missing data and/or errors, which were corrected by hand. The study excluded any illegible or incomplete forms. Missing responses in a given category were also excluded in the calculating of factor scores; therefore, only those surveys with each and every item completed on the Law School Selection Survey were analyzed. However, the short-answer responses were an exception to the rule. If a student responded to the multiple choice questions, but chose not to respond to a short-answer question, the survey was not excluded from the data.

The Procedure Used for Administering the Paper Survey

Three of the eight law schools selected to complete the survey by paper. Thus, a date and time was established by the researcher and dean/administrator to submit a paper version of the survey to students for both academic years. Similar to the mail surveys, the paper surveys were coded at the bottom to distinguish between students enrolled in day programs and students enrolled in night programs. Additionally, the surveys were
numbered accordingly and stapled to prevent the separation of each participant’s survey. In an effort to maintain anonymity, professionalism and ease of administration during the course of the study, it was agreed that the researcher would administer the survey. It was also determined that students might be more open in their responses if the researcher administered the survey instead of an administrator from the law school.

Before the survey was administered, the students were provided two copies of the Informed Consent Form to read and sign. The researcher also provided (1) pencils; (2) an explanation of the consent form; and (3) addressed any concerns regarding the consent form. Students were instructed to return one copy of the consent form to the researcher and to maintain a copy of the consent form for their records. The students were also encouraged in the instructions to refrain from writing their names on the survey.

Once the Informed Consent Form had been completed and returned to the researcher, the Instructions for Administration Sheet was used to administer the survey. In keeping with the ethical standards of Baylor University’s Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research, the researcher continued to emphasize to students that participation in the study was not only voluntary, but also they could choose not to answer the survey or any question on the survey. The surveys were collected at the end of a 15-30 minute period and returned to the researcher. Students were allowed to keep the pencils as a small token of appreciation for choosing to participate in the survey.

Once the surveys were reviewed for inconsistencies, they were manually entered into the Zoomerang website by the researcher. The Zoomerang data file was checked again by hand against the paper surveys for any missing data and/or errors, which were corrected manually. The study excluded any illegible or incomplete paper surveys.
Missing responses in a given category were also excluded in the calculating of factor scores; therefore, only those surveys with each and every item completed on the Law School Selection Survey was analyzed. However, the short-answer responses were an exception to the rule. If a student responded to the multiple choice questions, but chose not to respond to a short-answer question, the survey was not excluded from the data. Since the survey was administered by the researcher, there were no irregularities.

The Procedures Used for Administering the Electronic Survey

Four of the eight law schools selected to complete the survey electronically. The electronic version of the survey was administered using the Zoomerang website. Two options were provided for African-American law students to complete the survey. First, students were offered the option to complete the survey electronically by e-mail using the Zoomerang website. Second, students were offered the option to complete the survey electronically using the Zoomerang website in a classroom type setting throughout the day on a first-come, first-served basis. The researcher was available (1) to assist the students with the survey; (2) to address any concerns or answer any questions regarding the survey; (3) to confirm that participation in the survey was voluntary; and (4) to maintain the anonymity of each participant. During the electronic administration of the surveys, there were no computer problems or irregularities.

The Electronic Administration of the Survey by E-mail. Since every law school’s enrollment procedures were different, a time line was established by the dean/administrator(s) and researcher to ascertain when the survey would be electronically administered by e-mail. Thus, an e-mail was sent to each administrator a few days before
the designated date: (1) explaining to students the objective of the survey; (2) requesting their participation in the survey; (3) emphasizing that participation in the survey was voluntary; and (4) providing a link to access the survey electronically through the Zoomerang website as shown in Appendix M. The law school administrator was responsible for forwarding the email to each student and notifying the researcher once the survey had been forwarded for follow-up purposes. Additionally, the administrator confirmed the number of students to whom the survey was sent and whether or not they were enrolled in day programs or night programs. Although the surveys were identical, there was an electronic version of the survey for day students and for night students.

In discussing the FERPA guidelines regarding privacy issues, it was determined that the students’ e-mail accounts established by the law schools were public knowledge on their website. Therefore, the researcher was provided with the students’ law school e-mail addresses for follow-up purposes in administering the survey. The first follow-up e-mail was sent two weeks after the initial e-mail (see Appendix N). Additional follow-up e-mails were sent every three weeks after the first follow-up e-mail (see Appendix O). The follow-up schedule was adjusted to allow for finals, holidays, graduation, and summer breaks.

In order to remain compliant with the ethical standards of Baylor University’s Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research, the Informed Consent Form was incorporated into the electronic version of the survey. After reading the Informed Consent Form, students were required to answer “YES” or “NO” that they understood their rights as a participant with the option to print the page for future
reference before they were able to complete the survey. The student’s response to the consent form represented his/her signature and willingness to participate in the survey. Once the student completed and submitted the survey, the results were recorded in the Zoomerang website. In an effort to maintain the anonymity of the students, only the researcher had access to the results of the survey.

The Electronic Administration of the Survey at the Law School. For the Texas law schools that selected the option to complete the survey electronically using the Zoomerang website in a classroom type setting, several dates were discussed between the researcher and authorized administrator before deciding on a specific date to administer the survey. The date was determined by the participants’ class schedule and course load during the semester. Once a date had been established, the students received an e-mail from the researcher and the administrator, which (1) explained to students the objective of the survey; (2) requested their participation in the survey; (3) emphasized that participation in the survey was voluntary; and (4) provided the date(s), time, and place where the survey would be administered by the researcher at the law school as shown in Appendix P. Even though students were allowed to complete the survey on a first-come, first-served basis, students were encouraged to provide the researcher and administrator with a time of when they would complete the survey during the day. This information allowed the researcher to have the correct survey available for the student, which expedited the process since students were completing the survey between classes. The researcher agreed to administer the survey to students throughout the day on a first-come, first-served basis and the law school agreed to provide a central location (a room with computers) where the survey could be administered.
The law school administrator confirmed the number of students who would be participating in the survey by providing the researcher with the following information: (1) a list of the students’ names; (2) the academic year the student was admitted to the law school; (3) the student’s e-mail address, and (4) whether or not the individual was a day student or night student. Although the surveys were identical, there was an electronic version of the survey for day students and for night students. This process was used for both sets of African-American law students. Students from the previous academic year who had not participated in the first study were also given an opportunity to complete the survey for the previous academic year. This option was made available to law school students in order to (1) increase the size of the population being studied, (2) to increase the rate of response for each law school by academic year, and (3) to increase the rate of response overall.

As stated previously, the Informed Consent Form was incorporated into the electronic version of the survey in order to remain compliant with the ethical standards of Baylor University’s Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research. The student’s response to the consent form represented his/her signature and willingness to participate in the survey. It also meant that the students understood their rights as a participant. Once the student completed and submitted the survey, the results were recorded in the Zoomerang website. In an effort to maintain the anonymity of the students, only the researcher had access to the results of the survey.

The Procedure Used for Administering the Interview Protocol Form

During the meeting, it was agreed that the Interview Protocol Form would be completed electronically. Thus, the form was sent to the designated administrator in a
word document by e-mail as shown in Appendix K. Due to the nature of each administrator’s job, follow-up e-mails were not sent periodically. Instead, it was agreed that each administrator would submit the completed form during the 2006 spring semester. While several administrators had completed and submitted the Interview Protocol Form early, a follow-up was sent to the administrators that had not completed and submitted the form electronically as shown in Appendix L. Of the eight law schools that chose to participate in the study, seven administrators completed and submitted the Interview Protocol Form, which constituted a response rate of 87.5 percent.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

The research questions in the study were analyzed using frequency distributions, the ranking of mean scores, and Chi-square ($\chi^2$) statistics in Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 13.0). Frequency distributions were used to analyze the number and percentage of African-American law students responding to the importance of each college-choice factor. The ranking of mean scores was used to rank the law school selection factors for: (1) the private law school respondents, (2) public law school respondents, (3) historically Black law school respondents, (4) the total population of Texas law school respondents, (5) the total population of Texas law school respondents by gender and type of law school, and (6) the total population of Texas law school respondents by academic year and type of law school. The top factors were determined by assigning points to the ranking of the frequency responses, in which the sum of these points determined the top factors. Chi-square ($\chi^2$) statistics were used to identify relationships between the following variables: (1) the participating respondents by type of law school and the law school selection factors, (2) the total population of law school
respondents and the law school selection factors, (3) the law school respondents by
gender, type of law school, and the law school selection factors, and (4) the law school
respondents by academic year, type of law school, and the law school selection factors.
The most important factors and the least important factors were presented and discussed.

Several steps were taken to identify the major college choice factors in the
frequency distribution tables. First, students used a 5-point rating scale to measure the
importance of the law school selection factors in the survey. The rating scale was
developed into three broad categories: (1) Not Important, (2) Neutral, and (3) Important.
The first category “Not Important” included two options: (a) Not at All Important and (b)
Not Important. The third category “Important” also included two options: (a) Very
Important and (b) Important. Second, each category (Not Important, Neutral, and
Important) was added to the number of students and the percentage of students who
responded to each of the selected items. Third, several closely related “marketing” items,
such as scholarships, financial aid packages, and communication with the admissions
offices were incorporated to determine their combined influences on African-American
students law school choice. Fourth, several closely related “significant persons” items
were combined to determine their influences on the law school selection process of
African-American students.

The surveys were extracted from the Zoomerang website using Microsoft EXCEL
and a data file was created. The data file was checked by hand against the surveys for
missing data or errors. Once the final check for missing data and errors had been
completed and any corrections updated, the data file was imported into the Statistical
Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows version 13.0. Statistics were
generated using the standard formulas in SPSS for frequency distributions, the ranking of
mean scores, and the cross-tabulations of variables using Chi-square ($\chi^2$) statistics. The
administrator’s portion of the survey and the short answer responses of law school
respondents were analyzed using qualitative statistics. These responses were reviewed by
the researcher to determine whether or not general themes existed among the responses.
CHAPTER FOUR

Findings and Analysis of Data

Introduction

This study focused on the consideration of eleven research questions related to the factors that affect the law school choice of prospective African-American students in the state of Texas. As stated in Chapter 1, a purpose was associated with each research question. Therefore, the purposes of this study were as follows:

1. To identify the relative factors affecting the law school choice of prospective African-American students enrolling in accredited private law schools in the state of Texas.
2. To identify the relative factors affecting the law school choice of African-American students enrolling in accredited public law schools in the state of Texas.
3. To identify the relative factors affecting the law school choice of African-American students enrolling in an accredited historically Black law school in the state of Texas.
4. To determine if there are differences in the factors affecting the law school choice of African-American students who attend accredited private law schools, public law schools and a historically Black law school in the state of Texas.
5. To describe certain demographic characteristics of African-American students enrolling in Texas law schools.
6. To determine which institutions of higher education African-American students are attending prior to enrolling in Texas law schools.
7. To determine the perceptions of African-American students in regards to the minority recruiting strategies of Texas law schools.
8. To determine the role parents, peers, family members, close friends, mentors, etc. play in the college choice process of prospective African-American law students.
9. To determine the perceptions of Texas law schools from an institutional point of view regarding the effectiveness of their minority recruiting strategies in relation to African-American students.
10. To determine the effect(s) of *Hopwood v. State of Texas* and *Grutter v. Bollinger* on the recruitment strategies of the nine Texas law schools overall.

11. To determine the effect(s) of *Hopwood v. State of Texas* and *Grutter v. Bollinger* on the recruitment strategies of each Texas law school in relation to African-American students.

**Research Questions**

To address the stated purposes, the following research questions formed the basis of inquiry for this study:

1. What factor(s) are the major determinants in the law school choice of African-American students enrolling in accredited private law schools in the state of Texas?

2. What factor(s) are the major determinants in the law school choice of African-American students enrolling in accredited public law schools in the state of Texas?

3. What factor(s) are the major determinants in the law school choice of African-American students enrolling in an accredited historically Black law school in the state of Texas?

4. Is there a difference in the factors affecting the law school choice of African-American students who attend accredited private law schools, public law schools and a historically Black law school in the state of Texas?

5. What are the demographic characteristics of African-American students currently enrolling in Texas law schools?

6. Which institutions of higher education are African-American students attending prior to enrolling in Texas law schools?

7. How do African-American students perceive the different minority recruiting strategies amongst Texas law schools?

8. Who helps prospective African-American law students in the college choice process? (e.g., parents, peers, family members, close friends, mentors, etc.)

9. From an institutional point of view, how do Texas law schools perceive the effectiveness of their minority recruiting strategies in relation to African-American students?

10. What effect(s) has *Hopwood v. State of Texas* and *Grutter v. Bollinger* had on the recruitment strategies of the nine law schools in the state of Texas overall?
11. What effect(s) has *Hopwood v. State of Texas* and *Grutter v. Bollinger* had on the recruitment strategies of each Texas law school in relation to African-American students?

To answer these research questions, a survey was developed and submitted to African-American students who had been admitted and were attending law schools that offered day-programs and/or night-programs in the state of Texas for the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 academic years. The surveys were administered to students in the following formats: (1) by mail, (2) by paper in a classroom setting at the law school, (3) by e-mail, in which a link was enclosed for students to access the Zoomerang website, and (4) electronically at the law school. In this instance, a computer lab was provided by the law school administrators in order for the researcher to access the Zoomerang website electronically. Students were able to complete the survey between classes. To obtain the highest response rate, it was at the discretion of the law school administrators how the survey was administered to their students. All of this information established preliminary baseline data on factors influencing two dimensions of the decision process by entering African-American law students: (1) the initial consideration of institutions; and (2) the ultimate decision to enroll in a particular institution. To address the last three research questions, a survey was also developed and submitted to the designated law school administrator in a Microsoft Word document by e-mail.

**Demographic Analysis**

*Question Number Five*

The fifth research question inquired about the demographic characteristics of African-American students enrolling in Texas law schools. Therefore, several survey questions were divided into four categories to obtain a demographic analysis of the
respondents who chose to participate in the study. These categories included: (1) a
description of the survey respondents for private law schools in Texas, (2) a description
of the survey respondents for public law schools in Texas, (3) a description of the survey
respondents for a historically Black law school in Texas, and (4) a description of the
survey respondents for all Texas law schools participating in the study. These survey
questions (#3, #4, #6-#12, #14, and #18) were asked to provide the reader with more
information about the populations being surveyed.

Method

Frequency distributions were conducted using Statistical Package for the Social
Sciences (SPSS 13.0) to determine the number of African-American students who
completed the survey and to ascertain further demographic information about the students
participating in the study. Cross-tabulations using Chi-square ($\chi^2$) statistics were
conducted to determine the level of significance of each demographic variable.
Demographic variables with an $\alpha$ value less than .05 were considered statistically
significant (George & Mallery, 2005). In addition, demographic variables with an $\alpha$
value between .05 and .10 were considered marginally significant (George & Mallery,
2005).

A Description of the Law School Populations

Of the 299 African-American students who chose to participate in the survey,
12% (36) attended private Texas law schools, 17.7% (53) attended public Texas law
schools and 70.2% (210) attended a historically Black law school in Texas as shown in
Figure 1. Although the historically Black law school surveyed in this study was a public
law school, it was identified as a separate population because the Law School represented the largest population participating in the study. It was not the intent of the researcher then, or now, to discriminate or single-out the historically Black law school, but instead, to avoid the possibility of skewed data. It is important to note that the researcher was/is grateful to the historically Black law school administration and their respondents for agreeing to participate because without their participation, there would not have been a study.

Figure 1. Population of Texas Law Schools

Description of Survey Respondents for Private Law Schools in Texas

Results of the law program, gender, and age. Of the 36 students attending private law schools, 72.2% (26) were enrolled in day-programs and 27.8% (10) were enrolled in night-programs. The private law school population consisted of 12 (33.3%) males and 24 (66.7%) females. In addition, 25% of the students were 24 years of age or less, 38.9% were between the ages of 25-30, 16.7% were between the ages of 31-35, and 19.4% were between the ages of 36-45. The demographic percentages are shown in Figures 2-4.
Figure 2. Private Law Schools in Texas by Law Programs

Figure 3. Private Law Schools in Texas by Gender

Figure 4. Private Law Schools in Texas by Age
Results of state, marital status, and number of children. In response to the question regarding which state a student resided in prior to attending law school, 91.7% of the students responded that they resided in Texas and 8.3% responded that they resided in states other than Texas. Regarding their marital status, 66.7% indicated that they were single, 30.6% indicated that they were married, and 2.8% indicated that they were either separated or divorced as shown in Figures 5-6. Additionally, 66.7% of the respondents surveyed at the private law schools reported that they had no children, 8.3% reported that they had one child, 13.9% reported that they had two children, 2.8% reported that they had three children, and 8.3% reported that they had four children. None of the respondents who attended a private Texas law school had more than four children. These demographic variables and percentages are shown in Figure 7.
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**Figure 5. Private Law Schools in Texas by State**
Results of highest degree earned, full-time employment, reason for leaving employment, and income. In regards to the highest degree earned prior to entering law school, the majority (88.9%) of the respondents reported that they had earned a bachelor degree as shown in Figure 8. In addition, 77.8% of the respondents surveyed indicated
that they were employed full-time prior to admittance to law school. While students were provided several options regarding the reason for leaving their position of employment, 30.6% cited “other,” 27.8% cited “N/A,” and 25% responded that they were still employed. Students were provided an opportunity to explain what “other” meant, but none of the respondents opted to elaborate on their responses. The majority of the respondents (50%) stated that their income ranged above $35,001 at their previous job. Moreover, 33.3% of the respondents stated that their income ranged from $10,001-$35,000, while 16.7% of the respondents stated their income ranged under $10,000. The demographic variables and percentages are shown in Figures 9-11.

**Figure 8.** Private Law Schools in Texas by Highest Degree Earned

**Figure 9.** Private Law Schools in Texas by Full-time Employment
Results of law program, gender, and age. As stated in Figure 1, public law school respondents represented 17.7% of the total number of respondents surveyed. Of the 53 respondents attending public law schools, 96.2% were enrolled in day-programs and 3.8% were enrolled in night-programs (Figure 12). The public law school population was 25% (13) male and 75% (39) female. One respondent chose not to answer the gender question (Figure 13). In addition, 73.6% of the respondents were 24 years of age or less,
18.9% were between the ages of 25-30, 5.7% were between the ages of 31-35, and 1.9% was between the ages of 36-45 as shown in Figure 14.

*Figure 12.* Public Law Schools in Texas by Law Programs

*Figure 13.* Public Law Schools in Texas by Gender
Results of the state, marital status, and number of children. Respondents (75.5%) attending public law schools responded that they resided in the state of Texas prior to entering law school as shown in Figure 15. Regarding their marital status, 96.2% of the respondents indicated that they were single and 3.8% (1.9% each) reported that they were either married, separated, or divorced (Figure 16). Additionally, 96.2% of the respondents replied that they had no children and 3.8% indicated that they had one child. None of the respondents attending public law schools reported having more than one child (Figure 17).
Results of the highest degree earned, full-time employment, reason for leaving employment, and income. In regards to the highest degree earned prior to entering law school, the majority (94.3%) of the respondents indicated that they had earned a bachelor degree. In addition, 58.5% of the respondents stated that they were employed full-time
prior to entering law school. Although respondents were provided several options regarding the reason for leaving their position of employment, 64.2% responded “N/A,” and 26.4% responded that they had quit. Public law school respondents also reported having the following incomes: (1) 49.1% earned an average income under $10,000; (2) 26.4% earned an average income of $10,001-$35,000; and (3) 24.5% earned an average income of more than $35,001. The demographic variables and percentages are provided in Figures 18-21.

![Figure 18. Public Law Schools in Texas by Highest Degree Earned](image1)

**Figure 18.** Public Law Schools in Texas by Highest Degree Earned

![Figure 19. Public Law Schools in Texas by Full-time Employment](image2)

**Figure 19.** Public Law Schools in Texas by Full-time Employment
Figure 20. Public Law Schools in Texas by Employment (Reason for Leaving)

Figure 21. Public Law Schools in Texas by Income

Description of Survey Respondents for a Historically Black Law School in Texas

Although the historically Black law school surveyed was a public law school, the results of the law school were identified separately because the respondents represented 70.2% of the total population participating in the study as shown in Figure 1. It was not the intent of the researcher then, or now, to discriminate or single-out the historically Black law school respondents, but instead, to avoid the possibility of skewed data. It is
also important to note that the researcher was/is grateful to the historically Black law school administration and their respondents for agreeing to participate because without their participation, there would not have been a study.

*Results of the law program, gender, and age.* The entire historically Black law school population (70.2%) was enrolled in day-programs as shown in Figure 22. In addition, the respondents comprised of 43.1% (90) male and 56.9% (119) female. One respondent chose not to answer the question regarding gender as shown in Figure 23. Of the 210 respondents, 43.8% were 24 years of age or less, 34.8% were between the ages of 25-30, 12.4% were between the ages of 31-35, and 9% were between the ages of 36-45 as shown in Figure 24.

*Figure 22. A Historically Black Law School in Texas by Law Programs*
Figure 23. A Historically Black Law School in Texas by Gender

Figure 24. A Historically Black Law School in Texas by Age

Results of the state, marital status and number of children. Of the 210 respondents surveyed, 62.4% reported that they had resided in the state of Texas prior to entering law school as shown in Figure 25. Moreover, 75.2% of the respondents stated that they were single, 21% of the respondents indicated that they were married, and 3.8% of the respondents indicated that they were either separated or divorced. The majority (83.8%) of the population responded they had no children. None of the respondents
reported having more than four children. The demographic variables and percentages are shown in Figures 26-27.

**Figure 25.** A Historically Black Law School in Texas by State

**Figure 26.** A Historically Black Law School in Texas by Marital Status

**Figure 27.** A Historically Black Law School in Texas by Number of Children
Results of the highest degree earned, full-time employment, reason for leaving, and income. Of the 210 respondents surveyed, the highest degrees completed were a bachelor degree (83.3%) and a master degree (15.2%) as shown in Figure 28. The majority of the respondents (61%) indicated that they were employed full-time prior to entering law school. Although respondents were provided several options regarding the reason for leaving their position of employment, the reasons cited most often included (1) they quit (41.4%) and (2) “N/A” (39%). The average income for 45.9% of the population was under $10,000 as shown in Figures 29-31.

Figure 28. A Historically Black Law School in Texas by Highest Degree Earned

Figure 29. A Historically Black Law School in Texas by Full-Time Employment
Summary: Overall Description of Survey Respondents for Texas Law Schools

A total of 299 African-American students completed the Law School Selection Survey. Of the 299 respondents, 61.3% were female and 38.7% were male (Figure 32). Only two respondents (.7%) opted to not answer the gender question; therefore, these two students were omitted from the calculation in determining the final percentages for gender. Since every student had an equal opportunity to participate in the survey, a general consensus was formed about the population. First, there were more African-
American females enrolled in Texas law schools than African-American males at the
time the study was conducted. Second, more African-American females were interested
in the factors that influence the law school selection process than males.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{chart.png}
\caption{Total Population of Law Schools in Texas by Gender}
\end{figure}

As stated in Figure 1, 12% of the respondents attended a private law school,
17.7% of the respondents attended a public law school, and 70.2% of the respondents
attended a historically Black law school in Texas. Although students enrolled in day- and
night-programs were surveyed, 96% of the population comprised of students enrolled in
day-programs and 4% of the population comprised of students enrolled in night-programs
as shown in Figure 33. In addition, 68.2% of the respondents indicated that they resided
in the state of Texas prior to entering law school. The remaining 31.8% listed other
states, such as California, Florida, Georgia, etc. (Figure 34).

Since 46.8% of the respondents surveyed were 24 years of age or younger and
96% of the respondents were enrolled in day-programs, the participants can best be
described as traditional-age students by undergraduate standards (Figure 35). The highest
degree obtained by 86% of the population was a bachelor degree (Figure 36). In
addition, 77.9% of the respondents were single, 18.7% were married, 3.3% were either divorced or separated and 83.9% responded that they had no children (Figure 37-38).

Figure 33. Total Population of Texas Law Schools by Law Programs

Figure 34. Total Population of Texas Law Schools by State

Figure 35. Total Population of Texas Law Schools by Age
**Figure 36.** Total Population of Law Schools in Texas by Highest Degree Earned

**Figure 37.** Total Population of Texas Law Schools by Marital Status

**Figure 38.** Total population of Texas Law Schools by Number of Children
Although the population comprised of traditional-age students by undergraduate standards, 59.5% indicated that they were employed full-time prior to entering law school. Once respondents were notified of their admittance to law school, 34.8% responded that they quit their position of employment. Moreover, 42.1% cited the reason for leaving their position of employment as “N/A.” In regards to income, 43% of the respondents surveyed reported that they earned under $10,000 per year prior to entering law school. Additionally, 26.2% had income earnings from $10,001-$35,000 and 30.9% had income earnings of more than $35,001 prior to entering law school. These demographic variables and percentages are shown in Figures 39-41.

**Figure 39.** Total Population of Texas Law Schools by Full-time Employment

**Figure 40.** Total Population of Law Schools in Texas by Employment (Reason for Leaving)
In summary, the nine demographic variables of African-American Texas law school respondents consisted of: (1) type of law program, (2) gender, (3) age, (4) state of residence, (5) marital status, (6) number of children, (7) highest degree earned, (8) employment status, and (9) income level. Results of the responses were to provide the reader with information about the population being studied. The historically Black law school respondents represented 70.2% of the population participating in the study. Therefore, it was not the intent of the researcher then, or now, to discriminate or single-out the historically Black law school respondents who chose to participate in the study, but instead, to avoid the possibility of skewed data. The researcher was/is grateful to the historically Black law school administration and their respondents for agreeing to participate in the study because without their respondents’ participation, there would not have been a study.
Factors Affecting the Law School Choice of African American Students in Texas

To identify the factors that affected the law school choice of African-American students in Texas, four research questions (#1, #2, #3, and #4) were analyzed using (1) frequency distributions, (2) the ranking of mean scores, and (3) cross-tabulations using Chi-square ($\chi^2$) statistics. The factors were categorized into four groups: (1) faculty and staff factors, (2) social factors, (3) financial aid factors, and (4) career factors. Additionally, a second group titled “marketing” factors was created to determine the level of influence these factors possess during the law school selection process. The “marketing” factors were categorized into two groups: (1) primary “marketing” factors and (2) secondary “marketing” factors. Primary “marketing” factors are used in the initial phase of the recruitment process, such as (1) contact with the admissions staff, (2) financial aid communications, and (3) the frequency and quality of mail communications. Secondary “marketing” factors are used in the latter stages of the recruitment process, such as (1) contact with current students, (2) contact with faculty, and (3) contact with alumni.

Frequency Distributions

Frequency distributions were conducted using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 13.0) to analyze the number and percentage of African-American law students responding to the importance of each law school choice factor. Several steps were taken to identify the major college-choice factors in the frequency distribution tables. First, students used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the selected factors in the survey. The rating scale was divided into three broad categories:
(1) Not Important, (2) Neutral, and (3) Important. The first category “Not Important” included two options: (a) Not at All Important and (b) Not Important. The third category “Important” also included two options: (a) Important and (b) Very Important.

Second, each category (Not Important, Neutral, and Important) was added to the number of students and the percentage of students who responded to each of the selected factors. Third, several closely related “marketing” items, such as scholarships, financial aid packages, and communication with the admissions staff were incorporated to determine their combined influences on African-American choice of law school. Fourth, several closely related “significant persons” items were combined to determine their influences on the law school selection process of African-Americans.

The Ranking of Mean Scores

The descriptive procedure in SPSS was utilized to determine the mean and standard deviation scores for the 20 law school selection factors and the 11 “marketing factors” included on the survey. The mean scores were computed based on a scale ranging from 1 (Not at All Important) to 5 (Very Important). Mean scores were ranked from highest to lowest overall by (1) private Texas law school respondents, (2) public Texas law school respondents, (3) historically Black Texas law school respondents, and (4) Texas law school respondents overall. In addition, mean scores were ranked from highest to lowest for (1) male and female respondents and (2) respondents by academic year. The objective was to determine if the law school choice factors were different for African-American male and female Texas law school respondents and for African-American Texas law school respondents by academic year since the population comprised of different respondents.
Cross-tabulations using Chi-square ($\chi^2$) Statistics

Chi-square ($\chi^2$) statistics using cross tabulations were used to identify if a significant relationship existed between the following variables: (1) the type of law school (private, public, or historically Black) and the law school choice factors; (2) the respondents by gender, the type of law school, and the law school choice factors; and (3) the respondents by academic year, type of law school, and the law school choice factors. In addition, Chi-square ($\chi^2$) statistics using cross-tabulations were generated to determine the importance of (1) the admissions process, (2) scholarships, and (3) financial aid. Within the context of the study, if the cross-tabulations generated an $\alpha$ value less than .05, the results were considered statistically significant (George & Mallery, 2005). If the significance level fell between .05 and .10, the results were considered marginally significant (George & Mallery, 2005).

Analysis of Law School Choice Factors for Private Law School Respondents

Question Number One

The first research question asked what factor(s) were the major determinants in the law school choice of African-American students enrolling in accredited private law schools in Texas. The 20 law school selection factors for private law school respondents were grouped into four categories: (1) faculty and staff factors, (2) social factors, (3) financial aid factors, and (4) career factors. In addition, the “marketing” factors were categorized into two groups: (1) primary and (2) secondary. The ranking of mean scores were used to identify the most important factors and cross-tabulations using Chi-square ($\chi^2$) statistics were incorporated to determine if the level of importance, such as “Not at All Important” to “Very Important” was significant.
Faculty and Staff Factors: Private Law Schools

Faculty and staff factors for private law school respondents. This section examined the faculty and staff factors that affected the law school choice of African-American students enrolled into private Texas law schools. Therefore, survey question twenty-three asked law school respondents to: *Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given.* Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the faculty and staff factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the faculty and staff factors for private law school respondents. Four faculty and staff factors were considered most important by private law school respondents. These factors included (1) quality of faculty, (2) wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities), (3) minority faculty as role models and mentors, and (4) the admissions process. Likewise, private law school respondents identified two faculty and staff factors as least important in the law school selection process. The two faculty and staff factors identified as least important included: (1) African-American student/faculty ratio and (2) supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations. The results of the faculty and staff factors for private law school respondents are shown in Figure 42.
Social Factors: Private Law Schools

Social factors for private law school respondents. This section examined the social factors that affected the law school choice of African-American students enrolled in private Texas law schools. Therefore, survey question twenty-three asked law school respondents to: Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you.

Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given. Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the social factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the social factors for private law school respondents. The social factors identified as most important by private law school respondents were (1) academic reputation, (2) geographic location, and (3) distance from home. The study further found...
that private law school respondents identified (1) social atmosphere, (2) racial/ethnic diversity, and (3) campus visit experience as the least important factors (Figure 43).

![Social Factors for Private Law School Respondents](image)

*Figure 43. Social Factors for Private Law School Respondents*

**Financial Aid Factors: Private Law Schools**

*Financial aid factors for private law school respondents.* The objective of this section was to identify the most important financial aid factors for private Texas law school respondents. Similar to the other factors, private law school respondents were asked to answer survey question twenty-three: *Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given.* Respondents were also provided a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the financial aid factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.
Results of the financial aid factors for private law school respondents. It was indicated in the study that the two financial aid factors most important to private Texas law school respondents in the law school selection process were (1) total cost (tuition plus room and board) and (2) the financial aid offer. In addition, the financial aid factors of least importance to private law school respondents were (1) scholarships (amount offered by the law school) and (2) net cost (cost minus aid). The results of the most important and least important financial aid factors for private Texas law school respondents are shown in Figure 44.

\[\text{Figure 44. Financial Aid Factors for Private Law School Respondents}\]

Career Factors: Private Law Schools

Career factors for private law school respondents. This section examined the career factors that were most important and least important to private Texas law school respondents during the law school choice process. As with the other factors, private law school respondents were asked survey question twenty-three: *Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was*
in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong
answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each
characteristic given. Respondents were also provided a 5-point rating scale to measure
the importance of the career factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3)
Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the career factors for private law school respondents. It was
determined in the study that the single most important career factor to private Texas law
school respondents was assurance of employment after graduation (Figure 45).
Moreover, the least important career factor to private Texas law school respondents was
opportunities for part-time employment (Figure 45). This is not surprising since most
law schools strongly discourage their students from working while attending law school.
This discouragement is mainly due to the difficulty and intensity of the law school
curriculum.

Figure 45. Career Factors for Private Law School Respondents
Summary of Law School Selection Factors for Private Law School Respondents

The ranking of the law school selection factors by African-Americans attending private law schools in Texas is displayed in Table 2. Eight factors were identified by private Texas law school respondents as most important in the law school choice process when the factors were no longer categorized into subgroups. These factors included: (1) academic reputation, (2) quality of faculty, (3) wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities), (4) geographic location, (5) assurance of employment after graduation, (6) minority faculty as role models and mentors, (7) distance from home, and (8) the admissions process.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>% Important</th>
<th>% Very Important</th>
<th>Sig.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of Employment after Graduation</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority faculty as role models and mentors</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from home</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The admissions process</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Chi-square significance level in the above column reflects the significance level of the total population surveyed – private Texas law schools, public Texas law schools, and the historically Black Texas law school. If the α value was less than .05 than the results were considered statistically significant. If the α value was between .05 and .10 than the results were considered marginally significant (George & Mallery, 2005)
Private law school respondents also identified seven factors as least important in the law school choice process. These factors included (1) African-American student/faculty ratio, (2) social atmosphere, (3) opportunities for part-time employment, (4) campus visit experience, (5) racial/ethnic diversity; (6) size of the law school; and (7) supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations. The overall ranking of all law school selection factors by private Texas law school respondents is shown in Table Q.6 (Appendix Q).

Primary Marketing Factors: Private Law Schools

Primary marketing factors for private law school respondents. The objective of the primary marketing section was to identify the major factors that had an influence on African-American students in the law school selection process. Primary factors are incorporated during the initial phase of the recruitment process. In this section, the respondents were given the following instructions in survey question twenty-five: To help improve communication with the students, please rate how important the information and contacts you received from the law school you have chosen to attend were in the law school selection process. Respondents were provided a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the primary marketing factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the primary marketing factors for private law school respondents. Although the financial aid offer was not identified as one of the top factors in the law school selection process of private law school respondents, the importance of financial aid was the most important primary marketing factor as shown in Figure 46. Other
primary factors that were considered important included (1) financial aid communications, (2) contact with the admissions staff, and (3) the frequency and quality of mail communications. The primary marketing factors identified as least important included university publications and the frequency and quality of telephone contacts as shown in Figure 46.

![Primary Marketing Factors Legend](image)

**Figure 46.** Primary Marketing Factors for Private Law School Respondents

In the study, private law school respondents were also asked survey question twenty-seven: *My legal education is financed primarily by: Choose one.* The options included: (1) myself, (2) my family and/or spouse, (3) scholarships, (4) loans, (5) my employer and (6) other, which included military V.A. benefits, tuition waiver, etc. The majority of the respondents (66.7%) indicated that their legal education was financed primarily by student loans and 11.1% responded that they received financial support from their family and/or spouse as shown in Figure 47. Respondents were also asked in survey question twenty-eight: *Did you receive a scholarship or financial aid award from the*
law school you chose to attend? In regards to the question, 77.8% of the private law school respondents answered the question affirmatively as shown in Figure 48.

![Types of Financing](image)

**Figure 47.** Method of Financing Law School for Private Law School Respondents

![Response](image)

**Figure 48.** Scholarship and Financial Aid for Private Law School Respondents

Private law school respondents were asked two final questions to complete the financial aid section of the study. First, respondents were asked survey question twenty-nine: *How did the scholarship or financial aid award compare to the other law schools*
you were interested in attending? Second, respondents were asked survey question thirty: *How did the loan amount in the financial aid award package of the law school you chose to attend compare to the award you received at the other law schools you were considering?* In regards to the first question, 38.9% of the respondents indicated that the financial aid packages were the same and 36.1% replied “N/A,” which would explain why the financial aid offer had little effect on the law school selection process of private law school respondents. In regards to the second question, 47.1% of the respondents reported that their loan offers were the same and 32.4% replied “N/A,” which is not surprising since most law students fund their legal education through loans. The results of these comparisons are shown in Figures 49-50.

![Figure 49. Comparison of Financial Aid for Private Law School Respondents](image-url)

![Figure 50. Comparison of Loans for Private Law School Respondents](image-url)
Secondary Marketing Factors: Private Law Schools

Secondary marketing factors for private law school respondents. The purpose of the secondary marketing section was to identify the major factors that had an influence on the law school selection process during the latter stages of the recruitment process. Secondary factors are used to enhance the recruitment process by personalizing and distinguishing each law school, such as contact with current students, faculty and/or alumni. For example, if all of the factors were even across the board, often these factors would make the difference as to whether or not a student attends an institution. Therefore in this section, the respondents were given the following instructions in survey question twenty-five: To help improve communication with the students, please rate how important the information and contacts you received from the law school you have chosen to attend were in the law school selection process. Respondents were provided a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the secondary marketing factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the secondary marketing factors for private law school respondents. It was determined in the study that the secondary marketing factors ranked as most important were contact with current students and contact with faculty. Private law school respondents indicated that the least important law school choice factors were (1) contact with alumni, (2) off-campus receptions in your area, and (3) on-or-off-campus interviews. The results of the secondary marketing factors for private Texas law school respondents are shown in Figure 51.
Figure 51. Secondary Marketing Factors for Private Law School Respondents

Summary of the Primary and Secondary Marketing Factors for Private Law School Respondents

In summary, the most important primary marketing factor for private Texas law school respondents was the importance of financial aid despite the findings that indicated the financial aid offer factor was not one of the most important law school choice factors. This can be explained best by the fact that 66.7% of the respondents indicated that their legal education was financed primarily by student loans. In addition to the importance of financial aid, private Texas law school respondents also ranked (1) financial aid communications, (2) contact with the admissions staff, and (3) the frequency and quality of mail communications as the most important primary marketing factors in the law school selection process. In regards to the secondary marketing factors, respondents indicated that (1) contact with current students and (2) contact with the faculty were the two most important secondary marketing factors in the law school selection process.
Likewise, two primary marketing factors and three secondary marketing factors were ranked least important by private Texas law school respondents. The primary marketing factors included university publications and the frequency and quality of telephone contacts. The secondary marketing factors identified as least important by private Texas law school respondents included (1) contact with alumni, (2) off-campus receptions in your area, and (3) on-or-off-campus interviews. In summary, private law school respondents were most concerned about financial aid, the financial aid communications process, and connecting with current students and faculty. Moreover, respondents were least concerned about glossy, expensive university publications and contact with alumni when making the final decision in selecting a law school.

*Analysis of the Law School Choice Factors for Private Law School Respondents by Gender*

Since every student had an equal opportunity to participate in the survey, a general consensus was formed about the population, which consisted of 61.3% female and 38.7% male. First, there were more African-American females enrolled in Texas law schools than African-American males at the time the study was conducted. Second, more African-American females were interested in the factors that influence the law school selection process than males. The objective was to determine if there were differences in the 20 initial factors that affected the law school choice process of African-American female and male private Texas law school respondents. The intent was also to determine if there were differences in the primary and secondary marketing factors that affected the law school choice of African-American female and male private Texas law school respondents.
Faculty and Staff Factors: Private Law Schools by Gender

Faculty and staff factors for private law school respondents by gender. The purpose of this section was to determine the faculty and staff factors that affected the law school choice of African-American female and male respondents attending private Texas law schools. The respondents’ responses were based on survey question twenty-three: Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given. Respondents were also provided a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the faculty and staff factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the faculty and staff factors for private law school respondents by gender. Four faculty and staff factors were considered most important by female and male respondents attending private Texas law schools. Female private Texas law school respondents ranked: (1) quality of faculty, (2) wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities), (3) minority faculty as role models and mentors, and (4) the admissions process as the most important faculty and staff factors in the law school choice process. However, male private Texas law school respondents differed by ranking: (1) wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities), (2) quality of faculty, (3) minority faculty as role models and mentors, and (4) supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations as the most important faculty and staff factors in selecting a law school. When the responses of both populations were combined, the four most
important faculty and staff factors were (1) quality of faculty, (2) wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities), (3) minority faculty as role models and mentors, and (4) the admissions process.

Female respondents attending private Texas law schools identified two faculty and staff factors as least important in the law school selection process. These factors included (1) the African-American student/faculty ratio and (2) supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations. Similar to female respondents, male respondents also identified African-American student/faculty ratio as the least important faculty and staff factor in the selection process. However, male respondents further indicated that (1) the admissions process and (2) faculty sensitivity to minority needs were equally unimportant faculty and staff factors in the law school selection process. When the responses of both populations were combined, the least important faculty and staff factor was the African-American student/faculty ratio as shown in Figure 52.

Figure 52. Faculty and Staff Factors for Female & Male Respondents Attending Private Law Schools in Texas
Social Factors: Private Law Schools by Gender

Social factors for private law school respondents by gender. The intent of this section was to determine the social factors that affected the law school choice of African-American female and male respondents attending private Texas law schools. Therefore, female and male private Texas law school respondents were given the following instructions in survey question twenty-three: *Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given.* Respondents were also provided a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the social factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the social factors for private law school respondents by gender. There were three social factors that female and male private Texas law school respondents ranked as most important in the law school choice process. Female and male private Texas law school respondents identified academic reputation and geographic location as the two most important social factors in selecting a law school. However, the respondents differed in regards to the third social factor. Female respondents identified distance from home; whereas, male respondents identified the campus visit experience as the third most important social factor in the selection process. When the responses of both populations were combined, the three most important social factors were: (1) academic reputation, (2) geographic location, and (3) distance from home.
In addition, there were two social factors considered of least importance in the law school choice process by female and male respondents. Although female and male private Texas law school respondents indicated that social atmosphere was the second least important social factor in the selection process, the respondents differed on the primary social factor of least importance. Female private Texas law school respondents ranked the campus visit experience as the primary least important social factor in the selection process. In contrast, male private Texas law school respondents identified racial/ethnic diversity as the primary least important social factor. When the responses of both populations were combined, female and male private Texas law school respondents ranked (1) social atmosphere, (2) racial/ethnic diversity and (3) the campus visit experience as the overall least important social factors in the law school selection process as shown in Figure 53.

![Social Factors Legend]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR – Academic Reputation</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA – Social Atmosphere</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL – Size of Law School</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL – Geographic Location</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV – Campus Visit Experience</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DH – Distance from Home</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 53. Social Factors for Female & Male Respondents Attending Private Law Schools in Texas*
Financial Aid Factors: Private Law Schools by Gender

Financial aid factors for private law school respondents by gender. The goal of this section was to determine the financial aid factors that affected the law school choice of African-American female and male respondents attending private Texas law schools. Subsequently, both groups of respondents were instructed to answer survey question twenty-three: Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given. Respondents were also provided a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the financial aid factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the financial aid factors for private law school respondents by gender. In regards to the financial aid factors, female respondents ranked (1) the financial aid offer, (2) total cost (tuition plus room and board), and (3) net cost (cost minus aid) as the most important factors in the law school selection process. Male respondents ranked (1) total cost (tuition plus room and board), (2) net cost (cost minus aid) and (3) scholarships (amount offered by the law school) as the most important financial aid factors in the law school choice process. However, when the responses of both groups were combined, (1) total cost (tuition plus room and board) and (2) the financial aid offer were ranked as the most important financial aid factors as shown in Figure 54.
When respondents were asked to rank the least important financial aid factors, each group identified one factor. Female respondents ranked scholarships as the least important factor in the law school selection process. In contrast, male respondents ranked the financial aid offer as the least important factor in the law school selection process as shown in Figure 54.

![Financial Aid Factors Legend](image)

**Factors**

*Figure 54. Financial Aid Factors for Female & Male Respondents Attending Private Law Schools in Texas*

**Career Factors: Private Law Schools by Gender**

*Career factors for private law school respondents by gender.* The purpose of this section was to identify the career factors that were most important and least important to female and male private Texas law school respondents during the law school choice process. As with the other factors, respondents were asked to respond to survey question twenty-three: *Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to*
attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you.

Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given. Respondents were also provided a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the career factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the career factors for private law school respondents by gender. It was determined in the study that the single most important career factor to female and male respondents was assurance of employment after graduation (Figure 55). Likewise, the least important career factor to both groups of respondents was opportunities for part-time employment (Figure 55). As stated previously, since most law schools discourage their students from working while attending law school, the fact that opportunities for part-time employment was the least important career factor was not surprising.

![Figure 55. Career Factors for Female & Male Respondents Attending Private Law Schools in Texas](image-url)
Summary of the Law School Selection Factors for Private Law School Respondents by Gender

The ranking of law school selection factors by African-American females and males attending private Texas law schools is displayed in Tables 3-4. According to Table 3, eight factors were identified by female respondents as the most important law school choice factors when the factors were no longer categorized into subgroups. These factors included (1) quality of faculty, (2) academic reputation, (3) geographic location, (4) wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities), (5) the financial aid offer, (6) distance from home, (7) minority faculty as role models and mentors, and (8) assurance of employment after graduation and total cost (tuition plus room and board).

However, three factors were identified by female respondents as having an equal level of importance in the law school selection process. First, academic reputation and geographic location were ranked second overall by female private Texas law school respondents in the selection process. Second, the financial aid offer and distance from home were ranked fifth overall by female respondents in selecting a law school. Third, assurance of employment after graduation and total cost (tuition plus room and board) were ranked eighth overall by female private Texas law school respondents in the law school choice process as shown in Table 3. Female respondents also identified five factors as least important in the law school selection process. These factors included (1) opportunities for part-time employment, (2) African-American student/faculty ratio, (3) social atmosphere, (4) supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations, and (5) racial/ethnic diversity. The overall ranking of law school selection factors by female private Texas law school respondents are shown in Table Q.7 in Appendix Q.
Table 3

*Top Ranking of Law School Selection Factors by Female Private Law School Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>% Important</th>
<th>% Very Important</th>
<th>Sig.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from home</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority faculty as role models and mentors</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of Employment after Graduation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Chi-square significance level in the above column reflects the significance level of the total population surveyed by gender. If the α value was less than .05 than the results were considered statistically significant. If the α value was between .05 and .10 than the results were considered marginally significant (George & Mallery, 2005).

While some of the selection factors were the same for female and male respondents, some were different and the order of importance was different. The eight factors ranked most important by male respondents attending private Texas law schools included (1) academic reputation, (2) wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities), (3) assurance of employment after graduation, (4) quality of faculty, (5) geographic location (6) minority faculty as role models and mentors, (7) supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations, and (8) the campus visit experience as shown in Table 4. However, male respondents identified geographic location and minority faculty
as role models and mentors as having the same level of importance by ranking the factors fifth overall in selecting a law school. Similar to female respondents, male respondents also identified five factors as least important in the law school selection process. These factors were as follows: (1) African-American student/faculty ratio, (2) the financial aid offer, (3) scholarships (amount offered by the law school), (4) net cost (cost minus aid), and (5) total cost (tuition plus room and board) and racial/ethnic diversity. The last two factors were identified by male respondents as being equally unimportant in the law school choice process. The overall ranking of all law school selection factors for male private Texas law school respondents are shown in Table Q.8 in Appendix Q.

Table 4

*Top Ranking of Law School Selection Factors by Male Private Law School Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>% Important</th>
<th>% Very Important</th>
<th>Sig.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of Employment after Graduation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority faculty as role models and mentors</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus visit experience</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Chi-square significance level in the above column reflects the significance level of the total population surveyed by gender. If the $\alpha$ value was less than .05 than the results were considered statistically significant. If the $\alpha$ value was between .05 and .10 than the results were considered marginally significant (George & Mallery, 2005).*
Primary Marketing Factors: Private Law Schools by Gender

Primary marketing factors for private law school respondents by gender. The intent of the primary marketing section was to identify the major factors that had an influence on the law school selection process of female and male respondents. Primary marketing factors are used during the initial phase of the recruitment process. In this section, respondents were given the following instructions in survey question twenty-five: To help improve communication with the students, please rate how important the information and contacts you received from the law school you have chosen to attend were in the law school selection process. Respondents were provided a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the primary marketing factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the primary marketing factors for private law school respondents by gender. Although male private Texas law school respondents ranked the financial aid offer as one of the least important factors in the law school choice process, female and male private Texas law school respondents indicated that financial aid process was important. Female private Texas law school respondents ranked the importance of financial aid as the most important primary marketing factor in the law school selection process. Financial aid communications and contact with the admissions staff were identified as the second and third most important primary marketing factors in the law school decision-making process by female private Texas law school respondents. Male respondents attending private Texas law schools indicated that financial aid communications and the frequency and quality of mail communications as the second
most important primary marketing factors in the law school selection process. Moreover, contact with the admissions staff was identified as the third most important primary marketing factor by male private Texas law school respondents. University publications and the frequency and quality of telephone contacts were identified as the least important primary marketing factors in selecting a law school by female private Texas law school respondents. However, male private Texas law school respondents differed by ranking the frequency and quality of telephone contacts first and university publications second as the least important primary marketing factors in selecting a law school. The overall results of the primary marketing factors for female and male private Texas law school respondents are shown in Figure 56.

![Primary Marketing Factors Legend](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAD</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELC</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPB</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAI</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 56. Primary Marketing Factors for Female and Male Respondents Attending Private Law Schools in Texas*
Secondary Marketing Factors: Private Law Schools by Gender

Secondary marketing factors for private law school respondents by gender. The objective of the secondary marketing section was to identify the major factors that had an influence on the law school selection process of female and male respondents attending private law schools in Texas. Secondary marketing factors are incorporated during the progression of the recruitment process. These factors are used to enhance the recruitment process by personalizing and distinguishing each law school, such as contact with current students, faculty, and/or alumni. Therefore, students were given the following instructions in survey question twenty-five: To help improve communication with the students, please rate how important the information and contacts you received from the law school you have chosen to attend were in the law school selection process.

Respondents were provided a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the secondary marketing factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the secondary marketing factors for private law school respondents by gender. As shown in Figure 57, female private Texas law school respondents ranked contact with faculty and contact with students as the two most important secondary marketing factors in the law school selection process. Male private Texas law school respondents also identified two secondary marketing factors as most important in the law school decision-making process. These factors included contact with current students and contact with alumni. The least important secondary marketing factor in the law school selection process for female private Texas law school respondents was contact
with alumni; whereas, male private Texas law school respondents identified off-campus receptions in your area as the least important secondary marketing factor. The overall results of the secondary marketing factors for female and male private Texas law school respondents are shown in Figure 57.

Figure 57. Secondary Marketing Factors for Female & Male Respondents Attending Private Law Schools in Texas

Analysis of the Law School Choice Factors for Private Law School Respondents by Academic Year

Since the study was conducted over two academic years and the students who responded to the survey were different, the objective was to determine if the factors affecting the law school choice of private law school respondents were different by academic year. Therefore, the purpose of this section was to determine if there was a difference in the (1) faculty and staff factors, (2) the social factors, (3) the financial aid factors, and (4) the career factors for private Texas law school respondents who
participated in the survey in 2004 and 2005. This section examined if there was a
difference in the primary and secondary marketing factors for respondents who attended
private Texas law schools in 2004 and 2005.

Faculty and Staff Factors: Private Law Schools by Academic Year

Faculty and staff factors for private law school respondents by academic year.
The objective of this section was to determine the faculty and staff factors that affected
the law school choice of African-American students who attended private Texas law
schools in 2004 and 2005. In order to identify these factors, respondents were asked to
answer survey question twenty-three: Please rate each of the characteristics below
based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law
school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the
best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given.

Respondents were also provided a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the
faculty and staff factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4)
Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the faculty and staff factors for private law school respondents by
academic year. Two faculty and staff factors were considered most important by private
law school respondents attending Texas law schools in 2004. These factors included (1)
quality of faculty and (2) minority faculty as role models and mentors. On the contrary,
private law school respondents attending Texas law schools in 2005 identified three
faculty and staff factors as most important in the law school choice process. In order of
importance, the factors were as follows: (1) quality of faculty, (2) the admissions process,
and (3) supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations. When the responses of both populations were combined, private Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 indicated that quality of faculty and minority faculty as role models and mentors were the two most important faculty and staff factors in selecting a law school (Figure 58).

In addition, there were several factors identified as least important by private law school respondents attending Texas law schools in 2004 and 2005. For example, both groups of respondents ranked African-American student/faculty ratio as the least important faculty and staff factor in the law school selection process. However, respondents in 2004 and 2005 differed on the second faculty and staff factor of least importance. Private law school respondents enrolled in 2004 identified supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations; whereas, private Texas law school respondents in 2005 identified minority faculty as role models and mentors. The overall results of the faculty and staff factors in the law school selection process for private Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 are shown in Figure 58.

**Figure 58.** Faculty and Staff Factors for Private Law School Respondents in Texas by Academic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AD - The Admissions Process</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QF - Quality of Faculty</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAR - African-American Student/Faculty Ratio</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORG - Supportive On-Campus &amp; Off-Campus Organizations</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN - Faculty Sensitivity to Minority Needs</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRM - Minority Faculty as Role Models and Mentors</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty and Staff Factors Legend**
- AD – The Admissions Process
- QF – Quality of Faculty
- AAR – African-American Student/Faculty Ratio
- ORG – Supportive On-Campus & Off-Campus Organizations
- MN – Faculty Sensitivity to Minority Needs
- MRM – Minority Faculty as Role Models and Mentors
- WRC – Wide-ranging Curriculums (provide more job opportunities)
Social Factors: Private Law Schools by Academic Year

Social factors for private law school respondents by academic year. The goal of this section was to determine the social factors that affected the law school choice of private law school respondents who attended Texas law schools in 2004 and 2005. Therefore, respondents in 2004 and 2005 were asked to answer survey question twenty-three: *Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given.* Respondents were also provided a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the social factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the social factors for private law school respondents by academic year. There were two social factors that 2004 and 2005 private law school respondents ranked as most important in the law school selection process. Although the order of importance was different, academic reputation and geographic location were identified as the most important social factors. Private law school respondents in 2004 ranked geographic location first and academic reputation second. However, private Texas law school respondents in 2005 ranked academic reputation first and geographic location second in the law school selection process. When the results of both populations were combined, private Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 ranked academic reputation first and geographic location second as the most important social factors in selecting a law school.
Moreover, both groups of respondents identified three social factors as least important in the law school decision-making process. Respondents in 2004 and 2005 ranked social atmosphere as the primary least important factor in the law school selection process. Respondents in 2004 ranked racial/ethnic diversity and the campus visit experience as the second and third least important social factors in the choice process. However, respondents in 2005 differed by ranking the campus visit experience second and racial/ethnic diversity third as the least important social factors in the law school choice process. The overall results for most important and least important social factors for private Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 are shown in Figure 59.

![Social Factors Legend](image)

**Figure 59.** Social factors for Private Law School Respondents in Texas by Academic Year
Financial Aid Factors: Private Law Schools by Academic Year

Financial aid factors for private law schools respondents by academic year. This section examined the financial aid factors that affected the law school choice of private Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005. Respondents in 2004 and 2005 were instructed to answer survey question twenty-three: Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given. Respondents were also provided a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the financial aid factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the financial aid factors for private law school respondents by academic year. Respondents in the 2004 academic year ranked (1) total cost (tuition plus room and board) and (2) scholarships (amount offered by the law school) as the most important financial aid factors in the law school selection process. Respondents in the 2005 academic year ranked (1) the financial aid offer and (2) net cost (cost minus aid) as the most important financial aid factors in the law school decision-making process. The two most important financial aid factors for respondents in 2004 and 2005 as a whole were (1) total cost (tuition plus room and board) and (2) the financial aid offer.

Respondents in 2005 also identified two financial aid factors as least important in selecting a law school. These factors included (1) the financial aid offer and (2) net cost (cost minus aid). Similarly, respondents in the 2005 academic year ranked (1)
scholarships (amount offered by the law school) and (2) total cost (tuition plus room and board) as the least important financial aid factors in the law school choice process. Overall, private Texas law school respondents ranked (1) scholarships (amount offered by the law school) and (2) net cost (cost minus aid) as the least important factors in the law school decision-making process. The financial aid factors ranked most and least important by private Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 are shown in Figure 60.

![Financial Aid Factors Legend](chart)

**Figure 60.** Financial Aid Factors for Private Law School Respondents in Texas by Academic Year

**Career Factors: Private Law Schools by Academic Year**

*Career factors for private law school respondents by academic year.* The purpose of this section was to identify the career factors that were most important and least important to private Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005. As with the other factors, respondents were asked to respond to survey question twenty-three: *Please
rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given. Respondents were also provided a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the career factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the career factors for private law school respondents by academic year.

It was concluded in the study that the single most important career factor to private Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 was assurance of employment after graduation (Figure 61). Likewise, the least important career factor to private Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 was opportunities for part-time employment (Figure 61). Since law students are discouraged from working during the pursuit of their legal degree, the fact that opportunities for part-time employment was the least important career factor was not surprising.

Figure 61. Career Factors for Private law School Respondents in Texas by Academic Year
Summary of the Law School Selection Factors for Private Law School Respondents by Academic Year

The ranking of law school selection factors by African-American students attending private Texas law schools in 2004 and 2005 is displayed in Tables 5-7. According to Table 5, eight factors were identified as most important by private law school respondents in 2004 when the law school selection factors were no longer categorized into subgroups. Respondents in 2004 ranked three factors as most important in the law school selection process. These factors included: (1) quality of faculty (2) geographic location, and (3) minority faculty as role models and mentors. Private law school respondents in 2004 ranked these three factors first in the law school selection process.

Private law school respondents in 2004 also ranked (1) wide-ranging curriculums (provide more opportunities) as fourth, (2) academic reputation as fifth, (3) assurance of employment after graduation as sixth, and (4) distance from home as seventh in the law school decision-making process. However, the last two factors, faculty sensitivity to minority needs and size of the law, were given equal levels of importance and ranked eighth overall by private Texas law school respondents in 2004 during the law school selection process as shown in Table 5. The study also determined that private law school respondents in 2004 identified four factors as least important in selecting a law school. These law school factors included: (1) opportunities for part-time employment, (2) African-American student/faculty ratio, (3) supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations, and (4) the financial aid offer. The overall ranking of law school selection factors by private Texas law school respondents in 2004 are shown in Table Q.9 (Appendix Q).
Table 5

*Top Ranking of Law School Selection Factors by Private Law School Respondents in 2004*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>% Important</th>
<th>% Very Important</th>
<th>Sig.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority faculty as role models and mentors</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of Employment after Graduation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from home</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty sensitivity to minority needs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of law school</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Chi-square significance level in the above column reflects the significance level of the total population surveyed in 2004. If the α value was less than .05 than the results were considered statistically significant. If the α value was between .05 and .10 than the results were considered marginally significant (George & Mallery, 2005).*

Although some of the law school choice factors were the same for respondents in 2004 and 2005, some were different and the order of importance was different.

Subsequently, private Texas law school respondents in 2005 ranked the following eight factors as most important in the law school decision-making process: (1) academic reputation, (2) quality of faculty, (3) wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities), (4) assurance of employment after graduation, (5) the financial aid offer, (6) geographic location, (7) the admissions process, and (8) supportive on-campus and
off-campus organizations. Respondents in 2005 identified the financial aid offer and geographic location as being equally important in the selection process by ranking both factors fifth overall as shown in Table 6. Private Texas law school respondents in 2005 also identified four factors as least important in the choice process. These factors included (1) social atmosphere, (2) the campus visit experience, (3) African-American student/faculty ratio, and (4) racial/ethnic diversity. The last two factors, African-American student/faculty ratio and racial/ethnic diversity, were considered equally unimportant and ranked seventeenth overall by private Texas law school respondents in 2005. The overall ranking of law school selection factors by private Texas law school respondents in 2005 are shown in Table Q.10 (Appendix Q).

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>% Important</th>
<th>% Very Important</th>
<th>Sig.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of Employment after Graduation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The admissions process</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Chi-square significance level in the above column reflects the significance level of the total population surveyed in 2005. If the $\alpha$ value was less than .05 than the results were considered statistically significant. If the $\alpha$ value was between .05 and .10 than the results were considered marginally significant (George & Mallery, 2005).
Primary Marketing Factors: Private Law Schools by Academic Year

Primary marketing factors for private law school respondents by academic year.
The purpose of the primary marketing section was to identify the major factors that had an influence on the law school selection process of private Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005. Therefore, private law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 were given the following instructions in survey question twenty-five: To help improve communication with the students, please rate how important the information and contacts you received from the law school you have chosen to attend were in the law school selection process. Respondents were provided a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the primary marketing factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the primary marketing factors for private law school respondents by academic year. Although the financial aid offer was ranked as one of the least important factors in the law school choice process by private Texas law school respondents in 2004, both groups of respondents identified the importance of financial aid as the most important primary marketing factor. Moreover, respondents in 2004 and 2005 ranked financial aid communications as the second most important primary marketing factor in the law school decision-making process. Private Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 further indicated that (1) contact with the admissions staff and (2) the frequency and quality of mail communications were the third and fourth most important primary marketing factors in selecting a law school. Additionally, both groups of respondents
ranked (1) university publications and (2) the frequency and quality of telephone contacts as the least important primary factors in the law school choice process (Figure 62).

![Primary Marketing Factors Legend](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAD – Contact with the Admissions Staff</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC – Frequency and Quality of Mail Communications</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELC – Frequency and Quality of Telephone contacts</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC – Financial Aid Communications</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPB – University Publications</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAI – Importance of Financial Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 62. Primary Marketing Factors for Private Law School Respondents in Texas by Academic Year*

**Secondary Marketing Factors: Private Law Schools by Academic Year**

*Secondary marking factors for private law school respondents by academic year.*

The objective of the secondary marketing section was to identify the major factors that had an influence on the law school choice process of private law school respondents enrolled in Texas law schools in 2004 and 2005. Secondary marketing factors are usually incorporated during the progression of the recruitment process. These factors are used to enhance the recruitment process by personalizing and distinguishing each law school, such as contact with current students, faculty, and/or alumni. Therefore, respondents were given the following instructions in survey question twenty-five: *To help improve*
communication with the students, please rate how important the information and contacts you received from the law school you have chosen to attend were in the law school selection process. Respondents were provided a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the secondary marketing factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the secondary marketing factors for private law school respondents by academic year. Private Texas law school respondents in 2004 ranked contact with faculty and contact with current students as the two most important secondary marketing factors in the law school choice process. However, private Texas law school respondents in 2005 differed by ranking contact with current students first and contact with faculty second at the most important secondary marketing factors in the choice process. When the responses were combined for both populations, contact with faculty and contact with current students were identified as the most important secondary marketing factors in selecting a law school. Respondents in 2004 further indicated that the least important secondary marketing factor was contact with alumni. Conversely, respondents in 2005 identified off-campus receptions in your area as the least important secondary marketing factor in selecting a law school. Overall, the respondents closely ranked (1) contact with alumni and (2) off-campus receptions in your area as the least important factors in the law school selection process. The overall results of the secondary marketing factors for private Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 are shown in Figure 63.
Analysis of Law School Choice Factors for Public Law School Respondents

Question Number Two

The second research question asked what factor(s) were the major determinants in the law school choice of African-American students enrolling in accredited public law schools in Texas. The 20 law school selection factors for public law school respondents were grouped into four categories: (1) faculty and staff factors, (2) social factors, (3) financial aid factors, and (4) career factors. Likewise, the “marketing” factors were categorized into two groups (1) primary and (2) secondary. The ranking of mean scores were used to identify the most important factors and cross-tabulations using Chi-square ($\chi^2$) statistics were incorporated to determine the level of importance, such as “Not at All Important” to “Very Important.”
Faculty and Staff Factors: Public Law Schools

Faculty and staff factors for public law school respondents. This section identified the faculty and staff factors that affected the law school choice of African-Americans enrolled in public Texas law schools. Survey question twenty-three asked public Texas law school respondents to: Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given. Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the faculty and staff factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the faculty and staff factors for public law school respondents. It was determined in the study that two factors were considered most important to public Texas law school respondents in the law school selection process. These factors included: (1) wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities) and (2) quality of faculty. Likewise, public Texas law school respondents identified two faculty and staff factors as least important in the law school selection process. These factors included: (1) African-American student/faculty ratio and (2) minority faculty as role models and mentors. The overall results of the faculty and staff factors for public Texas law school respondents are shown in Figure 64.
Social Factors: Public Law Schools

Social factors for public law school respondents. The purpose of this section was to identify the social factors that affected the law school choice of public law school respondents attending Texas law schools. Therefore, survey question twenty-three was asked to each African-American public Texas law school respondent participating in the study: *Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given.* Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the social factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the social factors for public law school respondents. The social factor identified as most important by public Texas law school respondents was academic
reputation. Geographic location was ranked as the second most important social factor in the law school selection process. Public Texas law school respondents further indicated that size of the law school was the least important social factor in the selection process. The campus visit experience and distance from home were ranked the second and third least important social factors in the law school decision-making process as shown in Figure 65.

![Figure 65. Social Factors for Public Law School Respondents](image)

**Financial Aid Factors: Public Law Schools**

Financial aid factors for public law school respondents. The objective of this section was to identify the most important financial aid factors for public Texas law school respondents. Similar to the other factors, public Texas law school respondents were asked to answer survey question twenty-three: Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each
characteristic given. Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the financial aid factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the financial aid factors for public law school respondents. It was concluded in the study that total cost (tuition plus room and board) was the most important financial aid factor to public Texas law school respondents. The respondents also identified net cost (cost minus aid) and scholarships (amount offered by the law school) as the second and third most important financial aid factors in the selection process. Public Texas law school respondents indicated that the financial aid offer was the least important financial aid factor in the law school choice process. The overall results of the financial aid factors for public Texas law school respondents are shown in Figure 66.

![Financial Aid Factors Legend](chart)
- TC – Total Cost (tuition plus room and board)
- FA – Financial Aid Offer
- NC – Net Cost (cost minus aid)
- SCH – Scholarships (amount offered by law school)

Figure 66. Financial Aid Factors for Public Law School Respondents
Career Factors: Public Law Schools

Career factors for public law school respondents. The purpose of this section was to identify the most important and least important career factors to public Texas law school respondents during the law school choice process. Similar to the other factors, public Texas law school respondents were instructed to answer survey question twenty-three: Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given. Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the career factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the career factors for public law school respondents. It was determined in the study that the single most important career factor to public Texas law school respondents was assurance of employment after graduation. Moreover, the least important career factor was opportunities for part-time employment (Figure 67). Since most law schools discourage their students from working while pursuing a legal degree, this finding was not surprising.

Figure 67. Career Factors for Public Law School Respondents
Summary of the Law School Selection Factors for Public Law School Respondents

The ranking of law school selection factors by African-American students attending public Texas law schools is displayed in Table 7. It was determined that eight factors were considered most important by public law school respondents in the law school selection process when the factors were no longer categorized into subgroups. These factors included (1) academic reputation, (2) assurance of employment after graduation, (3) total cost (tuition plus room and board), (4) wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities), (5) quality of faculty, (6) net cost (cost minus aid), (7) scholarships (amount offered by the law school) and (8) the financial aid offer.

Table 7

Top Ranking of Law School Selection Factors by Public Law School Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>% Important</th>
<th>% Very Important</th>
<th>Sig.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of Employment after Graduation</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by law school)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Chi-square significance level in the above column reflects the significance level of the total population surveyed – private law schools, public law schools, and the historically Black law school. If the α value was less than .05 than the results were considered statistically significant. If the α value was between .05 and .10 than the results were considered marginally significant (George & Mallery, 2005).
Public law school respondents also identified five factors of least importance in the law school choice process. These factors included (1) opportunities for part-time employment, (2) size of the law school, (3) African-American student/faculty ratio, (4) the campus visit experience, and (5) distance from home. The overall ranking of all law school selection factors by public Texas law school respondents are shown in Table Q.11 (Appendix Q).

Primary Marketing Factors: Public Law Schools

*Primary marketing factors for public law school respondents.* The objective of the primary marketing section was to identify the major factors that had an influence on the law school selection process of public Texas law school respondents. Primary marketing factors are incorporated into the initial phase of the recruitment process. Therefore, the respondents were given the following instructions in survey question twenty-five: *To help improve communication with the students, please rate how important the information and contacts you received from the law school you have chosen to attend were in the law school selection process.* Respondents were provided a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the primary marketing factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

*Results of the primary marketing factors for private law school respondents.* Initially, public Texas law school respondents ranked the financial aid offer as the least important financial aid factor in selecting a law school. However, the importance of financial aid was identified by public Texas law school respondents as the most important primary marketing factor in the law school selection process (Figure 68). Other primary
marketing factors that were considered important in the law school choice process included financial aid communications and contact with the admissions staff. The primary marketing factors ranked as least important by public Texas law school respondents were university publications and the frequency and quality of telephone contacts as shown in Figure 68.

![Primary Marketing Factors for Public Law School Respondents](image)

*Figure 68. Primary Marketing Factors for Public Law School Respondents*

In the study, public Texas law school respondents were also asked to answer survey question twenty-seven: *My legal education is financed primarily by: Choose one.* The options included: (1) myself, (2) my family and spouse, (3) scholarships, (4) loans, (5) my employer and (6) other, which included military V.A. benefits, tuition waiver, etc. The majority of the respondents (56.6%) indicated that their legal education was financed primarily by student loans and 11.3% indicated that they were paying for law school themselves or they received financial support from “other.” However, there was no indication of what or whom “other” represented in the financing of their legal education as shown in Figure 69. Public law school respondents were also asked survey question
Did you receive a scholarship or financial aid award from the law school you chose to attend? In regards to this question, 86.8% of the public law school respondents answered the question affirmatively as shown in Figure 70.

**Figure 69.** Method of Financing Law School for Public Law School Respondents

**Figure 70.** Scholarships and Financial Aid for Public Law School Respondents

To complete the financial aid section of the study, public law school respondents were asked two final survey questions. First, respondents were asked survey question
twenty-nine: How did the scholarship or financial aid award compare to the other law schools you were interested in attending? Second, respondents were asked survey question thirty: How did the loan amount in the financial aid award package of the law school you chose to attend compare to the award you received at the other law schools you were considering? In regards to the first question, public Texas law school respondents (32.1%) responded that the financial aid package was better, 28.3% of the respondents indicated that the financial aid package was the same, 26.4% of the respondents reported that the financial aid package was less, and 13.2% of the respondents replied “N/A.” Moreover, the public Texas law school respondents (54.7%) reported that the loan offer was about the same, 18.9% of the respondents indicated that the loan offer was better, and 13.2% of the respondents replied “N/A.” The results of these comparisons are shown in Figures 71-72.

![Comparison of Financial Aid for Public Law School Respondents](image-url)
Secondary Marketing Factors: Public Law Schools

Secondary marketing factors for public law school respondents. The purpose of the secondary marketing section was to identify the factors that had the most and least influence on the law school selection process of public law school respondents in Texas. Secondary factors are used to enhance the recruitment process by personalizing and distinguishing each law school through contact with current students, faculty, and/or alumni. Therefore, public Texas law school respondents were given the following instructions in survey question twenty-five: To help improve communication with the students, please rate how important the information and contacts you received from the law school you have chosen to attend were in the law school selection process.

Respondents were provided a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the secondary marketing factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Figure 72. Comparison of Loans for Public Law School Respondents
Results of the secondary marketing factors for public law school respondents. It was determined in the study that the secondary marketing factor ranked as most important by public Texas law school respondents was contact with current students. Public law school respondents also ranked contact with faculty as the second most important factor in the law school selection process. Moreover, public Texas law school respondents indicated that the least important secondary marketing factors were (1) off-campus receptions in your area and (2) on-or-off-campus interviews. The results of the secondary marketing factors for public Texas law school respondents are shown in Figure 73.

![Figure 73. Secondary Marketing Factors for Public Law School Respondents](Image)

Summary of the Primary and Secondary Marketing Factors for Public Law School Respondents

In summary, the most important primary marketing factor was the importance of financial aid. Public law school respondents also identified financial aid communications and contact with the admissions staff as the second and third most important primary
marketing factors in the selection process. Moreover, public law school respondents ranked contact with current students as the most important secondary marketing factor in the law school decision-making process. Respondents also considered contact with faculty as an important secondary marketing factor.

Public Texas law school respondents further identified two primary and secondary marketing factors as least important in the law school choice process. The primary marketing factors included (1) university publications and (2) the frequency and quality of telephone contacts. The secondary marketing factors included (1) off-campus receptions in your area and (2) on-or-off-campus interviews. Public Texas law school respondents were most concerned about financial aid, the financial communications process and connecting with current students. Conversely, respondents were concerned the least about glossy, expensive university publications and the frequency and quality of telephone contacts during the law school decision-making process.

Analysis of Law School Choice Factors for Public Law School Respondents by Gender

Every student had an equal opportunity to participate in the survey; therefore, a general consensus was formed about the population being studied, which consisted of 61.3% female and 38.7% male. First, more African-American females were enrolled in Texas law schools than African-American males at the time the study was conducted. Second, African-American females were more interested in the factors that influence the law school choice process than males. Therefore, the intent was to determine if there were differences in not only in the 20 initial factors, but also in the primary and secondary marketing factors that affect the law school selection process of African-American students enrolling in Texas’ public law schools.
**Faculty and Staff Factors: Public Law Schools by Gender**

*Faculty and staff factors for public law school respondents by gender.* The purpose of this section was to determine the faculty and staff factors that affected the law school choice of African-American females and males attending public law schools in Texas. The respondents’ responses were based on the following instructions in survey question twenty-three: *Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given.* Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the faculty and staff factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

*Results of the faculty and staff factors for public law school respondents by gender.* According to Figure 74, two faculty and staff factors were considered most important by female and male respondents attending public law schools in Texas. Female and male public Texas respondents indicated that (1) quality of faculty and (2) wide-ranging curriculums were the most important faculty and staff factors in the law school selection process. However, whereas female respondents ranked both of the factors as equally important, male respondents ranked wide-ranging curriculums first and quality of faculty as second. When the results of both populations were combined, wide-ranging curriculums was ranked first and quality of faculty was ranked second as the most important faculty and staff factors in the selection process by female and male public Texas law school respondents.
Although female and male respondents indicated that the African-American student/faculty ratio was the least important faculty and staff factor in the law school choice process, male respondents also identified a second faculty and staff factors as least important. This factor was the admissions process. Overall, there was a general consensus that the African-American student/faculty ratio was the least important faculty and staff factor in the law school selection process (Figure 74).

Figure 74. Faculty and Staff Factors for Female & Male Respondents Attending Public Law Schools in Texas

Social Factors: Public Law Schools by Gender

Social factors for public law school respondents by gender. The intent of this section was to determine the social factors that affected the law school choice of African-American female and male respondents. Therefore, female and male respondents
attending public law schools in Texas were given the following instructions to answer survey question twenty-three: *Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given.* Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the social factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

*Results of the social factors for public law school respondents by gender.* There were two social factors that female and male respondents ranked as important in the law school selection process. Female and male respondents indicated that academic reputation was the most important social factor in the selection process. However, female and male public Texas law school respondents differed in their ranking of the second most important social factor in the law school selection process. Female respondents ranked geographic location as the second most important social factor in selecting a law school; whereas male respondents identified racial/ethnic diversity as the second most important social factor. Overall, female and male respondents ranked (1) academic reputation and (2) geographic location as the two most important factors in the selection process as shown in Figure 75.

Female and male public Texas law school respondents further indicated that the size of the law school was the least important social factor in the law school choice process. Moreover, the campus visit experience and social atmosphere were ranked the second and third least important social factors in the choice process by female public Texas law school respondents. African-American male respondents attending public
Texas law schools identified distance from home and the campus visit experience as the second and third most important social factors in selecting a law school as shown in Figure 75.

![Social Factors Legend]

**Figure 75.** Social Factors for Female & Male Respondents Attending Public Law Schools in Texas

**Financial Aid Factors: Public Law Schools by Gender**

*Financial aid factors for public law school respondents by gender.* The intent of this section was to determine the financial aid factors that affected the law school choice of African-American female and male respondents attending public law schools in Texas. Subsequently, female and male public law school respondents were instructed to answer survey question twenty-three: *Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best.*
answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given. Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the financial aid factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the financial aid factors for public law school respondents by gender. Female and male respondents attending public Texas law schools ranked total cost (tuition plus room and board) as the most important financial aid factor in the law school selection process. Female and male respondents further identified net cost (cost minus aid) and scholarships (amount offered by the law school) as the second and third most important financial aid factors in selecting a law school. Moreover, female and male respondents attending public Texas law schools indicated that the financial aid offer was the least important factor in the law school decision-making process. The results of the financial aid factors for female and male respondents attending public Texas law schools are shown in Figure 76.

Figure 76. Financial Aid Factors for Female & Male Respondents Attending Public Law Schools in Texas
Career Factors: Public Law Schools by Gender

Career factors for public law school respondents by gender. The purpose of this section was to identify the career factors that were most and least important to female and male respondents attending public Texas law schools during the law school selection process. Similar to the other factors, female and male public Texas law school respondents were asked to answer survey question twenty-three: Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given. Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the career factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the career factors for public law school respondents by gender. The findings indicated that the single most important career factor to female and male respondents enrolled in public Texas law schools was assurance of employment after graduation. Likewise, the least important career factor to female and male public Texas law school respondents was opportunities for part-time employment. The overall results of the career factors for public Texas law school respondents are shown in Figure 77. Since law schools strongly discourage law students from working while pursuing their legal education, it was not surprising that public Texas law school respondents identified opportunities for part-time employment as the least important career factor in the law school selection process.
Summary of the Law School Selection Factors for Public Law School Respondents by Gender

The ranking of law school selection factors by African-American female and male respondents attending public law schools in Texas is displayed in Tables 8-9. Based on the information in Table 8, there were eight factors identified by female public Texas law school respondents as the most important law school factors in the selection process when the factors were no longer categorized into subgroups. These factors included: (1) academic reputation, (2) assurance of employment after graduation, (3) total cost (tuition plus room and board), (4) quality of faculty, (5) wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities), (6) net cost (cost minus aid), (7) scholarships (amount offered by the law school), and (8) the financial aid offer.

Quality of faculty and wide-ranging curriculums were given the same level of importance by female respondents and ranked fourth overall in the selection process. Net cost and scholarships were also given the same level of importance by female public
Texas law school respondents and ranked sixth overall in the law school choice process.

The ranking of these law school choice factors for female public Texas law school respondents is shown in Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>% Important</th>
<th>% Very Important</th>
<th>Sig.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by the law school)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Chi-square significance level in the above column reflects the significance level of the total population surveyed by gender for all law school respondents. If the α value was less than .05 than the results were considered statistically significant. If the α value was between .05 and .10 than the results were considered marginally significant (George & Mallery, 2005).

There were also five factors identified as least important by female public Texas law school respondents during the law school selection process. The law school selection factors included: (1) opportunities for part-time employment, (2) size of the law school, (3) African-American student/faculty ratio, (4) campus visit experience, and (5) social
atmosphere. The overall ranking of law school selection factors for female public Texas law school respondents is shown in Table Q.12 (Appendix Q).

Although female and male respondents attending public Texas law schools indicated that academic reputation was the most important law school selection factor, there were some differences in the factors and the order of importance between the groups. For example, male respondents ranked academic reputation and wide-ranging curriculums as the most important factors in the law school choice process. Male respondents stated these two factors were of equal importance in the selection process by ranking these factors first overall as shown in Table 9. Assurance of employment after graduation was ranked third by male respondents, while total cost and quality of faculty were considered of equal importance and ranked fourth. Likewise, net cost and scholarships were given the same level of importance and ranked sixth. The final law school selection factor of importance to male respondents was the financial aid offer, which was ranked eighth overall. The overall ranking of law school selection factors for male public Texas law school respondents is shown in Table 9.

Male public Texas law school respondents also identified five factors as least important in the selection of a law school. These law school selection factors included: (1) opportunities for part-time employment, (2) size of the law school, (3) distance from home, (4) the admissions process, and (5) African-American student/faculty ratio as least important in the law school decision-making process. The overall ranking of all law school selection factors by male respondents is shown in Table Q.13 (Appendix Q).
### Table 9

*Top Ranking of Law School Selection Factors by Male Public Law School Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>% Important</th>
<th>% Very Important</th>
<th>Sig.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by the law school)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Chi-square significance level in the above column reflects the significance level of the total population surveyed by gender for all law school respondents. If the α value was less than .05 than the results were considered statistically significant. If the α value was between .05 and .10 than the results were considered marginally significant (George & Mallery, 2005).*

**Primary Marketing Factors: Public Law Schools by Gender**

*Primary marketing factors for public law school respondents by gender.* The objective of the primary marketing section was to identify the factors that had an influence on the law school selection process of female and male respondents attending public Texas law schools. Primary marketing factors are used during the initial phase of the recruitment process. In this section, female and male public Texas law school respondents were given the following instructions in survey question twenty-five: To
help improve communication with the students, please rate how important the information and contacts you received from the law school you have chosen to attend were in the law school selection process. Respondents were provided a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the primary marketing factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the primary marketing factors for public law school respondents by gender. In addition to the financial aid offer being ranked as one of the most important factors in the law school decision-making process by female and male public Texas law school respondents, female respondents also ranked the importance of financial aid as the most important primary marketing factor. In contrast, male respondents ranked financial aid communications as the most important primary marketing factor in the law school choice process. Additionally, female public Texas law school respondents identified financial communications as the second most important primary marketing factor, whereas male respondents identified contact with the admissions staff as the second most important primary marketing factor in selecting a law school. Female respondents further identified contact with the admissions staff as the third most important primary marketing factor in the choice process. Conversely, male respondents ranked the frequency and quality of mail communications as the third most important primary marketing factor in the law school choice process. When the responses of female and male public Texas law school respondents were combined, the two most important primary marketing factors were (1) the importance of financial aid and (2) financial aid communications as shown in Figure 78.
The primary marketing factors that were considered least important by female respondents included (1) university publications and (2) the frequency and quality of telephone contacts. Male respondents differed by ranking the frequency and quality of telephone contacts first and university publications second as the least important primary marketing factors in the law school decision-making process. Overall, the least important primary marketing factors for female and male respondents were (1) university publications and (2) the frequency and quality of telephone contacts. The results of the most and least important primary marketing factors for female and male respondents attending public Texas law schools are shown in Figure 78.

![Figure 78. Primary Marketing Factors for Female & Male Respondents Attending Public Law Schools in Texas](image)
Secondary Marketing Factors: Public Law Schools by Gender

Secondary marketing factors for public law school respondents by gender. The purpose of the secondary marketing section was to identify the major factors that had an influence on the law school selection process of female and male respondents attending public law schools in the state of Texas. Secondary marketing factors are incorporated during the progression of the recruitment process. Therefore, respondents were given the following instructions in survey question twenty-five: *To help improve communication with the students, please rate how important the information and contacts you received from the law school you have chosen to attend were in the law school selection process.* Respondents were provided a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the secondary marketing factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the secondary marketing factors for public law school respondents by gender. Although male and female public Texas law school respondents indicated that contact with current students was the most important secondary marketing factor in the selection process, the respondents’ rankings differed regarding the second most important factor. Female public Texas law school respondents ranked contact with faculty as the second most important secondary marketing factor in the selection process. Conversely, male public Texas law school respondents ranked contact with alumni as the second most important secondary marketing factor in selecting a law school. When the responses of female and male respondents were combined, the most important secondary marketing factors were (1) contact with current students and (2) contact with faculty. Additionally, female and male public Texas law school respondents identified two secondary
marketing factors as least important in the law school choice process. The secondary marketing factors were (1) off-campus receptions in your area and (2) on-or off-campus interviews. The secondary marketing factors for female and male respondents attending public Texas law schools are shown in Figure 79.

![Secondary Marketing Factors for Female & Male Respondents Attending Public Law Schools in Texas](image)

**Figure 79.** Secondary Marketing Factors for Female & Male Respondents Attending Public Law Schools in Texas

**Analysis of the Law School Choice Factors for Public Law School Respondents by Academic Year**

This study was conducted over two academic years. Therefore, students who participated in the survey were different, which made it important to determine if a difference existed in the factors that affected the law school choice of public Texas law school respondents by academic year. Specifically, the purpose of this section was to determine if differences existed in the (1) faculty and staff factors, (2) the social factors,
(3) the financial aid factors, and (4) the career factors for public Texas law school respondents participating in the survey in 2004 and 2005. This section also determined if differences existed in the primary and secondary marketing factors for respondents who attended public Texas law schools in 2004 and 2005.

Faculty and Staff Factors: Public Law Schools by Academic Year

Faculty and staff factors for public law school respondents by academic year.

The objective of this section was to determine the faculty and staff factors that affected the law school choice of African-American students who attended public Texas law schools in 2004 and 2005. In order to identify these factors, respondents were asked to answer survey question twenty-three: Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given.

Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the faculty and staff factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the faculty and staff factors for public law school respondents by academic year. Public law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 identified two faculty and staff factors as most important in the law school selection process. These factors included (1) wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities) and (2) quality of faculty. Moreover, there were several factors identified as least important by public law school respondents attending Texas law schools in 2004 and 2005. For example,
both groups of respondents ranked African-American student/faculty ratio as the least important factor in the law school choice process. Additionally, public law school respondents in 2004 ranked supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations as the second least important factor in the law school decision-making process. Respondents in 2005 identified faculty sensitivity to minority needs as the second least important faculty and staff factor in selecting a law school. The results of the faculty and staff factors for public law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 are shown in Figure 80.

![Figure 80. Faculty and Staff Factors for Public Law School Respondents in Texas by Academic Year](image)

**Social Factors: Public Law Schools by Academic Year**

*Social factors for public law school respondents by academic year.* The intent of this section was to determine the social factors that affected the law school choice of public law school respondents attending Texas law schools in 2004 and 2005. Therefore,
each academic year respondents were asked to answer survey question twenty-three:

*Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given.* Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the social factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

*Results of the social factors for public law school respondents by academic year.*

There were two social factors that public Texas law school respondents in 2004 ranked as most important in the law school choice process. These social factors included (1) academic reputation and (2) geographic location. Public law school respondents in 2005 also ranked academic reputation as the most important social factor in the selection process. However, respondents in 2005 ranked distance from home as the second most important social factor in the selection of a law school. Public Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 also identified two social factors as least important in the law school decision-making process. Respondents in 2004 and 2005 indicated that size of the law school was the least important social factor in the choice process. However, respondents in 2004 and 2005 differed regarding the second least important social factor in selecting a law school. Distance from home was identified as the second least important social factor in the selection process by respondents in 2004; whereas, respondents in 2005 identified the campus visit experience as the second least important social factor. Overall, academic reputation was the most important social factor and size
of the law school was the least important social factor for public Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 (Figure 81).

**Figure 81.** Social Factors for Public Law School Respondents in Texas by Academic Year

**Financial Aid Factors: Public Law Schools by Academic Year**

Financial aid factors for public law school respondents by academic year. This section examined the financial aid factors that affected the law school choice of public law school respondents enrolled in Texas law schools in 2004 and 2005. Respondents in 2004 and 2005 were instructed to answer survey question twenty-three: *Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given.* Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure
the importance of the financial aid factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the financial aid factors for public law school respondents by academic year. Respondents in the 2004 academic year ranked (1) total cost (tuition plus room and board), (2) net cost (cost minus aid), and (3) scholarships (amount offered by the law school) as the three most important financial aid factors in the law school selection process. Likewise, respondents in the 2005 academic year ranked (1) total cost (tuition plus room and board), (2) the financial aid offer, and (3) scholarships (amount offered by the law school) as the three most important financial aid factors in the selection process. Although respondents in 2005 indicated that all of the financial aid factors were important in the law school decision-making process, net cost (cost minus aid) was ranked the least important financial aid factor in the selection process. Conversely, the financial aid offer was identified as the least important factor by public Texas law school respondents in 2004. When the results of respondents in 2004 and 2005 were combined, all of the financial aid factors were identified as important (Figure 82).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 82. Financial Aid Factors for Public Law School Respondents in Texas by Academic Year.
Career Factors: Public Law Schools by Academic Year

Career factors for public law school respondents by academic year. The purpose of this section was to identify the career factors that were most and least important to public Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005. Similar to the other factors, respondents attending public Texas law schools in 2004 and 2005 were asked to respond to survey question twenty-three: Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given. Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the career factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the career factors for public law school respondents by academic year.
The findings in the study indicated that the single most important career factor to public Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 was assurance of employment after graduation. Furthermore, the least important career factor to public Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 was opportunities for part-time employment. The results of the career factors for public law school respondents attending Texas law schools in 2004 and 2005 are shown in Figure 83. The ranking of opportunities for part-time employment as the least important career factor can best be explained by the fact that most Texas law schools discourage students to work while pursuing their legal education due to the difficulty and intensity of the curriculum.
Summary of the Law School Selection Factors for Public Law School Respondents by Academic Year

The ranking of law school selection factors by African-American students attending public Texas law schools in 2004 and 2005 are displayed in Tables 10-11. According to Table 10, eight factors were identified as most important in the law school choice process by public Texas law school respondents in 2004 when the law school factors were no longer categorized into subgroups. These factors included (1) academic reputation, (2) total cost (tuition plus room and board), (3) assurance of employment after graduation, (4) wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities), (5) net cost (cost minus aid), (6) quality of faculty, (7) scholarships (amount offered by the law school), and (8) geographic location. There were also five factors ranked as least
important by public Texas law school respondents in 2004. These factors included (1) opportunities for part-time employment, (2) size of the law school, (3) distance from home, (4) African-American student/faculty ratio, and (5) supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations. The overall ranking of law school selection factors by public Texas law school respondents in 2004 are shown in Table Q.14 in Appendix Q.

Table 10

Top Ranking of Law School Selection Factors by Public Law School Respondents in 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>% Important</th>
<th>% Very Important</th>
<th>Sig.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by the law school)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Chi-square significance level in the above column reflects the significance level of the total population surveyed in 2004 and 2005. If the $\alpha$ value was less than .05 than the results were considered statistically significant. If the $\alpha$ value was between .05 and .10 than the results were considered marginally significant (George & Mallery, 2005).

Public Texas law school respondents in 2005 also identified eight factors as most important in the law school selection process. In order of importance, these factors
included: (1) academic reputation, (2) assurance of employment after graduation, (3) total cost (tuition plus room and board), (4) wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities), (5) quality of faculty, (6) the financial aid offer, (7) scholarships (amount offered by the law school), and (8) net cost (cost minus aid). Moreover, respondents in 2005 identified five factors as least important in the law school choice process. In order of least importance, these factors included: (1) opportunities for part-time employment, (2) size of the law school, (3) African-American student/faculty ratio, (4) the campus visit experience, and (5) social atmosphere as shown in Table 11. The overall results of the law school selection factors for public Texas law school respondents in 2005 are shown in Table Q.15 in Appendix Q.

Table 11

*Top Ranking of Law School Selection Factors by Public Law School Respondents in 2005*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>% Important</th>
<th>% Very Important</th>
<th>Sig.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by the law school)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Chi-square significance level in the above column reflects the significance level of the total population surveyed in 2004 and 2005. If the α value was less than .05 than the results were considered statistically significant. If the α value was between .05 and .10 than the results were considered marginally significant (George & Mallery, 2005).*
Primary Marketing Factors: Public Law Schools by Academic Year

Primary marketing factors for public law school respondents by academic year. The purpose of the primary marketing section was to identify the major factors that had an influence on the law school selection process of public law school respondents enrolled in Texas law schools in 2004 and 2005. Therefore, public Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 were given the following instructions in survey question twenty-five: To help improve communication with the students, please rate how important the information and contacts you received from the law school you have chosen to attend were in the law school selection process. Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the primary marketing factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the primary marketing factors for public law school respondents by academic year. Three primary marketing factors were identified as most important in the law school selection process by respondents in 2004 and 2005. These factors included: (1) the importance of financial aid, (2) financial aid communications, and (3) contact with the admissions staff. Respondents in 2004 and 2005 also ranked two primary marketing factors as least important in the selection process. These factors included (1) university publications and (2) the frequency and quality of telephone contacts. The results of the primary marketing factors for public law school respondents attending Texas law schools in 2004 and 2005 are shown in Figure 84.
Secondary Marketing Factors: Public Law Schools by Academic Year

Secondary marketing factors for public law school respondents by academic year.

The objective of the secondary marketing section was to identify the major factors that had an influence on the law school choice process of public law school respondents attending Texas law schools in 2004 and 2005. Secondary marketing factors are incorporated during the progression of the recruitment process to personalize and enhance each law school. Therefore, public Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 were given the following instructions in survey question twenty-five: *To help improve communication with the students, please rate how important the information and contacts you received from the law school you have chosen to attend were in the law school selection process.* Respondents were provided a 5-point rating scale to measure
the importance of the secondary marketing factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the secondary marketing factors for public law school respondents by academic year. According to Figure 85, respondents in 2004 and 2005 ranked contact with current students as the most important secondary marketing factor in the law school selection process. The second most important secondary marketing factor for public Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 was contact with faculty. However, respondents in 2004 identified contact with alumni as having the same level of importance as contact with faculty by ranking both factors second overall in the selection of a law school. Additionally, public Texas law school respondents in 2004 identified two secondary marketing factors as least important in the selection process. These factors included: (1) on-or-off-campus interviews and (2) off-campus receptions in your area. Public Texas law school respondents in 2005 differed by ranking off-campus receptions in your area first and on-or-off-campus interviews second as the least important secondary marketing factors in the law school choice process as shown in Figure 85.

Public law school respondents in 2005 further indicated that contact with alumni was the third least important secondary marketing factor in the law school choice process. Overall, public law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 attending Texas law schools ranked contact with students as the most important secondary marketing factor and on-or-off-campus receptions in your area as the least important secondary marketing factor in the selection process. The overall results of the secondary marketing factors for public Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 are shown in Figure 85.
Analysis of the Law School Choice Factors for Historically Black Law School Respondents

Question Number Three

The third research question asked what factor(s) were the major determinants in the law school choice of African-American students enrolling in an accredited historically Black law school in Texas. Similar to the first and second research questions, 20 law school selection factors were grouped into four categories: (1) faculty and staff factors, (2) social factors, (3) financial aid factors, and (4) career factors. Likewise, the “marketing” factors were categorized into two groups (1) primary and (2) secondary. The ranking of mean scores were used to identify the most important factors and cross-tabulations using Chi-square ($\chi^2$) were incorporated to determine if the level of
importance, such as “Not at All Important” to “Very Important” was significant for each law school choice factor.

Faculty and Staff Factors: A Historically Black Law School

Faculty and staff factors for historically Black law school respondents. This section examined the faculty and staff factors that affected the law school choice of African-American student enrolled in a historically Black Texas law school. Respondents of the historically Black Texas law school were asked to respond to survey question twenty-three: Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given. Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the faculty and staff factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the faculty and staff factors for historically Black law school respondents. There were two faculty and staff factors ranked as most important by historically Black Texas law school respondents in the selection of a law school. These faculty and staff factors included (1) quality of faculty and (2) wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities). Likewise, historically Black Texas law school respondents identified two faculty and staff factors as least important in the law school choice process. These faculty and staff factors included (1) African-American student/faculty ratio and (2) supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations. The
faculty and staff factors for historically Black Texas law school respondents are shown in Figure 86.

Figure 86. Faculty and Staff Factors for Historically Black Law School Respondents

Social Factors: A Historically Black Law School

Social factors for historically Black law school respondents. The intent of this section was to identify the social factors that affected the law school choice of African-American students attending a historically Black law school in Texas. Survey question twenty-three was asked to historically Black Texas law school respondents participating in the study: Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you.

Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given. Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the social factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.
Results of the social factors for historically Black law school respondents.

Historically Black Texas law school respondents ranked racial/ethnic diversity as the most important social factor in the law school selection process. The second most important social factor was geographic location. Respondents also identified three social factors that were of least importance in the selection process. These social factors included (1) the campus visit experience, (2) social atmosphere, and (3) size of the law school. The overall results of the social factors for historically Black Texas law school respondents are shown in Figure 87.

![Figure 87. Social Factors for Historically Black Law School Respondents](image)

Financial Aid Factors: A Historically Black Law School

Financial aid factors for historically Black law school respondents. The purpose of this section was to ascertain the most important financial aid factors for historically Black law school respondents in Texas. Similar to the other factors, historically Black Texas law school respondents were asked to answer survey question twenty-three:

*Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are*
no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given. Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the financial aid factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the financial aid factors for historically Black law school respondents.

Unlike the other law school choice factors, historically Black Texas law school respondents identified all of the financial aid factors as important. In order of importance, the financial aid factors were ranked as follows: (1) total cost (tuition plus room and board), (2) net cost (cost minus aid), (3) the financial aid offer, and (4) scholarships (amount offered by the law school). However, historically Black Texas law school respondents indicated that the least important financial aid factor was scholarships (amount offered by the law school) as shown in Figure 88.

Figure 88. Financial Aid Factors for Historically Black Law School Respondents
Career Factors: A Historically Black Law School

Career factors for historically Black law school respondents. This section examined the career factors that were most important and least important to historically Black law school respondents in Texas during the law school choice process. Therefore, historically Black Texas law school respondents were asked to answer survey question twenty-three: Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given. Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the career factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the career factors for historically Black law school respondents. The findings in the study indicated that the single most important career factor to historically Black Texas law school respondents was assurance of employment after graduation. Moreover, the least important career factor to historically Black Texas law school respondents was opportunities for part-time employment. The overall results of the career factors for historically Black Texas law school respondents are shown in Figure 89.

Summary of the Law School Selection Factors for Historically Black Law School Respondents

The ranking of law school selection factors by African-American students attending a historically Black Texas law schools is displayed in Table 12. Eight factors were identified as the most important factors in the law school choice process by
historically Black Texas law school respondents when the law school factors were no longer categorized into subgroups. These factors included: (1) total cost (tuition plus room and board), (2) net cost (cost minus aid), (3) the financial aid offer, (4) assurance of employment after graduation, (5) scholarships (amount offered by the law school), (6) quality of faculty, (7) wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities), and (8) racial/ethnic diversity. Historically Black Texas law school respondents further indicated that scholarships (amount offered by the law school) and quality of faculty were equally important by ranking both law school factors fifth overall in the selection process as shown in Table 12.

Historically Black Texas law school respondents also identified six factors as least important in the law school choice process. These factors included: (1) opportunities for part-time employment, (2) the campus visit experience, (3) social atmosphere, (4) size of the law school, (5) African-American student/faculty ratio, and (6) supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations. The overall ranking of law school selection factors for historically Black Texas law school respondents are shown in Table Q.16 in Appendix Q.

Figure 89. Career Factors for Historically Black Law School Respondents
Table 12

*Top Ranking of Law School Selection Factors by Historically Black Law School Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>% Important</th>
<th>% Very Important</th>
<th>Sig.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by the law school)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic diversity</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Chi-square significance level in the above column reflects the significance level of the total population surveyed – private law schools, public law schools, and the historically Black law school. If the α value was less than .05 than the results were considered statistically significant. If the α value was between .05 and .10 than the results were considered marginally significant (George & Mallery, 2005).*

*Primary Marketing Factors: A Historically Black Law School*

*Primary marketing factors for historically Black law school respondents.* The objective of the primary marketing section was to identify the major factors that had an influence on the law school selection process of historically Black Texas law school respondents. Primary marketing factors are used during the initial phase of the recruitment process. In this section, historically Black Texas law school respondents were given the following instructions in survey question twenty-five: *To help improve*
communication with the students, please rate how important the information and contacts you received from the law school you have chosen to attend were in the law school selection process. Respondents were provided a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the primary marketing factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the primary marketing factors for historically Black law school respondents. Historically Black Texas law school respondents ranked three primary marketing factors as most important in the law school decision-making process. These primary marketing factors comprised of (1) the importance of financial aid, (2) financial aid communications, and (3) contact with the admissions staff. Likewise, historically Black Texas law school respondents identified three primary marketing factors of least importance in the law school selection process. These primary marketing factors included: (1) university publications, (2) the frequency and quality of telephone contacts, and (3) the frequency and quality of mail communications. The results of the primary marketing factors for historically Black Texas law school respondents are shown in Figure 90.

![Primary Marketing Factors Legend](image)

**Primary Marketing Factors Legend**
- CAD – Contact with the Admissions Staff
- MC – Frequency and Quality of Mail Communications
- TELC – Frequency and Quality of Telephone Contacts
- FAC – Financial Aid Communications
- UPB – University Publications
- FAI – Importance of Financial Aid

**Figure 90.** Primary Marketing Factors for Historically Black Law School Respondents
In the survey, historically Black law school respondents were also asked survey question twenty-seven: *My legal education is financed primarily by: Choose one.* The options included: (1) myself, (2) my family and spouse, (3) scholarships, (4) loans, (5) my employer and (6) other, which included military V.A. benefits, tuition waiver, etc. The majority of the historically Black law school respondents (50%) indicated that their legal education was financed primarily by student loans. Historically Black Texas law school respondents (19%) also indicated that they were responsible for financing their legal education, while 15.2% of the respondents reported that their legal education was financed by “other” (Figure 91). Respondents were also asked survey question twenty-eight: *Did you receive a scholarship or financial aid award from the law school you chose to attend?* Historically Black Texas law school respondents (82.4%) responded affirmatively to this question as shown in Figure 92.

![Figure 91. Method of Financing Law School for Historically Black Law School Respondents](image-url)
In order to complete the financial aid section of the study, historically Black Texas law school respondents were asked two final survey questions. First, respondents were asked survey question twenty-nine: *How did the scholarship or financial aid award compare to the other law schools you were interested in attending?* Second, respondents were asked survey question thirty: *How did the loan amount in the financial aid award package of the law school you chose to attend compare to the award you received at the other law schools you were considering?* Regarding the first question, historically Black respondents (48.6%) indicated that the financial aid package was the same, 31% of the respondents indicated that the financial aid package was better, 4.8% of the respondents indicated that the financial aid package was less and 15.7% of the respondents replied “N/A” as shown in Figure 93. Moreover, 61% of the historically Black Texas law school respondents reported that the loan offer was the same, 14.3% of the respondents reported that the loan offer was better, and 15.2% of the respondents replied “N/A” (Figure 94).
Secondary Marketing Factors: A Historically Black Law School

Secondary marketing factors for historically Black law school respondents. The purpose of the secondary marketing section was to ascertain the major factors that had an influence on the law school selection process of historically Black law school respondents during the latter stages of the recruitment process. Therefore, respondents were given the following instructions in survey question twenty-five: To help improve communication with the students, please rate how important the information and contacts
you received from the law school you have chosen to attend were in the law school selection process. Respondents were provided a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the secondary marketing factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the secondary marketing factors for historically Black law school respondents. The findings indicated that three secondary marketing factors were most important to historically Black Texas law school respondents in the law school selection process. These secondary marketing factors included: (1) contact with current students, (2) contact with faculty, and (3) on-or off-campus interviews. Historically Black Texas law school respondents further indicated that the least important secondary marketing factors in selecting a law school were off-campus receptions in your area and contact with alumni. The results of the secondary marketing factors for historically Black Texas law school respondents are shown in Figure 95.

![Figure 95. Secondary Marketing Factors for Historically Black Law School Respondents](image-url)
Summary of the Primary and Secondary Marketing Factors for Historically Black Law School Respondents

In summary, the most important primary marketing factor for historically Black Texas law school respondents was the importance of financial aid. This can best be explained by the fact that 82.4% of the respondents received some type of financial aid and because 50% of the respondents indicated that their legal education was financed primarily by student loans. Historically Black Texas law school respondents also ranked financial aid communications and contact with the admissions staff as the second and third most important primary marketing factors in the law school selection process. The three most important secondary marketing factors for historically Black Texas law school respondents were (1) contact with current students, (2) contact with faculty, and (3) on-or-off-campus interviews.

Three primary marketing factors were also identified as least important by historically Black Texas law school respondents. These factors included (1) university publications, (2) the frequency and quality of telephone contacts, and (3) the frequency and quality of mail communications. Moreover, historically Black Texas law school respondents identified two secondary marketing factors as least important in the law school decision-making process. These factors included (1) on-or-off-campus interviews and (2) contact with alumni. In summary, historically Black Texas law school respondents were most concerned about financial aid, the financial aid communication process, and connecting with current students and faculty. Likewise, historically Black Texas law school respondents were least concerned about glossy, expensive university publications and off-campus receptions in your area when selecting a law school.
Analysis of the Law School Choice Factors for Historically Black Law School Respondents by Gender

Overall, the female population (61.3%) was larger than the male population (38.7%) participating in the study. However, every student had an equal opportunity to participate, which allowed for two general conclusions. First, there were more African-American females enrolled in Texas law schools than African-American males at the time the study was conducted. Second, female historically Black Texas law school respondents participating in the study were more interested in the factors that influence the law school selection process than male historically Black Texas law school respondents. Therefore, the objective was to determine if differences existed in the initial 20 factors that affected the law school process of African-American female and male historically Black Texas law school respondents. The intent was also to determine if differences existed in the primary and secondary marketing factors that affected the selection process of African-American female and male historically Black Texas law school respondents.

Faculty and Staff Factors: A Historically Black Law School by Gender

Faculty and staff factors for historically Black law school respondents by gender.

The purpose of this section was to determine the faculty and staff factors that affected the law school choice of African-American male and female respondents attending a historically Black law school in Texas. The responses of female and male historically Black law school respondents were based on the following instructions in survey question twenty-three: Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to
Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given. Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the faculty and staff factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the faculty and staff factors for historically Black law school respondents by gender. Female and male respondents attending a historically Black law school in Texas ranked two faculty and staff factors as most important in the law school choice process. These factors included: (1) quality of faculty and (2) wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities). However, male respondents differed by ranking wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities) first and quality of faculty second as the most important faculty and staff factors in the choice process. When the results of both populations were combined, quality of faculty and wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities) were identified as the most important faculty and staff factors by female and male historically Black Texas law school respondents in the law school decision-making process.

There were also two faculty and staff factors identified as least important by female and male respondents attending a historically Black law school in Texas. These faculty and staff factors included: (1) African-American student/faculty ratio and (2) supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations. When the responses of female and male historically Black Texas law school respondents were combined, African-American student/faculty ratio and supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations were identified as the least important faculty and staff factors in selecting a law school. The
overall results of the faculty and staff factors for female and male respondents attending a historically Black law school in Texas are shown in Figure 96.

Figure 96. Faculty and Staff Factors for Female & Male Respondents Attending a Historically Black Law School in Texas

Social Factors: A Historically Black Law School by Gender

Social factors for historically Black law school respondents by gender. The objective of this section was to determine the social factors that affected the law school choice of African-American female and male respondents attending a historically Black law school in Texas. Subsequently, historically Black Texas law school respondents were given the following instructions to answer survey question twenty-three: Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given. Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure
the importance of the social factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the social factors for historically Black law school respondents by gender. There was one social factor identified as most important by female and male respondents attending a historically Black law school in Texas. Female respondents ranked racial/ethnic diversity as the most important social factor in the law school selection process. Conversely, male respondents ranked geographic location as the most important social factor in the selection process. When the results of female and male historically Black Texas law school respondents were combined, racial/ethnic diversity was identified as the most important social factor in the law school decision-making process.

In addition, there were four social factors considered least important in the law school choice process by female historically Black Texas law school respondents. These social factors included: (1) the campus-visit experience, (2) social atmosphere, (3) size of the law school, and (4) distance from home. Although the order of importance differed, female and male historically Black Texas law school respondents identified three of the same social factors as least important in the law school selection process. Subsequently, male respondents indicated that the least important social factors were (1) the campus visit experience, (2) size of the law school, and (3) social atmosphere. Overall, racial/ethnic diversity was ranked the most important social factor and the campus visit experience was ranked the least important social factor by female and male respondents attending a historically Black law school in Texas. The complete results of
the social factors for female and male historically Black Texas law school respondents are shown in Figure 97.

![Social Factors Legend](image)

**Figure 97.** Social Factors for Female & Male Respondents Attending a Historically Black Law School in Texas

**Financial Aid Factors: A Historically Black Law School by Gender**

Financial aid factors for historically Black law school respondents by gender.

The purpose of this section was to identify the financial aid factors that affected the law school choice of African-American female and male respondents attending a historically Black law school in Texas. Subsequently, female and male historically Black Texas law school respondents were instructed to answer survey question twenty-three: *Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given.* Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure
the importance of the financial aid factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the financial aid factors for historically Black law school respondents by gender. Although total cost (tuition plus room and board) was ranked the most important financial aid factor by female and male respondents attending a historically Black law school in Texas, both groups of respondents identified all of the financial factors as important in the law school selection process. In order of importance, female and male historically Black Texas law school respondents ranked the remaining financial factors as follows: (1) net cost (cost minus aid) was ranked second, (2) the financial aid offer was ranked third, and (3) scholarships (amount offered by the law school) was ranked fourth. The results of the financial aid factors for female and male respondents attending a historically Black law school in Texas are shown in Figure 98.
Career Factors: A Historically Black Law School by Gender

Career factors for historically Black law school respondents by gender. The intent of this section was to determine the career factors that were most and least important during the law school choice process for female and male respondents attending a historically Black law school in Texas. Similar to the other factors, respondents were asked to respond to survey question twenty-three: *Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given.* Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the career factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the career factors for historically Black law school respondents by gender. It was determined in the study that the single most important career factor to female and male respondents attending a historically Black law school in Texas was assurance of employment after graduation. Likewise, the least important career factor to female and male historically Black Texas law school respondents was opportunities for part-time employment. The complete results of the career factors for female and male respondents attending a historically Black law school in Texas are shown in Figure 99.
The ranking of the law school selection factors by African-American females and male attending a historically Black law school in Texas is displayed in Tables 13-14. According to Table 13, there were eight factors identified as most important in the law school choice process by African-American female respondents attending a historically Black law school in Texas when the law school factors were no longer categorized into subgroups. These factors included: (1) total cost (tuition plus room and board), (2) net cost (cost minus aid), (3) quality of faculty, (4) the financial aid offer, (5) the assurance of employment after graduation, (6) racial/ethnic diversity, (7) wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities), and (8) scholarships (amount offered by the law school). Female historically Black Texas law school respondents indicated that net cost (cost minus aid) and quality of faculty had the same level of importance. Subsequently, these law school factors were ranked second overall in the law school selection process.
Moreover, female respondents identified the financial aid offer and assurance of employment after graduation as also having the same level of importance. Therefore, these law school factors were ranked fourth overall in the selection process by female historically Black Texas law school respondents as shown in Table 13.

There were also six law school factors identified by female respondents as least important in the law school selection process. These factors included: (1) opportunities for part-time employment, (2) the campus visit experience, (3) social atmosphere, (4) size of the law school, (5) distance from home, and (6) African-American student/faculty ratio. The overall ranking of the law school selection factors by female historically Black Texas law school respondents are shown in Table Q.17 in Appendix Q.

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>% Important</th>
<th>% Very Important</th>
<th>Sig.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic diversity</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by the law school)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Chi-square significance level in the above column reflects the significance level of the total population surveyed by gender. If the α value was less than .05 than the results were considered statistically significant. If the α value was between .05 and .10 than the results were considered marginally significant (George & Mallery, 2005).
Although some of the factors were the same for female and male respondents attending a historically Black law school in Texas, some of the factors differed and the order of importance differed. The eight factors ranked most important by male respondents attending a historically Black law school in Texas included: (1) total cost (tuition plus room and board), (2) net cost (cost minus aid), (3) the financial aid offer, (4) assurance of employment after graduation, (5) scholarships (amount offered by the law school), (6) wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities), (7) quality of faculty, and (8) geographic location. The ranking of the eight law school factors by male historically Black Texas law school respondents are shown in Table 14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>% Important</th>
<th>% Very Important</th>
<th>Sig.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by the law school)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Chi-square significance level in the above column reflects the significance level of the total population surveyed by gender. If the α value was less than .05 than the results were considered statistically significant. If the α value was between .05 and .10 than the results were considered marginally significant (George & Mallery, 2005).
Male respondents also identified six factors of least importance in the law school decision-making process. These factors included: (1) opportunities for part-time employment, (2) the campus visit experience, (3) size of the law school, (4) social atmosphere, (4) African-American student/faculty ratio, and (5) supportive on-campus and off-campus organization. The overall ranking of the law school selection factors for male historically Black Texas law school respondents are shown in Table Q.18.

*Primary Marketing Factors: A Historically Black Law School by Gender*

*Primary marketing factors for historically Black law school respondents by gender*. The intent of the primary marketing section was to determine the major factors that had an influence on the law school choice process of female and male respondents enrolled in a historically Black law school in Texas. Therefore, female and male respondents were given the following instructions in survey question twenty-five: *To help improve communication with the students, please rate how important the information and contacts you received from the law school you have chosen to attend were in the law school selection process*. Respondents were provided a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the primary marketing factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

*Results of the primary marketing factors for historically Black law school respondents by gender*. There were three primary marketing factors ranked as most important and least important by female and male historically Black Texas law school respondents in the selection process. The importance of financial aid was ranked the most important primary marketing factor in the law school selection process by female
and male historically Black Texas law school respondents. Moreover, female and male historically Black Texas law school respondents identified financial aid communications and contact with the admissions staff as the second and third most important primary marketing factors in the choice process.

Female respondents also ranked (1) university publications, (2) the frequency and quality of telephone contacts, and (3) the frequency and quality of mail communications as the least important primary marketing factors in the law school decision making process. However, university publications and the quality of telephone contacts were identified as being equally unimportant by female historically Black Texas law school respondents and ranked the least important overall. Male historically Black Texas law school respondents also indicated that university publications was the least important primary marketing factor in the law school selection process. However, the frequency and quality of telephone contacts and the frequency and quality of mail communications were ranked second and third as the least important primary marketing factors by male historically Black Texas law school respondents (Figure 100).

---

**Figure 100.** Primary Marketing Factors for Female & Male Respondents Attending a Historically Black Law School in Texas
Secondary Marketing Factors: A Historically Black Law School by Gender

Secondary marketing factors for historically Black law school respondents by gender. The purpose of the secondary marketing section was to determine the major factors that had an influence on the law school selection process of female and male respondents enrolled in a historically Black law school in Texas. Secondary marketing factors are incorporated during the progression of the recruitment process to personalize and distinguish each law school. Therefore, respondents were given the following instructions in survey question twenty-five: To help improve communication with the students, please rate how important the information and contacts you received from the law school you have chosen to attend were in the law school selection process.

Respondents were provided a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the secondary marketing factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the secondary marketing factors for historically Black law school respondents by gender. Female and male historically Black Texas law school respondents identified two secondary marketing factors as most important in the law school decision-making process. Female respondents attending a historically Black law school in Texas ranked contact with current students and contact with faculty as the two most important secondary marketing factors in the selection process. However, male historically Black Texas law school respondents differed by ranking contact with current faculty first and contact with current students second as the most important secondary marketing factors in the selection process. The results of the most important secondary
marketing factors for female and male historically Black Texas law school respondents are shown in Figure 101.

Three secondary marketing factors were identified as least important in selecting a law school by female and male historically Black Texas law school respondents. The secondary marketing factors for female and male historically Black Texas law school respondents included: (1) off-campus receptions in your area, (2) contact with alumni, and (3) on-or-off-campus interviews. The results of the least important secondary marketing factors for female and male respondents attending a historically Black law school in Texas are shown in Figure 101.

Figure 101. Secondary Marketing Factors for Female & Male Respondents Attending an Historically Black Law School in Texas
Analysis of the Law School Choice Factors for Historically Black Law School Respondents by Academic Year

This study was conducted over two academic years and surveyed two different groups of respondents. Therefore, the objective of this section was to determine if differences existed in (1) the faculty and staff factors, (2) the social factors, (3) the financial aid factors, (4) and the career factors of historically Black Texas law school respondents who participated in the survey in 2004 and 2005. The intent of this section was also to determine if differences existed in the primary and secondary marketing factors of the African-American respondents attending a historically Black law school in Texas in 2004 and 2005.

Faculty and Staff Factors: A Historically Black Law School by Academic Year

Faculty and staff factors for historically Black law school respondents by academic year. The purpose of this section was to identify the faculty and staff factors that affected the law school choice of African-American students who attended a historically Black law school in the state of Texas in 2004 and 2005. In order to identify the faculty and staff factors, respondents were asked to answer survey question twenty-three: Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given. Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the faculty and staff factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.
Results of the faculty and staff factors for historically Black law school respondents by academic year. Historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 ranked (1) quality of faculty and (2) wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities) as the most important faculty and staff factors in the law school decision-making process. Moreover, historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 identified two faculty and staff factors as least important in the selection of a law school. The faculty and staff factors included: (1) African-American student/faculty ratio and (2) supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations. The overall results of the faculty and staff factors for historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 are shown in Figure 102.
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**Figure 102.** Faculty and Staff Factors for Historically Black Law School Respondents in Texas by Academic Year

Social Factors: A Historically Black Law School by Academic Year

Social factors for historically Black law school respondents by academic year.

This section examined the social factors that affected the law school choice of historically
Black Texas law school respondents enrolled in 2004 and 2005. Therefore, respondents in 2004 and 2005 were asked to respond to survey question twenty-three: *Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given.* Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the social factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

*Results of the social factors for historically Black law school respondents by academic year.* Respondents in 2004 and 2005 identified two social factors as most important in the law school selection process. Historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 ranked racial/ethnic diversity as the most important social factor in the selection process. However, respondents in 2004 ranked geographic location as the second most important social factor; whereas, respondents in 2005 ranked academic reputation as the second most important social factor in the law school decision-making process.

Historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 also identified three social factors as least important in the law school choice process. These social factors included: (1) the campus visit experience, (2) social atmosphere, and (3) size of the law school. Additionally, historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 ranked distance from home as the fourth least important social factor in the choice process. The overall results of the social factors for historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 are shown in Figure 103.
Figure 103. Social Factors for Historically Black Law School Respondents in Texas by Academic Year

Financial Aid Factors: A Historically Black Law School by Academic Year

Financial aid factors for historically Black law school respondents by academic year. The financial aid section examined the factors that affected the law school decision-making process of historically Black law school respondents in Texas by academic year. Subsequently, historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 were instructed to answer survey question twenty-three: Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given. Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the financial aid factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.
Results of the financial aid factors for historically Black law school respondents by academic year. The findings indicated that historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 identified all of the financial aid factors as important in the selection of a law school. Historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 ranked total cost (tuition plus room and board) as the most important financial aid factor in the law school selection process. Moreover, Historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 ranked the remaining three financial factors as follows: (1) net cost (tuition plus room and board) was ranked second, (2) the financial aid offer was ranked third, and (3) scholarships (the amount offered by the law school) were ranked fourth.

Although historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2005 also indicated that all of the financial aid factors were important in selecting a law school, the order importance differed when compared to historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004. Scholarships (the amount offered by the law school) were ranked second by historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2005 during the selection of a law school. Net cost (cost minus aid) was ranked third and the financial aid offer was ranked fourth in the law school choice process by historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2005. When the responses of historically Black Texas law school respondents were combined, the financial aid factors were ranked in the following order of importance: (1) total cost (tuition plus room and board), (2) net cost (cost minus aid), (3) the financial aid offer, and (4) scholarships (the amount offered by the law school). The results of the financial aid factors for historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 are shown in Figure 104.
Figure 104. Financial Aid Factors for Historically Black Law School Respondents in Texas by Academic Year

Career Factors: A Historically Black Law School by Academic Year

Career factors for historically Black law school respondents by academic year.

The career section examined the most and least important factors that affected the law school choice of historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005. Similar to the other factors, respondents were asked to answer survey question twenty-three: *Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend.* There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given. Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the career factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the career factors for historically Black law school respondents by academic year. The findings indicated that the single most important career factor to
historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 was assurance of employment after graduation. Likewise, the career factor identified as least important by historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 was opportunities for part-time employment. The overall results of the career factors for historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 are shown in Figure 105.

Figure 105. Career Factors for Historically Black Law School Respondents in Texas by Academic Year

Summary of the Law School Selection Factors for Historically Black Law School Respondents by Academic Year

The ranking of law school selection factors by African-American students attending a historically Black Texas law school in 2004 and 2005 are displayed in Tables 15-16. Historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 identified eight factors as most important in the law school selection process when the factors were no longer categorized into subgroups. In order of importance, these factors included (1) total cost (tuition plus room and board), (2) net cost (cost minus aid), (3) the financial aid offer, (4) quality of faculty, (5) racial/ethnic diversity, (6) wide-ranging curriculums (provide more
job opportunities), (7) assurance of employment after graduation, and (8) scholarships (amount offered by the law school) as shown in Table 15.

### Table 15

**Top Ranking of Law School Selection Factors by Historically Black Law School Respondents in 2004**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>% Important</th>
<th>% Very Important</th>
<th>Sig.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic diversity</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by the law school)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Chi-square significance level in the above column reflects the significance level of the total population surveyed in 2004. If the α value was less than .05 than the results were considered statistically significant. If the α value was between .05 and .10 than the results were considered marginally significant (George & Mallery, 2005).

Moreover, historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 identified six factors as least important in the law school decision-making process. In order of least importance, these factors included (1) opportunities for part-time employment, (2) campus visit experience, (3) social atmosphere, (4) size of law school, (5) distance from
home, and (6) African-American student/faculty ratio. Historically Black Texas law
school respondents in 2004 further identified opportunities for part-time employment and
the campus visit experience as being equally unimportant by ranking the law school
choice factors nineteenth overall. The ranking of all law school selection factors for
historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 is shown in Table Q.19
(Appendix Q).

Historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2005 also identified eight
factors as most important in the law school choice process. In order of importance, these
factors included (1) total cost (tuition plus room and board), (2) assurance of employment
after graduation, (3) net cost (cost minus aid), (4) scholarships (amount offered by the
law school), (5) the financial aid offer, (6) quality of faculty, (7) wide-ranging
curriculums (provide more job opportunities), and (8) academic reputation. Net cost
(cost minus aid) and scholarships (amount offered by the law school) were ranked third
overall in the selection process by historically Black Texas law school respondents as
shown in Table 16.

Historically Black law school respondents in 2005 further identified six factors as
least important in the law school selection process. In order of least importance, these
factors included (1) opportunities for part-time employment, (2) the campus visit
experience, (3) social atmosphere, (4) African-American student/faculty ratio, (5) size of
the law the school, and (6) supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations. The
overall ranking of law school selection factors for historically Black Texas law school
respondents in 2005 is shown in Table Q.20 (Appendix Q).
Table 16

**Top Ranking of Law School Selection Factors by Historically Black Law School Respondents in 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>% Important</th>
<th>% Very Important</th>
<th>Sig.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by the law school)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Chi-square significance level in the above column reflects the significance level of the total population surveyed in 2005. If the $\alpha$ value was less than .05 than the results were considered statistically significant. If the $\alpha$ value was between .05 and .10 than the results were considered marginally significant (George & Mallery, 2005).

**Primary Marketing Factors: A Historically Black Law School by Academic Year**

Primary marketing factors for historically Black law school respondents by academic year. This section examined the primary marketing factors that affected the law school choice of historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005. Therefore, historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 were given the following instructions in survey question twenty-five: *To help improve*
communication with the students, please rate how important the information and contacts you received from the law school you have chosen to attend were in the law school selection process. Respondents were provided a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the primary marketing factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the primary marketing factors for historically Black law school respondents by academic year. Historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 indicated that three primary marketing factors were most important in the law school selection process. These factors included (1) the importance of financial aid, (2) financial aid communications, and (3) contact with the admissions staff. Moreover, historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 identified three factors as least important in the selection process. These factors included: (1) the frequency and quality of telephone contacts, (2) university publications, and (3) the frequency and quality of mail communications. Although the order of importance differed, historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2005 ranked the following primary factors as least important in the choice process: (1) university publications, (2) the frequency and quality of telephone contacts, and (3) the frequency and quality of mail communications. The overall results of the primary marketing factors for historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 are shown in Figure 106.
### Secondary Marketing Factors: A Historically Black Law School by Academic Year

*Secondary marketing factors for historically Black law school respondents by academic year.* The purpose of this section was to identify the secondary marketing factors that were most important in the law school choice process for historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005. Secondary marketing factors are incorporated during the progression of the recruitment process and assist law school administrators in personalizing and distinguishing each law school. Therefore, historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 were given the following instructions in survey question twenty-five: *To help improve communication with the students, please rate how important the information and contacts you received from the law school you have chosen to attend were in the law school selection process.*

Respondents were provided a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAD</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELC</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPB</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAI</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 106. Primary Marketing Factors for Historically Black Law School Respondents in Texas by Academic Year*
secondary marketing factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the secondary marketing factors for historically Black law school respondents by academic year. Historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 identified contact with faculty and contact with current students as the most important secondary marketing factors in the law school selection process. However, historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2005 differed by ranking contact with current students first and contact with faculty second as the most important secondary marketing factors in the law school choice process. Moreover, historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 identified three secondary marketing factors as least important in selecting a law school. These secondary marketing factors included (1) off-campus receptions in your area, (2) on-or-off campus interviews, and (3) contact with alumni as shown in Figure 107.

Figure 107. Secondary Marketing Factors for Historically Black Law School Respondents in Texas by Academic Year
Analysis of Law School Choice Factors for all Texas Law School Respondents

Question Number Four

The fourth research question asked whether or not there was a difference in the factors affecting the law school choice of African-American students who attended accredited private law schools, public law schools and a historically Black law school in the state of Texas. Similar to the first three questions, the 20 law school selection factors for all Texas law school respondents were grouped into four categories: (1) faculty and staff factors, (2) social factors, (3) financial aid factors, and (4) career factors. In addition, the “marketing” factors were categorized into two groups (1) primary and (2) secondary. The ranking of mean scores were used to identify the most important law school choice factors and cross-tabulations using Chi-square ($\chi^2$) were incorporated to determine if the level of importance, such as “Not at All Important” to “Very Important” was significant.

Faculty and Staff Factors: All Texas Law Schools

Faculty and staff factors for all Texas law school respondents. This section examined the faculty and staff factors that affected the law school choice of African-American students attending Texas law schools. Survey question twenty-three asked Texas law school respondents to: Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given. Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the faculty and staff factors: (1)
Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the faculty and staff factors for all Texas law school respondents.

African-American respondents enrolled in Texas law schools identified quality of faculty and wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities) as the two most important faculty and staff factors in the law school selection process. African-American respondents also identified African-American student/faculty ratio and supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations as the least important faculty and staff factors in selecting a law school. The results of the faculty and staff factors for African-American Texas law school respondents are shown in Figure 108.
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**Figure 108. Faculty and Staff Factors for all Law School Respondents**

**Social Factors: All Texas Law Schools**

**Social factors for all Texas law school respondents.** The purpose of this section was to identify the social factors that affected the law school choice of African-American students enrolled in Texas law schools. Therefore, respondents were given the following instructions in survey question twenty-three: *Please rate each of the characteristics*
below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting
the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just
choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic
given. Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the social
factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5)
Very Important.

Results of the social factors for all Texas law school respondents. African-
American respondents ranked academic reputation as the most important social factor in
the law school decision-making process. Likewise, respondents indicated that there were
three factors of least importance in the selection process. These social factors included
(1) the campus visit experience, (2) size of the law school and (3) social atmosphere. The
overall results of the social factors for African-American students attending Texas law
schools are shown in Figure 109.
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Social Factors Legend

- R/E – Racial/Ethnic Diversity
- AR – Academic Reputation
- SA – Social Atmosphere
- SL – Size of Law School
- GL – Geographic Location
- CV – Campus Visit Experience
- DH – Distance from Home
Financial Aid Factors: All Texas Law School Respondents

Financial aid factors for all Texas law school respondents. The objective of this section was to identify the most important financial aid factors for all African-American law school respondents in Texas who chose to participate in the study. Similar to the other factors, African-American law school respondents were asked to answer survey question twenty-three: *Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given.* Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the financial aid factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the financial aid factors for all Texas law school respondents. Although African-American respondents ranked total cost (tuition plus room and board) as the most important financial aid factor in the law school selection process, all of the financial aid factors were identified as important. Therefore, the remaining three financial aid factors were ranked as follows by African-American respondents in Texas law schools: (1) net cost (cost minus aid) was ranked second, (2) the financial aid offer was ranked third, and (3) scholarships (amount offered by the law school) were ranked fourth. The overall results of the financial aid factors for All Texas law school respondents are shown in Figure 110.
Career Factors: All Texas Law Schools

Career factors for all Texas law school respondents. This section examined the career factors that were most important and least important to African-American students attending Texas law schools during the law school choice process. Similar to the first three groups of factors, African-American Texas law school respondents were instructed to answer survey question twenty-three: Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given.

Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the career factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the career factors for all Texas law school respondents. The findings in the study indicated that the single most important career factor to African-American
respondents enrolled in Texas law schools was assurance of employment after graduation during the law school choice process. Likewise, the least important factor to African-American Texas law school respondents was opportunities for part-time employment during the selection process. The overall results of the career factors affecting the law school choice of African-American respondents attending Texas law schools are shown in Figure 111.
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**Figure 111. Career Factors for all Texas Law School Respondents**

**Summary of the Law School Selection Factors for all Texas Law School Respondents**

The ranking of law school selection factors by African-American students attending Texas law schools is displayed in Table 17. Eight law school selection factors were identified by African-American Texas law school respondents as most important in selecting a law school when the factors were no longer categorized into subgroups. In order of importance, these factors included: (1) total cost (tuition plus room and board), (2) assurance of employment after graduation, (3) net cost (cost minus aid), (4) quality of
faculty, (5) wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities), (6) the financial aid offer, (7) academic reputation, and (8) scholarships (amount offered by the law school).

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>% Important</th>
<th>% Very Important</th>
<th>Sig.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by the law school)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Chi-square significance level in the above column reflects the significance level of the total population surveyed – private law schools, public law schools, and the historically Black law school. If the $\alpha$ value was less than .05 than the results were considered statistically significant. If the $\alpha$ value was between .05 and .10 than the results were considered marginally significant (George & Mallery, 2005).

African-American respondents enrolled in Texas law schools also identified six factors as least important in the law school selection process. These factors included (1) opportunities for part-time employment, (2) the campus visit experience, (3) size of the law school, (4) social atmosphere, (5) African-American student/faculty ratio, and (6) supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations. The overall ranking of selection factors by All African-American Texas law school respondents participating in the study are shown in Table Q.21 in Appendix Q.
Primary Marketing Factors: All Texas Law Schools

*Primary marketing factors for all Texas law school respondents.* The objective of the primary marketing section was to identify the major factors that had an influence on the law school choice process of African-American students attending Texas law schools. Primary marketing factors are used during the initial phase of the recruitment process in conjunction with the other factors. Therefore, African-American law school respondents were given the following instructions when answering survey question twenty-three:

*Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given.* Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the primary marketing factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

*Results of the primary marketing factors for all Texas law school respondents.* Three primary marketing factors were identified as most important in the selection process by African-American respondents enrolled in Texas law schools. These primary marketing factors included (1) the importance of financial aid, (2) financial aid communications, and (3) contact with the admissions staff. African-American respondents enrolled in Texas law schools also identified three primary marketing factors as least important in the law school decision-making process. These primary marketing factors included (1) university publications, (2) the frequency and quality of telephone
contacts, and (3) the frequency and quality of mail communications. The overall results of the primary marketing factors are shown in Figure 112.

![Primary Marketing Factors](image)

**Figure 112.** Primary Marketing Factors for all Texas Law School Respondents

In the study, African-American Texas law school respondents were also asked survey question twenty-seven: *My legal education is financed primarily by: Choose one.* The options included: (1) myself, (2) my family and spouse, (3) scholarships, (4) loans, (5) my employer and (6) other, which included military V.A. benefits, tuition waiver, etc. The majority of the respondents (53.2%) indicated that their legal education was financed primarily by student loans. Although African-American Texas law school respondents (16.1%) further indicated that their legal education was financed by self, 13.4% replied “other” (Figure 113). African-American Texas law school respondents were also asked to answer survey question twenty-eight: *Did you receive a scholarship or financial aid award from the law school you chose to attend?* African-American respondents (82.6%) enrolled in Texas law schools replied affirmatively (Figure 114).
In order to complete the financial aid section of the study, all African-American Texas law school respondents were asked two final survey questions. First, respondents were asked survey question twenty-nine: *How did the scholarship or financial aid award compare to the other law schools you were interested in attending?* Second, respondents were asked survey question thirty: *How did the loan amount in the financial aid award package of the law school you chose to attend compare to the award you received at the
other law schools you were considering? Regarding the first question, African-American Texas law school respondents (43.8%) indicated that the financial aid packages were the same. Moreover, 28.1% of the respondents reported that the financial aid package offered from the law school they chose to attend was better and 17.7% of the respondents replied “N/A” (Figure 115). In regard to the second question, 58.2% of the respondents indicated that the loan offer they received from the law school they chose to attend was the same, 14.5% of the respondents reported the loan offer was better than the other law schools, and 16.8% replied “N/A” as shown in Figure 116.

**Figure 115.** Comparison of Financial Aid for all Texas Law School Respondents

**Figure 116.** Comparison of Loans for all Texas Law School Respondents
Secondary Marketing Factors: All Texas Law Schools

Secondary marketing factors for all Texas law school respondents. The purpose of the secondary marketing section was to identify the major factors that had an influence on the law school selection process of African-American Texas law school respondents participating in the study. Secondary marketing factors are used to personalize and distinguish each law school during the progression of the recruitment process. Therefore, in this section, African-American Texas law school respondents were given the following instructions in survey question twenty-five: *To help improve communication with the students, please rate how important the information and contacts you received from the law school you have chosen to attend were in the law school selection process.*

Respondents were provided a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the secondary marketing factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the secondary marketing factors for all Texas law school respondents. African-American Texas law school respondents participating in the study ranked contact with current students and contact with faculty as the most important secondary marketing factors in selecting a law school. Likewise, African-American Texas law school respondents identified three secondary marketing factors as least important in the law school choice process. These secondary marketing factors included (1) off-campus receptions in your area, (2) contact with alumni, and (3) on-or-off campus interviews. The overall results of the secondary marketing factors for all African-American Texas law school respondents participating in the study are shown in Figure 117.
In summary, the most important primary marketing factor was the importance of financial aid, which can best be explained by the fact that 53.2% of the African-American Texas law school respondents participating in the survey financed their legal education by student loans. African-American Texas law school respondents also ranked financial aid communications and contact with the admissions staff as the second and third most important primary marketing factors in the law school selection process. Respondents further indicated that contact with current students and contact with faculty were the two most important secondary marketing factors in the selection process. Conversely, glossy, expensive university publications were ranked as the least important primary marketing factor by all African-American Texas law school respondents participating in the study. The frequency and quality of telephone contacts was identified as the second least important primary marketing factor. Likewise, the secondary marketing factor that all African-American Texas law school respondents participating in the study indicated was the least important in the choice process was off-campus receptions in your area.
Analysis of the Law School Choice Factors for all Texas Law School Respondents by Gender

Since 61.3% of the total population was female and 38.7% was male, a general consensus was formed about the respondents participating in the study. First, there were more African-American females enrolled in Texas law schools than males at the time the study was conducted. Second, more African-American females were interested in the factors that influence the law school selection process than males. Therefore, the purpose of this section was to determine if there were differences in the initial 20 factors and the primary and secondary marketing factors that affected the law school choice of All African-American females and males enrolled in Texas law schools who participated in the study.

Faculty and Staff Factors: All Texas Law Schools by Gender

Faculty and staff factors for all Texas law school respondents by gender. The intent of this section was to determine the faculty and staff factors that affected the law school decision-making process of African-American females and males enrolled in Texas law schools. The responses of African-American female and male Texas law school respondents were based on survey question twenty-three: Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given. Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the faculty and staff factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.
Results of the faculty and staff factors for all Texas law school respondents by gender. African-American female respondents attending Texas law schools identified quality of faculty and wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities) as the most important faculty and staff factors in selecting a law school. However, African-American male Texas law school respondents differed by ranking wide-ranging curriculums first and quality of faculty second in the selection process. Moreover, female and male respondents attending Texas law schools indicated that African-American student/faculty ratio and supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations were the least important faculty and staff factors in the law school selection process. The results of the faculty and staff factors for African-American female and male Texas law school respondents are shown in Figure 118.

Figure 118. Faculty and Staff Factors for Female & Male Respondents Attending Texas Law School
Social Factors: All Texas Law Schools by Gender

Social factors for all Texas law school respondents by gender. The purpose of this section was to determine the social factors that affected the law school choice of African-American female and male respondents attending Texas law schools. Therefore, African-American female and male Texas law school respondents were given the following instructions to answer survey question twenty-three: Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given. Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the social factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the social factors for all Texas law school respondents by gender. African-American female and male respondents attending Texas law schools indicated that academic reputation was the most important social factor in the law school decision-making process. Racial/ethnic diversity and geographic location were ranked the second most important social factors by African-American female and male respondents attending Texas law schools during the selection process. Female and male respondents attending Texas law schools also identified three social factors as least important in the choice process. For African-American female Texas law school respondents, these social factors included: (1) the campus visit experience, (2) social atmosphere, and (3) size of the law school. Although African-American male Texas law school respondents
identified the same social factors as African-American female Texas law school respondents, the order of importance differed in the selection process. In order of least importance, African-American male Texas law school respondents ranked the size of the law school first, the campus visit experience second, and social atmosphere third in the law school selection process. The overall results of African-American female and male Texas law school respondents are shown in Figure 119.

![Social Factors Legend]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 119. Social Factors for Female & Male Respondents Attending Texas Law Schools*

**Financial Aid Factors: All Texas Law Schools by Gender**

*Financial aid factors for all Texas law schools by gender.* The objective of this section was to determine the financial aid factors that affected the law school choice of African-American female and male respondents attending Texas law schools. Subsequently, African-American female and male Texas law school respondents were instructed to answer survey question twenty-three: *Please rate each of the*
characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given. Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the financial aid factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the financial aid factors for all Texas law schools by gender. Although the most important financial aid factor identified by African-American female and male respondents attending Texas law schools was total cost (tuition plus room and board), all of the financial aid factors were considered important. The remaining three financial aid factors were ranked by African-American female and male respondents as follows: (1) net cost (cost minus aid) was ranked second, (2) the financial aid offer was ranked third, and (3) scholarships (amount offered by the law school) were ranked fourth. The results of the financial aid factors for African-American female and male Texas law school respondents are shown in Figure 120.

![Financial Aid Factors Legend](image)

TC – Total Cost (tuition plus room and board)
FA – Financial Aid Offer
NC – Net Cost (cost minus aid)
SCH – Scholarships (amount offered by law school)

**Figure 120.** Financial Aid Factors for Female & Male Respondents Attending Texas Law Schools
Career Factors: All Texas Law Schools by Gender

Career factors for all Texas law school respondents by gender. This section examined the career factors that were most important and least important to African-American female and male respondents enrolled in Texas law schools during the law school selection process. Similar to the other factors, African-American female and male Texas law school respondents were asked to answer survey question twenty-three:

*Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given.*

Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the career factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the career factors for all Texas law school respondents by gender. The findings in the study indicated that the single most important career factor to African-American female and male respondents enrolled in Texas law schools was the assurance of employment after graduation in selecting a law school. Moreover, African-American female and male Texas law school respondents reported that the least important career factor in the law school selection process was opportunities for part-time employment. The overall results of the career factors for African-American females and males enrolled in Texas law schools are shown in Figure 121.
Summary of the Law School Selection Factors for all Texas Law School Respondents by Gender

The ranking of law school selection factors by African-American females and males attending Texas law schools is displayed in Tables 18-19. African-American female Texas law school respondents identified eight factors as most important in the law school decision-making process. These factors included: (1) total cost (tuition plus room and board), (2) quality of faculty, (3) assurance of employment after graduation, (4) net cost (cost minus aid), (5) wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities), (6) the financial aid offer, (7) academic reputation, and (8) scholarships (amount offered by the law school). These law school choice factors are shown in Table 18.
Table 18

*Top Ranking of Law School Selection Factors by all Female Texas Law School Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>% Important</th>
<th>% Very Important</th>
<th>Sig.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by the law school)</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Chi-square significance level in the above column reflects the significance level of the total population surveyed – private law schools, public law schools, and the historically Black law school by gender. If the α value was less than .05 than the results were considered statistically significant. If the α value was between .05 and .10 than the results were considered marginally significant (George & Mallery, 2005).

When the factors were no longer categorized into subgroups, there were also six factors identified by African-American females attending Texas law schools as least important in the selection process. These law school factors included: (1) opportunities for part-time employment, (2) the campus visit experience, (3) social atmosphere, (4) size of the law school, (5) African-American student/faculty ratio, and (6) supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations. The results of all law school selection factors for
African-American female respondents enrolled in Texas law schools are shown in Table Q.22 (Appendix Q).

While some of the factors were the same for African-American female and male respondents attending Texas law schools, some of them differed and the order of importance differed. The eight factors identified as most important by African-American male Texas law school respondents in the law school decision-making process were as follows: (1) total cost (tuition plus room and board), (2) net cost (cost minus aid), (3) assurance of employment after graduation, (4) the financial aid offer, (5) wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities), (6) scholarships (amount offered by the law school), (7) quality of faculty, and (8) academic reputation. Net cost (cost minus aid) and assurance of employment after graduation were given the same level of importance and ranked second overall by African-American male Texas law school respondents as shown in Table 19.

Similar to female respondents, male respondents also identified six law school factors of least importance in the selection process. These law school factors included: (1) opportunities for part-time employment, (2) size of the law school, (3) the campus visit experience, (4) African-American student/faculty ratio, (5) social atmosphere, and (6) supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations. The overall ranking of law school selection factors for African-American males enrolled in Texas law schools are shown in Table Q.23 (Appendix Q).
Table 19

Top Ranking of Law School Selection Factors by all Male Texas Law School Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>% Important</th>
<th>% Very Important</th>
<th>Sig.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by the law school)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Chi-square significance level in the above column reflects the significance level of the total population surveyed – private law schools, public law schools, and the historically Black law school by gender. If the α value was less than .05 than the results were considered statistically significant. If the α value was between .05 and .10 than the results were considered marginally significant (George & Mallery, 2005).

Primary Marketing Factors: All Texas Law Schools by Gender

Primary marketing factors for all Texas law school respondents by gender. The objective of the primary marketing section was to identify the major factors that had an influence on the law school decision-making process of African-American female and male respondents attending Texas law schools. Primary factors are used in conjunction with the initial 20 law school selection factors during the beginning of the recruitment
process. Therefore, respondents were given the following instructions in survey question twenty-five: *To help improve communication with the students, please rate how important the information and contacts you received from the law school you have chosen to attend were in the law school selection process.* Respondents were provided a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the primary marketing factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

*Results of the primary factors for all Texas law school respondents by gender.*

Three primary marketing factors were identified as most important in the law school choice process by African-American female and male respondents attending Texas law schools. African-American female and male Texas law school respondents ranked (1) the importance of financial aid, (2) financial aid communications, and (3) contact with the admissions staff as the most important primary marketing factors. Likewise, African-American female and male respondents identified three primary marketing factors as least important in the law school choice process. These primary marketing factors included: (1) university publications, (2) the frequency and quality of telephone contact, and (3) the frequency and quality of mail communications. The overall ranking of the primary marketing factors by African-American female and male respondents attending Texas law schools is shown in Figure 122.
**Figure 122.** Primary Marketing Factors for Female & Male Respondents Attending Texas Law Schools

**Secondary Marketing Factors: All Texas Law Schools by Gender**

*Secondary marketing factors for all Texas law school respondents by gender.*

This section examined the major factors that had an influence on the law school choice process of African-American females and males attending Texas law schools. Secondary marketing factors are incorporated into the recruitment process to personalize and distinguish each law school. Therefore, African-American female and male Texas law school respondents were given the following instructions to answer survey question twenty-five: *To help improve communication with the students, please rate how important the information and contacts you received from the law school you have chosen to attend were in the law school selection process.* Respondents were provided a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the secondary marketing factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.
Results of the secondary marketing factors for all Texas law school respondents by gender. African-American female and male respondents attending Texas law schools indicated that contact with current students was the most important secondary marketing factor in the law school selection process. Furthermore, African-American female and male Texas law school respondents ranked contact with faculty as the second most important secondary marketing factor in the selection process. African-American female and male respondents also identified three secondary marketing factors as least important in the law school choice process. These secondary marketing factors included: (1) off-campus receptions in your area, (2) contact with alumni, and (3) on-or-off-campus interviews. The results of the secondary marketing factors for African-American female and male respondents enrolled in Texas law schools are shown in Figure 123.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CWS – Contact with Current students</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWF – Contact with Faculty</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWA – Contact with Alumni</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OREC – Off-Campus Receptions in Your Area</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CINT – On-or-Off-Campus Interviews</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 123. Secondary Marketing Factors for Female & Male Respondents Attending Texas Law Schools
Analysis of the Law School Choice Factors for all Texas Law Schools Respondents by Academic Year

This study was conducted over two academic years; therefore, the students who participated in the survey were different. Hence, the objective of this section was to determine if the factors affecting the law school selection process of African-American respondents enrolled in Texas law schools were different in 2004 and 2005. Similar to the first three questions, the initial 20 factors were grouped into the following categories: (1) faculty and staff factors, (2) social factors, (3) financial aid factors, and (4) career factors. Additionally, the intent of this section was to determine if differences existed in the primary and secondary marketing factors affected the law school choice of African-American respondents enrolled in Texas law schools in 2004 and 2005.

Faculty and Staff Factors: All Texas Law Schools by Academic Year

Faculty and staff factors for all Texas law school respondents by academic year.
The purpose of this section was to determine the faculty and staff factors that affected the law school choice of all African-American students who attended Texas law schools in 2004 and 2005. In order to identify these factors, African-American Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 were asked to answer survey question twenty-three: *Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given.* Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the faculty and staff factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.
Results of the faculty and staff factors for all Texas law school respondents by academic year. Two faculty and staff factors were considered most important by all African-American respondents attending Texas law schools in 2004 and 2005. In order of importance, the faculty and staff factors included: (1) quality of faculty and (2) wide-ranging curriculums (provide more opportunities). Moreover, African-American Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 ranked African-American student/faculty ratio as the least important faculty and staff factor in the law school selection process. The results of the faculty and staff factors for African-American Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 are shown in Figure 124.

Figure 124. Faculty and Staff Factors for Texas Law School Respondents by Academic Year

Social Factors: All Texas Law Schools by Academic Year

Social factors for all Texas law school respondents by academic year. This section examined the social factors that affected the law school choice of African-American respondents enrolled in Texas law schools in 2004 and 2005 who participated
in the study. Therefore, African-American Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 were asked to respond to survey question twenty-three: *Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given.* Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the social factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

**Results of the social factors for all Texas law school respondents by academic year.** African-American respondents in 2004 indicated that three social factors were most important in the law school decision making process. These social factors included (1) racial/ethnic diversity, (2) geographic location, and (3) academic reputation. Although African-American respondents in 2005 also ranked academic reputation as the most important factor in the law school selection process, the second and third most important social factors differed from those identified by African-American Texas law school respondents in 2004. African-American Texas law school respondents in 2005 ranked distance from home second and geographic location third as the most important social factors in selecting a law school. When the results of both populations were combined, academic reputation was considered the most important factor in the law school selection process as shown in Figure 125.

African-American respondents in 2004 and 2005 also identified three social factors as least important in the selection process. These factors included: (1) the campus visit experience, (2) size of the law school, and (3) social atmosphere. The
results of the social factors for African-American Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 are shown in Figure 125.

Figure 125. Social Factors for Texas Law School Respondents by Academic Year

Financial Aid Factors: All Texas Law School Respondents

Financial aid factors for all Texas law school respondents. The objective of this section was to identify the financial aid factors that affected the law school choice of African-American Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 participating in the study. Respondents for both academic years were instructed to answer survey question twenty-three: Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you.

Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given. Respondents used a 5-point
rating scale to measure the importance of the financial aid factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the financial aid factors for all Texas law school respondents. Total cost (tuition plus room and board) was ranked the most important financial aid factor in the law school selection process by African-American Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 participating in the study. Furthermore, African-American Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 also identified two other important financial aid factors in the selection process. Hence, net cost (cost minus aid) and the financial aid offer were ranked second and third in the law school selection process by African-American Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005.

African-American Texas law school respondents in 2005 also identified scholarships (amount offered by the law school) as having the same level of importance as net cost (cost minus aid) by ranking the financial aid factor second overall in the law school choice process. In contrast, African-American Texas law school respondents in 2004 ranked scholarships (amount offered by the law school) as the least important financial aid factor in selecting a law school. When the responses of both populations were combined, total cost and net cost were ranked as the most important financial aid factors and scholarships (amount offered by the law school) were ranked as the least important financial aid factor in the law school selection process. The overall results of the financial aid factors for African-American Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 participating in the study are shown in Figure 126.
Career Factors: All Texas Law Schools by Academic Year

Career factors for all Texas law school respondents by academic year. The purpose of this section was to identify the career factors that were most important and least important to all African-American law school respondents enrolled in Texas law schools in 2004 and 2005. African-American Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 were asked to respond to survey question twenty-three: *Please rate each of the characteristics below based on your perception of how important each characteristic was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given.* Respondents used a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the career factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.
Results of the career factors for all Texas law school respondents by academic year. In the study, it was determined that the most important career factor for all African-American Texas law school respondents enrolled in 2004 and 2005 was assurance of employment after graduation. In contrast, the least important career factor for African-American Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 was opportunities for part-time employment. The overall results of the career factors for African-American Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 are as shown in Figure 127.

![Career Factors Legend](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>PTE</th>
<th>AEG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 127. Career Factors for Texas Law School Respondents by Academic Year

Summary of the Law School Selection Factors for all Texas Law School Respondents by Academic Year

The ranking of law school selection factors by all African-American respondents enrolled in Texas law schools in 2004 and 2005 is displayed in Tables 20-21. African-American Texas law school respondents in 2004 identified eight factors as most important in the law school selection process. These factors included (1) total cost (tuition plus room and board), (2) quality of faculty, (3) net cost (cost minus aid), (4)
wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities), (5) assurance of employment after graduation, (6) the financial aid offer, (7) racial/ethnic diversity, and (8) geographic location (Table 21). Moreover, all African-American Texas law school respondents participating in the study in 2004 identified five law school factors as least important in the selection process. These factors included: (1) opportunities for part-time employment, (2) the campus visit experience, (3) size of the law school, (4) social atmosphere, and (5) African-American student/faculty ratio. The overall ranking of the law school selection factors for all African-American Texas law school respondents in 2004 is shown in Table Q.24 (Appendix Q).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>% Important</th>
<th>% Very Important</th>
<th>Sig.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic diversity</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Chi-square significance level in the above column reflects the significance level of the total population surveyed – private law schools, public law schools, and the historically Black law school in 2004. If the α value was less than .05 than the results were considered statistically significant. If the α value was between .05 and .10 than the results were considered marginally significant (George & Mallery, 2005).
Although some of the law school choice factors were the same for all African-American respondents in 2004 and 2005 participating in the study, the order of importance differed. African-American respondents enrolled in Texas law schools in 2005 identified eight factors in the law school selection process. These factors included (1) total cost (tuition plus room and board), (2) assurance of employment after graduation, (3) academic reputation, (4) net cost (cost minus aid), (5) scholarships (amount offered by the law school), (6) the financial aid offer, (7) quality of faculty, and (8) wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities). Net cost (cost minus aid) and scholarships (amount offered by the law school) were identified as having the same level of importance and ranked fourth overall by African-American Texas law school respondents in 2005 as shown in Table 21.

Respondents in 2005 also identified five factors as least important in the law school choice process. In order of least importance, these factors included: (1) opportunities for part-time employment, (2) the campus visit experience, (3) size of the law school, (4) African-American student/faculty ratio, and (5) social atmosphere. The overall ranking of law school selection factors for All African-American respondents enrolled in Texas law schools in 2005 who participated in the study is shown in Table Q.25 (Appendix Q).

*Primary Marketing Factors: All Texas Law Schools by Academic Year*

*Primary marketing factors for all Texas law school respondents by academic year.* This section examined the primary marketing factors that influenced the law school selection process of African-Americans attending Texas law schools in 2004 and 2005.
Table 21

*Top Ranking of Law School Selection Factors by all Texas Law School Respondents in 2005*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>% Important</th>
<th>% Very Important</th>
<th>Sig.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by the law school)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Chi-square significance level in the above column reflects the significance level of the total population surveyed – private law schools, public law schools, and the historically Black law school in 2005. If the \( \alpha \) value was less than .05 than the results were considered statistically significant. If the \( \alpha \) value was between .05 and .10 than the results were considered marginally significant (George & Mallery, 2005).*

who participated in the study. Therefore, respondents in 2004 and 2005 were given the following instructions in survey question twenty-five: *To help improve communication with the students, please rate how important the information and contacts you received from the law school you have chosen to attend were in the law school selection process.*

Respondents were provided a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the primary marketing factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.
Results of the primary marketing factors for all Texas law school respondents by academic year. Three primary marketing factors were identified as important in the law school choice process by all African-American law school respondents enrolled in 2004 and 2005 who participated in the study. The primary marketing factors included: (1) the importance of financial aid, (2) financial aid communications, and (3) contact with current students. African-American respondents enrolled in Texas law schools in 2004 and 2005 also identified three primary marketing factors as least important in the law school choice process. These primary marketing factors were as follows: (1) university publications, (2) the frequency and quality of telephone contacts, and (3) the frequency and quality of mail communications. The overall results of the primary marketing factors for all African-American Texas law school respondents participating in the study in 2004 and 2005 are shown in Figure 128.

Figure 128. Primary Marketing Factors for Texas Law School Respondents by Academic Year
Secondary Marketing Factors: All Texas Law School by Academic Year

Secondary marketing factors for all Texas law school respondents by academic year. The intent of this section was to identify the major factors that had an influence on the law school selection process of all African-American Texas law school respondents participating in the study in 2004 and 2005. Secondary marketing factors are incorporated into the recruitment process to personalize and distinguish law schools. Subsequently, respondents were given the following instructions in survey question twenty-five: *To help improve communication with the students, please rate how important the information and contacts you received from the law school you have chosen to attend were in the law school selection process.* Respondents were provided a 5-point rating scale to measure the importance of the secondary marketing factors: (1) Not at All Important, (2) Not Important, (3) Neutral, (4) Important, and (5) Very Important.

Results of the secondary marketing factors for all Texas law school respondents. African-American respondents in 2004 ranked contact with faculty and contact with current students as the two most important secondary marketing factors in the law school choice process. However, African-American Texas law school respondents in 2005 differed by ranking contact with current students first and contact with faculty second in selecting a law school. When the responses were combined for both populations, contact with current students was the most important secondary marketing factor in the selection process. African-American Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 further identified off-campus receptions in your area as the least important secondary marketing
factor in the law school decision-making process. Contact with alumni was ranked the second least important factor in the decision-making process by both groups of respondents as shown in Figure 129.

![Secondary Marketing Factors for Texas Law School Respondents by Academic Year](image)

**Figure 129.** Secondary Marketing Factors for Texas Law School Respondents by Academic Year

**Overall Summary Comparison of the Law School Selection Factors Affecting African-American Students Enrollment in Texas Law Schools**

The purpose of the fourth research question was to determine if there were differences in the factors affecting the law school choice of African-American students who attended accredited private law schools, public law schools, and a historically Black law school in the state of Texas. Therefore, this summary will compare the law school selection factors of (1) private law school respondents, (2) public law school respondents, (3) historically Black law school respondents, and (4) African-American respondents overall who participated in the survey. Moreover, the comparisons will consist of three categories: (1) respondents and the law school choice factors, (2) respondents by gender
and the law school choice factors, and (3) respondents by academic year and the law school choice factors.

*Law School Selection Factors: The Comparison of Private, Public, Historically Black and all Texas Law School Respondents*

Private and public Texas law school respondents differed from historically Black Texas law school respondents and African-American Texas law school respondents overall who ranked total cost (tuition plus room and board) as the most important factor in the law school selection process. Instead, private Texas law school respondents ranked academic reputation and quality of faculty as the most important factors in selecting a law school. Public Texas law school respondents also ranked academic reputation as the most important factor in the selection process (Table 22).

Total cost was ranked third by public Texas law school respondents and tenth by private Texas law school respondents in the law school decision-making process. Academic reputation was ranked eleventh by historically Black Texas law school respondents and seventh by African-American Texas law school respondents as a whole. Moreover, quality of faculty was ranked fourth by all Texas law school respondents participating in the study and fifth by public and historically Black Texas law school respondents in the selection process as shown in Table 22.

Public Texas law school respondents and African-American Texas law school respondents overall ranked assurance of employment as the second most important factor in the law school choice process. In contrast, historically Black Texas law school respondents ranked net cost (cost minus aid) as the second most important factor in the choice process. Overall, assurance of employment after graduation was ranked fourth by historically Black Texas law school respondents and fifth by private Texas law school
respondents. Net cost was ranked third by African-American Texas law school respondents as a whole, sixth by public Texas law school respondents and twelfth by private Texas law school respondents (Table 22).

Although private Texas law school respondents ranked wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities) as the third most important factor in the law school choice process, historically Black Texas law school respondents differed by ranking the financial aid offer as the third most important factor in the choice process. Overall, wide-ranging curriculums were ranked fourth by public Texas law school respondents, fifth by all Texas law school respondents participating in the study, and seventh by historically Black Texas law school respondents. Furthermore, the financial aid offer was ranked sixth by all Texas law school respondents who participated in the study, eight by public Texas law school respondents, and tenth by private Texas law school respondents. Historically Black Texas law school respondents further identified scholarships (amount offered by the law school) as the fifth important factor in the law school selection process. However, the importance of scholarships was ranked seventh by public Texas law school respondents, eighth by African-American law school respondents overall and thirteenth by private law school respondents (Table 22).

In summary, private Texas law school respondents were most concerned about the academic reputation of the law school, the quality of faculty, wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities), geographic location, and the assurance of employment after graduation. Likewise, public Texas law school respondents were most concerned about academic reputation, assurance of employment after graduation, total cost (tuition plus room and board) and wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities).
Table 22

Comparison Table of the Factors Affecting the Law School Selection Process of all Texas Law School Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>All Texas Law Schools</th>
<th>Private Texas Law Schools</th>
<th>Public Texas Law Schools</th>
<th>Historically Black Texas Law School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.054</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.036</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.006</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.009</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by law school)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.141</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.110</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>All Texas Law Schools</th>
<th>Private Texas Law Schools</th>
<th>Public Texas Law Schools</th>
<th>Historically Black Texas Law School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic diversity</td>
<td>Rank: 10 Mean: 3.77  Std. Dev: 1.123</td>
<td>Rank: 16 Mean: 3.53  Std. Dev: 1.055</td>
<td>Rank: 10 Mean: 3.70  Std. Dev: 1.119</td>
<td>Rank: 8 Mean: 3.82  Std. Dev: 1.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The admissions process</td>
<td>Rank: 11 Mean: 3.70  Std. Dev: 1.080</td>
<td>Rank: 8 Mean: 3.92  Std. Dev: 0.874</td>
<td>Rank: 13 Mean: 3.62  Std. Dev: 0.874</td>
<td>Rank: 9 Mean: 3.68  Std. Dev: 1.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty sensitivity to minority needs</td>
<td>Rank: 13 Mean: 3.63  Std. Dev: 1.062</td>
<td>Rank: 9 Mean: 3.89  Std. Dev: 0.950</td>
<td>Rank: 11 Mean: 3.66  Std. Dev: 0.919</td>
<td>Rank: 13 Mean: 3.57  Std. Dev: 1.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from home</td>
<td>Rank: 14 Mean: 3.54  Std. Dev: 1.235</td>
<td>Rank: 7 Mean: 3.97  Std. Dev: 0.878</td>
<td>Rank: 16 Mean: 3.49  Std. Dev: 1.382</td>
<td>Rank: 14 Mean: 3.47  Std. Dev: 1.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations</td>
<td>Rank: 15 Mean: 3.49  Std. Dev: 1.074</td>
<td>Rank: 14 Mean: 3.72  Std. Dev: 1.111</td>
<td>Rank: 12 Mean: 3.65  Std. Dev: 1.083</td>
<td>Rank: 15 Mean: 3.41  Std. Dev: 1.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social atmosphere</td>
<td>Rank: 17 Mean: 3.30  Std. Dev: 1.018</td>
<td>Rank: 19 Mean: 3.44  Std. Dev: 0.843</td>
<td>Rank: 15 Mean: 3.55  Std. Dev: 1.030</td>
<td>Rank: 18 Mean: 3.21  Std. Dev: 1.033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Historically Black Texas law school respondents and African-American Texas law school respondents overall were most concerned about total cost (tuition plus room and board), net cost (cost minus aid), assurance of employment after graduation and quality of faculty. Conversely, private Texas law school respondents were the least concerned about total cost (tuition plus room and board), net cost (cost minus aid), the financial aid offer, and scholarships (amount offered by the law school).

*Law School Selection Factors: The Comparison of Private, Public, Historically Black and all Texas Law School Respondents by Gender*

Female and male respondents attending a historically Black Texas law school and Texas law schools overall ranked total cost (tuition plus room and board) as the most important factor in the law school selection process. However, female and male respondents attending private and public Texas law schools differed in their ranking of the most important law school selection factor. Female respondents attending a public law school in Texas ranked academic reputation as the most important factor in the selection process. Similarly, male respondents attending public and private law schools in Texas also ranked academic reputation as the most important factor in selecting a law school. However, male respondents enrolled in public Texas law schools identified wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities) as being equally important with academic reputation by ranking both factors first in the selection process. In contrast, female respondents enrolled in private Texas law schools ranked quality of faculty as the most important factor in the law school selection process (Tables 23-24).

Total cost was ranked third by female respondents enrolled in public Texas law schools, eighth by female respondents enrolled in private Texas law schools, and fifteenth by male respondents enrolled in private Texas law schools. Academic reputation was
ranked the second most important factor by female respondents attending private Texas law schools, ninth and thirteenth by female and male respondents attending a historically Black Texas law school, and seventh and eighth by female and male respondents enrolled in Texas law schools overall. Moreover, quality of faculty was ranked the second most important factor in the selection process by female respondents attending a historically Black law school and Texas law schools overall. However, female public Texas law school respondents, as well as male private and public Texas law school respondents differed in the ranking of quality of faculty from the other law school respondents. These respondents ranked quality of faculty fourth in the selection process. Conversely, male historically Black Texas law school respondents and Texas law school respondents overall ranked quality of faculty seventh in the law school selection process. Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities) was ranked fourth by female private and public Texas law school respondents, fifth by female and male Texas law school respondents overall, sixth by male historically Black Texas law school respondents, and seventh by female historically Black Texas law school respondents (Tables 23-24).

Female and male historically Black Texas law school respondents also ranked net cost as the second most important factor in the law school choice process. Likewise, African-American male Texas law school respondents as a whole ranked net cost (cost minus aid) and assurance of employment after graduation the second most important factors in the choice process. Similarly, female public Texas law school respondents ranked assurance of employment after graduation as the second most important factor in the law school selection process. However, assurance of employment after graduation
was ranked third by female Texas law school respondents overall and male private and public Texas law school respondents in the selection process. Female and male historically Black Texas law school respondents ranked assurance of employment after graduation fourth in selecting a law school. Furthermore, net cost (cost minus aid) was ranked fourth by female Texas law school respondents overall, sixth by female and male public Texas law school respondents, tenth by female private Texas law school respondents and seventeenth by male private Texas law school respondents in the law school selection process as shown in Tables 23-24.

Although the financial aid offer was ranked third by male historically Black Texas law schools respondents as most important in the selection process, male private Texas law school respondents indicated that the financial aid offer was the least important factor in selecting a law school by ranking the law school factor nineteenth in the selection process. However, female historically Black Texas law school respondents and male Texas law school respondents overall ranked the financial aid offer fourth, female private Texas law school respondents ranked the financial aid offer fifth, and female and male public Texas law school respondents ranked the financial aid offer eighth in the law school choice process. African-American female and male private Texas law school respondents indicated that the least important law school factor was scholarships (amount offered by the law school) because the respondents ranked the factor twelfth and seventeenth overall in the selection process. Conversely, male historically Black Texas law school respondents identified scholarships (amount offered by the law school) as the fifth most important factor in the law school selection process. Female and male public Texas law school respondents, as well as male Texas law school respondents overall
ranked the importance of scholarships as sixth in the law school choice process. Finally, female historically Black Texas law school respondents and female Texas law school respondents overall ranked scholarships eighth in the choice process as shown in Tables 23-24.

In summary, the most important factors to female and male historically Black Texas law school respondents, as well as female and male Texas law school respondents overall included: (1) total cost (tuition plus room and board), (2) net cost (cost minus aid), (3) assurance of employment after graduation, (4) quality of faculty, and (5) the financial aid offer. In contrast, male and female public and private Texas law school respondents were most concerned about (1) academic reputation, (2) quality of faculty, (3) wide-ranging curriculums, and (4) assurance of employment after graduation. Although public Texas law school respondents were concerned about (1) total cost (tuition plus room and board), (2) net cost (cost minus aid), and (3) scholarships, male and female private Texas law school respondents indicated that these financial aid factors were the least important in the law school choice process (Tables 23-24).

Law School Selection Factors: The Comparison of Private, Public, Historically Black and all Texas Law School Respondents by Academic Year

In 2004 and 2005, historically Black Texas law school respondents and African American Texas law school respondents overall, ranked total cost (tuition plus room and board) as the most important factor in the law school selection process. However, public Texas law respondents in 2004 and 2005, as well as private Texas law school respondents in 2005 identified academic reputation as the most important factor in the selection process. Additionally, private Texas law school respondents in 2004 ranked three factors as most important in the law school selection process. These factors included (1) quality
Table 23

Comparison Table of the Factors Affecting the Law School Selection Process of all Female Texas Law School Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>All Texas Law Schools</th>
<th>Private Texas Law Schools</th>
<th>Public Texas Law Schools</th>
<th>Historically Black Texas Law School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.051</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.028</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.010</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.115</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by law school)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.168</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic diversity</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.096</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>All Texas Law Schools</th>
<th>Private Texas Law Schools</th>
<th>Public Texas Law Schools</th>
<th>Historically Black Texas Law School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>Rank 10 Mean 3.84 Std. Dev 1.110</td>
<td>Rank 2 Mean 4.29 Std. Dev .806</td>
<td>Rank 9 Mean 4.00 Std. Dev .973</td>
<td>Rank 11 Mean 3.69 Std. Dev 1.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The admissions process</td>
<td>Rank 11 Mean 3.79 Std. Dev 1.026</td>
<td>Rank 10 Mean 4.00 Std. Dev .978</td>
<td>Rank 10 Mean 3.72 Std. Dev 1.317</td>
<td>Rank 9 Mean 3.76 Std. Dev .927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority faculty as role models and mentors</td>
<td>Rank 12 Mean 3.71 Std. Dev 1.125</td>
<td>Rank 7 Mean 4.08 Std. Dev .974</td>
<td>Rank 15 Mean 3.59 Std. Dev 1.069</td>
<td>Rank 12 Mean 3.68 Std. Dev 1.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty sensitivity to minority needs</td>
<td>Rank 13 Mean 3.68 Std. Dev 1.004</td>
<td>Rank 12 Mean 3.96 Std. Dev .955</td>
<td>Rank 12 Mean 3.67 Std. Dev .772</td>
<td>Rank 13 Mean 3.61 Std. Dev 1.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from home</td>
<td>Rank 14 Mean 3.57 Std. Dev 1.272</td>
<td>Rank 5 Mean 4.17 Std. Dev 1.049</td>
<td>Rank 10 Mean 3.72 Std. Dev 1.317</td>
<td>Rank 15 Mean 3.39 Std. Dev 1.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive on-campus and off-campus</td>
<td>Rank 15 Mean 3.52 Std. Dev 1.078</td>
<td>Rank 16 Mean 3.54 Std. Dev 1.250</td>
<td>Rank 14 Mean 3.63 Std. Dev 1.224</td>
<td>Rank 14 Mean 3.49 Std. Dev 1.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American student/faculty ratio</td>
<td>Rank 16 Mean 3.35 Std. Dev 1.128</td>
<td>Rank 17 Mean 3.42 Std. Dev 1.100</td>
<td>Rank 18 Mean 3.18 Std. Dev 1.073</td>
<td>Rank 15 Mean 3.39 Std. Dev 1.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of law school</td>
<td>Rank 17 Mean 3.30 Std. Dev 1.041</td>
<td>Rank 14 Mean 3.67 Std. Dev .963</td>
<td>Rank 19 Mean 2.95 Std. Dev .999</td>
<td>Rank 17 Mean 3.34 Std. Dev 1.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social atmosphere</td>
<td>Rank 18 Mean 3.29 Std. Dev 1.041</td>
<td>Rank 17 Mean 3.42 Std. Dev .929</td>
<td>Rank 16 Mean 3.41 Std. Dev 1.044</td>
<td>Rank 18 Mean 3.22 Std. Dev 1.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus visit experience</td>
<td>Rank 19 Mean 3.09 Std. Dev 1.288</td>
<td>Rank 20 Mean 3.39 Std. Dev 1.500</td>
<td>Rank 16 Mean 3.41 Std. Dev 1.352</td>
<td>Rank 19 Mean 2.92 Std. Dev 1.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for part-time employment</td>
<td>Rank 20 Mean 2.85 Std. Dev 1.246</td>
<td>Rank 17 Mean 3.42 Std. Dev 1.316</td>
<td>Rank 20 Mean 2.59 Std. Dev 1.229</td>
<td>Rank 20 Mean 2.82 Std. Dev 1.212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24

*Comparison Table of the Factors Affecting the Law School Selection Process of all Male Texas Law School Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>All Texas Law Schools</th>
<th>Private Texas Law Schools</th>
<th>Public Texas Law Schools</th>
<th>Historically Black Texas Law School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.055</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.056</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.077</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.005</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by law school)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.075</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.122</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>All Texas Law Schools</th>
<th>Private Texas Law Schools</th>
<th>Public Texas Law Schools</th>
<th>Historically Black Texas Law School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank  Mean  Std. Dev</td>
<td>Rank  Mean  Std. Dev</td>
<td>Rank  Mean  Std. Dev</td>
<td>Rank  Mean  Std. Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority faculty as role models and mentors</td>
<td>10  3.70  1.069</td>
<td>5  4.17  .577</td>
<td>10  3.85  1.144</td>
<td>9  3.61  1.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic diversity</td>
<td>11  3.63  1.158</td>
<td>15  3.42  .996</td>
<td>13  3.92  .760</td>
<td>9  3.61  1.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty sensitivity to minority needs</td>
<td>12  3.58  1.132</td>
<td>9  3.75  .965</td>
<td>10  3.85  1.068</td>
<td>13  3.52  1.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The admissions process</td>
<td>13  3.55  1.157</td>
<td>9  3.75  .622</td>
<td>17  3.31  .630</td>
<td>12  3.56  1.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from home</td>
<td>14  3.50  1.165</td>
<td>13  3.58  .793</td>
<td>18  3.00  1.354</td>
<td>11  3.57  1.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations</td>
<td>15  3.43  1.077</td>
<td>7  4.08  .669</td>
<td>13  3.69  1.251</td>
<td>15  3.30  1.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social atmosphere</td>
<td>16  3.30  .982</td>
<td>14  3.50  .674</td>
<td>10  3.85  .899</td>
<td>17  3.19  1.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American student/faculty ratio</td>
<td>17  3.28  1.174</td>
<td>19  3.17  .835</td>
<td>16  3.46  1.127</td>
<td>16  3.27  1.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus visit experience</td>
<td>18  3.19  1.250</td>
<td>8  3.82  .982</td>
<td>15  3.54  1.450</td>
<td>19  3.06  1.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of law school</td>
<td>19  3.17  1.034</td>
<td>11  3.67  .888</td>
<td>19  2.92  1.115</td>
<td>18  3.13  1.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for part-time employment</td>
<td>20  2.98  1.270</td>
<td>11  3.67  1.371</td>
<td>20  2.85  1.519</td>
<td>20  2.91  1.205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of faculty, (2) geographic location, and (3) minority faculty as role models and mentors (Tables 25-26).

Overall, total cost (tuition plus room and board) was ranked second and third by public Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 and tenth and twelfth by private Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005. Moreover, academic reputation was ranked third by Texas law school respondents overall in 2005, fifth by private Texas law school respondents in 2004, and eighth by historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2005. In 2004, Texas law school respondents overall and historically Black Texas law school respondents ranked academic reputation ninth and twelfth in selecting a law school as shown in Tables 25-26.

While private Texas law school respondents in 2004 ranked geographic location as the most important factor in the law school choice process, private Texas law school respondents in 2005 differed by ranking geographic location fifth in the law school selection process. Likewise, public Texas law school respondents and Texas law school respondents overall in 2004 ranked geographic location eighth in the law school choice process. Historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 ranked geographic location ninth and thirteenth in the choice process. Additionally, public Texas law school respondents and Texas law school respondents overall in 2005 ranked geographic location tenth in the law school selection process (Tables 25-26).

In regards to quality of faculty, private Texas law school respondents in 2005 and Texas law school respondents overall in 2004 ranked this factor second in the law school selection process; thereby, differing from private Texas law school respondents in 2004 who identified quality of faculty as the most important factor in the selection process.
Moreover, historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 ranked quality of faculty fourth; public Texas law school respondents in 2005 ranked quality of faculty fifth; and Texas law school respondents in 2005 overall ranked quality of faculty seventh as the most important factors in selecting a law school. Historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2005 and public Texas law school respondents in 2004 identified quality of faculty as the sixth most important factor in the selection process (Tables 25-26).

Public, historically Black, and Texas law school respondents in 2005 overall indicated that assurance of employment after graduation was the second most important factor in the law school decision-making process. However, public Texas law school respondents in 2004 and private Texas law school respondents in 2005 ranked assurance of employment after graduation third and fourth in the decision-making process. Moreover, Texas law school respondents overall, private Texas law school respondents, and historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 ranked assurance of employment after graduation fifth, sixth, and seventh in the law school selection process.

Although Texas law school respondents overall in 2004 and historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2005 identified net cost (cost minus aid) as the third most important factor in the law school choice process, private Texas law school respondents in 2004 differed by ranking net cost (cost minus aid) fifteenth in the choice process. However, historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 also identified net cost (cost minus aid) as an important law school choice factor by ranking it second in the selection process. Likewise, Texas law school respondents overall in 2005 and public Texas law school respondents in 2004 ranked net cost (cost minus aid) fourth.
and fifth in the law school selection process. Similar to private Texas law school respondents in 2004 regarding the level of importance, public and private Texas law school respondents in 2005 ranked net cost (cost minus aid) eighth and ninth in the selection process (Tables 25-26).

Private, public, and Texas law school respondents overall in 2004 and public Texas law school respondents in 2005 identified wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities) as the fourth most important factor in the law school selection process. Moreover, private Texas law school respondents in 2005 ranked wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities) as third in the law school choice process. Historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 and Texas law school respondents overall in 2005 ranked wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities) as the sixth, seventh, and eighth most important law school factors in choice process. In 2005, historically Black Texas law school respondents and Texas law school respondents participating in the study ranked scholarships (amount offered by the law school) as the third and fourth most important factors in selecting a law school as shown in Tables 25-26.

Despite the findings that indicated private and public Texas law school respondents in 2004 were concerned the least about the financial aid offer by ranking it seventeenth and ninth in the selection process, historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2004 ranked the financial aid offer as the third most important factor in the law school selection process. Moreover, private and historically Black Texas law school respondents in 2005, as well as Texas law school respondents overall in 2004, ranked the financial aid offer as the fifth most important factor in the law school selection
process. Public and Texas law school respondents overall in 2005 ranked the financial aid offer as the sixth most important factor in the law school selection process. In summary, historically Black and Texas law school respondents overall in 2004 and 2005 responded that the most important law school selection factor was total cost (tuition plus room and board). Conversely, private and public Texas law school respondents in 2004 and 2005 indicated that the most important law school choice factors were (1) academic reputation, (2) quality of faculty, and geographic location (Tables 25-26).

The Undergraduate Institutions of African-American Law School Respondents in Texas

Question Number Six

The sixth research question inquired about the institutions of higher education that African-American students were attending prior to enrolling in Texas law schools. Therefore, respondents were asked to answer survey question five: *I earned my first bachelor degree at __________ in __________ (Please fill in the undergraduate institution and the correct year.*) The responses were grouped into categories because the number of respondents and institutions of higher education were immense in size. The institutions of higher education were grouped as follows based on the participants’ responses: (1) Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), (2) undergraduate institutions in the Texas A&M system, (3) undergraduate institutions in the University of Texas system, (4) undergraduate institutions in the University of Houston system, (5) the remaining undergraduate institutions in Texas, and (6) undergraduate institutions in states other than Texas.
Table 25

Comparison Table of the Factors Affecting the Law School Selection Process of all Texas Law School Respondents in 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>All Texas Law Schools</th>
<th>Private Texas Law Schools</th>
<th>Public Texas Law Schools</th>
<th>Historically Black Texas Law School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.938</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.061</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.111</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic diversity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.082</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.107</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>All Texas Law Schools</th>
<th>Private Texas Law Schools</th>
<th>Public Texas Law Schools</th>
<th>Historically Black Texas Law School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by law school)</td>
<td>Rank: 10, Mean: 3.86, Std. Dev: 1.211</td>
<td>Rank: 12, Mean: 3.65, Std. Dev: 1.498</td>
<td>Rank: 7, Mean: 4.13, Std. Dev: .992</td>
<td>Rank: 8, Mean: 3.84, Std. Dev: 1.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority faculty as role models and mentors</td>
<td>Rank: 11, Mean: 3.76, Std. Dev: 1.162</td>
<td>Rank: 1, Mean: 4.35, Std. Dev: .606</td>
<td>Rank: 15, Mean: 3.50, Std. Dev: 1.180</td>
<td>Rank: 11, Mean: 3.72, Std. Dev: 1.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The admissions process</td>
<td>Rank: 12, Mean: 3.75, Std. Dev: 1.025</td>
<td>Rank: 10, Mean: 3.71, Std. Dev: .686</td>
<td>Rank: 12, Mean: 3.63, Std. Dev: 1.209</td>
<td>Rank: 10, Mean: 3.78, Std. Dev: 1.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty sensitivity to minority needs</td>
<td>Rank: 13, Mean: 3.68, Std. Dev: 1.099</td>
<td>Rank: 8, Mean: 3.76, Std. Dev: .831</td>
<td>Rank: 11, Mean: 3.79, Std. Dev: .884</td>
<td>Rank: 13, Mean: 3.64, Std. Dev: 1.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from home</td>
<td>Rank: 15, Mean: 3.41, Std. Dev: 1.310</td>
<td>Rank: 7, Mean: 3.94, Std. Dev: .966</td>
<td>Rank: 18, Mean: 3.08, Std. Dev: 1.472</td>
<td>Rank: 16, Mean: 3.40, Std. Dev: 1.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social atmosphere</td>
<td>Rank: 17, Mean: 3.31, Std. Dev: 1.049</td>
<td>Rank: 15, Mean: 3.53, Std. Dev: .717</td>
<td>Rank: 12, Mean: 3.63, Std. Dev: .875</td>
<td>Rank: 18, Mean: 3.22, Std. Dev: 1.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of law school</td>
<td>Rank: 18, Mean: 3.25, Std. Dev: 1.074</td>
<td>Rank: 8, Mean: 3.67, Std. Dev: .903</td>
<td>Rank: 19, Mean: 2.96, Std. Dev: 1.122</td>
<td>Rank: 17, Mean: 3.24, Std. Dev: 1.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus visit experience</td>
<td>Rank: 19, Mean: 3.13, Std. Dev: 1.276</td>
<td>Rank: 13, Mean: 3.63, Std. Dev: 1.088</td>
<td>Rank: 14, Mean: 3.58, Std. Dev: 1.283</td>
<td>Rank: 19, Mean: 2.97, Std. Dev: 1.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for part-time employment</td>
<td>Rank: 20, Mean: 2.91, Std. Dev: 1.293</td>
<td>Rank: 20, Mean: 3.06, Std. Dev: 1.391</td>
<td>Rank: 20, Mean: 2.54, Std. Dev: 1.351</td>
<td>Rank: 19, Mean: 2.97, Std. Dev: 1.264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26

Comparison Table of the Factors Affecting the Law School Selection Process of all Texas Law School Respondents in 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>All Texas Law Schools</th>
<th>Private Texas Law Schools</th>
<th>Public Texas Law Schools</th>
<th>Historically Black Texas Law School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.006</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by law school)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.061</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.047</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.929</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.003</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from home</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.133</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>All Texas Law Schools</th>
<th>Private Texas Law Schools</th>
<th>Public Texas Law Schools</th>
<th>Historically Black Texas Law School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.104</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The admissions process</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.138</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority faculty as role models and mentors</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.048</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic diversity</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.148</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty sensitivity to minority needs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.020</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.043</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American student/faculty ratio</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.092</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of law school</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.007</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus visit experience</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.269</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for part-time employment</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.217</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Method

Frequency distributions were conducted using SPSS to determine the number of African-American students who responded to the survey question. Of the 299 respondents, 99% (296 students) chose to answer the survey question. Cross-tabulations using Chi-square ($\chi^2$) statistics were conducted to determine the level of significance regarding undergraduate institutions and type of law school respondents. The cross-tabulations regarding undergraduate institutions and type of law school respondents, such as private, public, historically Black, and all law Texas law school respondents generated a significance level of .017. Results with an $\alpha$ value less than .05 were considered statistically significant (George & Mallery, 2005). Additionally, results with an $\alpha$ value between .05 and .10 were considered marginally significant (George & Mallery, 2005). Although cross-tabulations were conducted regarding undergraduate institutions and type of law school respondents by gender and age; the significance level that generated was statistically insignificant.

The Undergraduate Institutions of Private, Public, Historically Black and Texas Law School Respondents Overall

The undergraduate institutions of private law school respondents. In the study, it was determined that the majority (27.8%) of the private Texas law school respondents received a bachelor degree from undergraduate institutions in states other than Texas. The four states in which undergraduate institutions were listed most often included: (1) Louisiana, (2) California, (3) Florida, and (4) Georgia. African-American private Texas law school respondents (25%) also indicated that they received a bachelor degree from undergraduate institutions in the University of Houston system. Some of these
institutions included: (1) the University of Houston - Main Campus (2) the University of Houston - Downtown, and (3) the University of Houston at Clear Lake.

Moreover, undergraduate institutions in the University of Texas system and the remaining undergraduate institutions in Texas granted 33.4% (16.7% each) of the bachelor degrees awarded to African-American students attending private law schools in Texas. Some of these institutions included: (1) the University of Texas – Main Campus, (2) the University of Texas at Arlington, (3) the University of Texas at Brownsville, (4) the University of Texas at Dallas, (5) the University of Texas at El Paso, (6) the University of North Texas, (7) Stephen F. Austin, (8) Baylor University, (9) Sam Houston State University, and (10) Southern Methodist University. Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) granted 13.9% of the bachelor degrees earned by private Texas law school respondents who participated in the study (Figure 130). Some of the HBCUs identified by private Texas law school respondents included (1) Prairie View A&M University, (2) Howard University, (3) Morehouse College, (4) Paul Quinn College in Dallas, (5) Grambling State University, and (6) Spellman College. Overall, 58.4% of the private Texas law school respondents earned a bachelor degree from an undergraduate institution in Texas when the percentages were combined for all Texas institutions as shown in Figure 130.

*The undergraduate institutions of public law school respondents.* Based on the responses from the survey question, the findings indicated that (1) 35.8% of the public Texas law school respondents received a bachelor degree from undergraduate institutions in states other than Texas, (2) 18.9% received a bachelor degree from undergraduate institutions in the University of Texas system, and (3) 17% received a bachelor degree
from HBCUs (Figure 131). Some of the out-of-state undergraduate institutions that public Texas law school respondents’ listed include: (1) California State University; (2) Georgia Tech; (3) the University of California at Berkley; (4) the University of Georgia; (5) Louisiana State University; and (6) Louisiana Tech University. Other undergraduate institutions that were listed in the University of Texas system included: (1) the University of Texas at San Antonio, (2) the University of Texas Pan American, and (3) the University of Texas at Tyler. Public Texas law school respondents also listed the following HBCUs when responding to the survey question: (1) Tuskegee University, (2) Southern University, and (3) Clark Atlanta University.

African-American students enrolled in public Texas law schools also received a bachelor degree from undergraduate institutions in the Texas A&M system and the University of Houston system. It was determined that each undergraduate system granted 11.3% of the African-American students attending public law schools in Texas a bachelor degree (Figure 131). Some of the institutions listed in the Texas A&M system included (1) Texas A&M – College Station, (2) Texas A&M – Corpus Christi, and (3) Texas A&M International University. Overall, 47.5% of the public Texas law school respondents earned a bachelor degree from an undergraduate institution in Texas when the percentages were combined for all Texas institutions. The overall results of the undergraduate institutions for public law school respondents in Texas are shown in Figure 131.
The undergraduate institutions of historically Black law school respondents.

According to Figure 133, historically Black Texas law school respondents (41.5%) earned a bachelor degree from undergraduate institutions in states other than Texas. Some of the undergraduate institutions that were listed included: (1) North Carolina State University, (2) Penn State University, (3) Rutgers University, (4) the University of Southern Mississippi, and (5) the University of North Carolina. Historically Black Texas law school respondents (19.8%) also indicated that they received an undergraduate degree from an HBCU, such as Florida A&M University, Tougaloo College, the
University of Texas at Prairie View A&M, and Howard University. The undergraduate institutions in the University of Texas system also granted 16.9% of the historically Black Texas law school respondents a bachelor degree (Figure 132). Overall, 38.6% of the historically Black Texas law school respondents earned a bachelor degree from an undergraduate institution in Texas when the percentages were combined for all Texas institutions as shown in Figure 132.

![Figure 132. The Undergraduate Institutions of Historically Black Law School Respondents in Texas](image)

The undergraduate institutions of all Texas law school respondents. Overall, it was determined that 38.9% of the African-American respondents attending all Texas law schools who chose to participate in the study earned a bachelor degree from undergraduate institutions in states other than Texas. Likewise, 18.6% of the respondents who attended Texas law schools earned a bachelor degree from Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). In regards to Texas, the responses of law school respondents were as follows: (1) 17.2% earned a bachelor degree from undergraduate institutions in the University of Texas system, (2) 10.1% earned a bachelor degree from
undergraduate institutions in the University of Houston system, (3) 7.4% earned a bachelor degree from undergraduate institutions in the Texas A&M system, and (4) 7.8% earned a bachelor degree from the remaining undergraduate institutions in Texas. When these percentages were combined, the findings indicated that 42.5% of the African-American respondents attending Texas law schools earned a bachelor degree from an undergraduate institution in Texas as shown in Figure 133.

Figure 133. The Undergraduate Institutions of all Texas Law School Respondents

Influencers in the College Choice Process of African-American Law Students in Texas

Question Number Eight

The eighth research question inquired about who helps prospective African-American law students in the college choice process, such as parents, peers, family members, close friends, mentors, etc.? Therefore, respondents were asked two survey questions. First, respondents were asked survey question nineteen: Who had a major influence on your law school selection process? Second, respondents were asked in
survey question twenty to: *Please elaborate on how the individual(s) affected your law school selection process.*

**Method**

In order to answer the two survey questions, frequency distributions were used to determine the number of African-American law students who had responded to the question. Of the 299 respondents, there were 297 who chose to answer the questions. Cross-tabulations were used to determine the level of significance between the type of respondents and influence. Based on the cross-tabulations, it was determined that when respondents were categorized into groups by income instead of type of law school, a significance level of .043 was generated from the data. As stated previously, results with an $\alpha$ value less than .05 were considered statistically significant (George & Mallery, 2005). Results with an $\alpha$ value between .05 and .10 were considered marginally significant (George & Mallery, 2005). The income of respondents was grouped into three categories (1) under $10,000, (2) $10,001-$35,000, and (3) more than $35,001. Additionally, qualitative statistics were used to identify general themes that occurred in the second survey question regarding how the individual(s) had an influence on the law school selection process.

**Income, Influencers and the Law School Choice Process**

In the study, it was determined that African-American law school respondents who earned under $10,000 were influenced the most by no one. In fact, 51.2% of the respondents stated that the final decision of which law school to attend was made by self. Moreover, respondents (36.2%) indicated that family and friends were the second strongest influencers in the law school choice process. African-American law school
respondents (42.3%) who earned from $10,001-$35,000 also responded that no one influenced the law school choice process. Similar to respondents who earned under $10,000, law school respondents (35.9%) reported that family and friends were the second strongest influencer in the law school choice process. Respondents (11.5%) further indicated that professors/mentors had some influence on the law school choice process as shown in Figure 134.

The primary influencer on the law school choice of African-American respondents who earned more than $35,001 was also themselves. Likewise, respondents (31.5%) indicated that family and friends were the second strongest influencers in the law school choice process. For these respondents (3.3%) professors/mentors had the least influence on the law school choice process. The overall results of African-American law school respondents and the individuals who influenced the law school choice process are shown in Figure 134.

![Figure 134. Influence on the Law School Choice Process of African-American Law School Respondents in Texas by Income](image-url)
In survey question twenty, respondents were further asked to: *Please elaborate on how the individual(s) affected your law school selection process.* Although survey question nineteen was reported through percentages, survey question twenty was reported as *verbatim* transcriptions of the respondents’ actual answers. In order to protect the identity of the respondent and the law school, the owner of the response will be identified as law school respondent (LSR). Moreover, the responses will be based on general themes that were identified in survey question nineteen, such as how parents influenced the law school choice process. The law school respondents who replied “N/A” because no one had an influence on the law school choice process will not be reported in the overall responses. The responses will be categorized by influencers as follows: (1) family and friends, (2) professor/mentor, (3) self, and (4) other.

*Family and friends.* The responses of African-American law students in Texas regarding the law school choice process and family and friends were as follows:

Spouse and other family members - I wanted to attend a school in which my family was just as comfortable with me attending as I was in attending a particular university. [LSR]

My parents gave the motivation and encouragement to follow my dreams. [LSR]

My brother helped me analyze the different schools. [LSR]

Good friends and graduates of ______ - This place is rich in history and placed here specifically because society thought because of ……, I was not qualified for this position (lawyer). [LSR]

My parents, spouse, and professor was very influential in my decision to attend law school and the selection process. They helped me collect the data on each school and analyze the positives and negatives of each school including affordability. [LSR]

Friends - I have a friend who is an attorney that graduated from this school. He is very successful. [LRS]
My friends were very influential in helping me determining a law school. [LSR]

Spouse - I'm in a mixed race marriage and wanted to attend a school with a diverse faculty and student body. [LSR]

My parents encouraged me to further my education in order to have a more fulfilling profession and a more monetarily stable future. [LSR]

My mother and wife have been very encouraging with my wish to attend law school and become a lawyer. [LSR]

Parents - Father and brother are both attorneys. [LSR]

Other family members - They helped me make the choice of which law school to attend. [LSR]

My parents consistently gave me encouragement. [LSR]

My spouse was very supportive of me attending law school. [LSR]

Friends - Where I come from, going to law school was unattainable because it was thought that you needed to come from "money". My best friend disproved that fact because now he is a lawyer, running his own firm, making millions. I observed this, and being a lawyer is a reachable dream. [LSR]

Other family members - My decision to attend law school at _____________ was based on the schools that had accepted me with a focus on any funds provided (i.e., scholarships and grants) by the school. Its distance from my hometown and the schools reputation of producing good lawyers also played a major role in my decision of which law school to attend. [LSR]

Parents and other family members - In choosing a law school, I looked at how close I would be to my parents and other family members. My parents also helped me by analyzing tuition costs. [LSR]

Spouse - My mother-in-law graduated from ______ law school. [LSR]

My parents provided encouragement, as well as emotional and financial support. [LSR]

My parents wanted me to surround myself with a diverse learning environment. [LSR]

Both of my parents attended law school and they helped me decide what I needed in the program I chose. [LSR]

Spouse - She wanted to move to Houston. [LSR]

My spouse was able to transfer his employment to Houston. [LSR]
My parents are my inspiration and support. [LSR]

My parents are providing me with financial support while I attend law school. [LSR]

My parents played a very important role in helping me select a law school. [LSR]

My father was an attorney up until he passed away in 1984. My parents met at Howard Law School in Washington, D.C. My mentor is also an attorney who is a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania Law School. [LSR]

Friends and other family members - Each of the individuals would state that I had potential for being a lawyer. [LSR]

Parents – they are both attorneys. [LSR]

Parents – It has always been a dream of mine to become a lawyer. [LSR]

My parents both have graduate/doctorate degrees and stressed the importance of graduate education in our home. [LSR]

My parents supported me every step of the way. [LSR]

My spouse did not say no to my choice in law schools and encouraged me to enroll. [LSR]

My parents have always been strong supporters of my educational goals. [LSR]

I had a lot of friends that were in law school and they recommended to me. [LSR]

I needed to be in a major metropolitan area so that my wife could find employment and she had things to do socially. [LSR]

Friends encouraged me to apply because they were admitted to the college. [LSR]

Was in a long term relationship. Chose to stay close to his business. We are no longer together. [LSR]

My spouse’s employer relocated us to DFW, which pretty much limited my choices. [LSR]

My parents felt that it was best for me to be closer to home. [LSR]

Co-workers told me specifically about classes, tuition, and fees for different institutions. [LSR]

My friends! They attended _________ and suggested the school to me. [LSR]
My spouse was able to find a job and I couldn’t be too far from my parents. [LSR]

I was out of the country at the time I received my acceptance letters. My parents helped me choose which school based on information about financial aid. [LSR]

My uncle allowed me to work at the Public Defenders Office during the summer. This experience affected my decision to attend law school. [LSR]

My uncle who was a professor at _____________ School of Law. [LSR]

My spouse provides encouragement and financial support. [LSR]

My mom, dad, grandmother and uncle played a major role in helping me select a law school. They encouraged me to pick the best option for the most money. [LSR]

My parents were very supportive. [LSR]

My dad and sister are lawyers. [LSR]

My husband and I are both first year law students, so we wanted to go to the same school. [LSR]

My uncle and cousin both attended _______________. [LSR]

I selected my law schools based on location in Texas. I wanted to stay close to my family and girlfriend. [LSR]

My dad is a lawyer and my brother just went to law school last year. [LSR]

My spouse was open to moving to anywhere in the U.S. so that I could pursue my dream. [LSR]

My father has been politically active my entire life and I’ve been exposed to law, politicians and judges, which in turn peaked my interest. [LSR]

I have friends and family that are lawyers. [LSR]

I have friends who are in other law schools and I took their advice on school selection in terms of prestige and reputation. [LSR]

My mother really brought up learning the state and going to Houston because it was time for a change from Louisiana. She also explained that I wouldn’t be far away from home, but far enough as to where I could grow as an individual. [LSR]

My parents discouraged me from waiting for more schools after acceptance. [LSR]
My parents were proponents of higher education, entrepreneurs and community involvement. I saw law school as an opportunity to do all three. [LSR]

After completion of my undergraduate studies, I had no idea about what I wanted to do for the next year or the rest of my life. I spoke with my parents and numerous relatives about what I should do. They directed me towards law school based on my personal qualities and goals. [LSR]

I wanted to go to school in Houston. My parents helped me weigh the pros and cons of going to school in a big city, getting caught in traffic and driving long distances to and from school as opposed to living right across the street from the school in a community I am familiar with. So, I decided it would be best to stay here. [LSR]

My parents help me select ___________ because of location and because it is close to home. [LSR]

My mom played a very intricate role in my selection. She would help me weigh which school I should go to and which ones to apply to. We searched the area. She was very involved in my final outcome. [LSR]

When I was getting ready to leave school, I talked to fellow students from my school and other universities about opportunities in the law industry. Through those talks, I decided to pursue a law career. [LSR]

Everyone in my family wanted me to come back to Texas for law school. [LSR]

My mother and uncle were adamant that law school is necessary in order for a person to protect her interests in life and business. The legal profession also tends to pay well and provide a wealth of opportunities for challenging employment. Other family members also had an influence in my law school selection process. [LSR]

My parents influenced me because they partially pay for my education. If I wanted to go to a more expensive school, I wouldn’t be able to because they would not be able to afford it. [LSR]

Parents, friends and family. Friends helped support my decision, parents supported me with financial support, and family friends encouraged me on what schools to apply to. [LSR]

My father and family encouraged me to go to law school in the state that I would like to eventually practice law. Consequently, I chose _______. [LSR]

They gave me advice on the pros and cons of in-state schools versus out-of-state. [LSR]

I did not want to leave Texas and go too far from my family (parents). [LSR]
My dad encouraged me to accept the best financial aid offer. My professors encouraged me to go to the best law school possible. [LSR]

My parents, other family members and co-workers affected my law school selection process. They helped me with researching the different law schools. [LSR]

Friends and other family members. My friend finished medical school and my brother is finishing his doctorate in psychology. This inspired me to obtain my law degree. [LSR]

Parents – I wanted to be at a school in the same state as my parents reside in. [LSR]

My dad is a lawyer and I have talked to him about the legal field. I have been told by professors that I have a gift for things in the legal field also. [LSR]

I talked to my parents about whether or not I should attend law school and about which school I should go to. [LSR]

Everyone in my family has a post-graduate degree. [LSR]

My cousin had an English degree and wanted to go to law school. I didn’t want to be a teacher, so I prayed about it and the Lord led me here. [LSR]

Professor and/or mentor. The responses of African-American law students regarding the law school choice process and professors/mentors were as follows:

Mentor encouraged me, said I had potential intellectually for legal analysis. I was also self-motivated. [LSR]

Mentor and son - My elementary teacher who is a mentor to me instilled values and the will to go after my goals. She also helped me strengthen my self-esteem. [LSR]

Professor - We broke down the negatives and positives of each school and made a decision based on that. [LSR]

My mentor provided encouragement. [LSR]

I had several mentors who were attorneys. They positively impacted my life. I aspire to become like them and I hope to inspire others to do the same. [LSR]

A Black female professor who spoke at an open house that I attended impressed me. [LSR]
I took a Social Work & Law course at the University of _______ of Social Work. Professor ________ was very influential in my decision to attend law school. [LSR]

My mentor helped me very much, but circumstances prevented me from going to my first choice school. [LSR]

Encouraged me my senior year of undergraduate to attend law school. The professor wrote a letter of recommendation. [LSR]

My undergrad professor graduated from __________. [LSR]

My mentor provided encouragement. [LSR]

Professor – an alumni of ____ encouraged recommendation to attend the school. [LSR]

My professor helped me evaluate my law school criteria and select schools in my LSAT range that fit my law school profile. [LSR]

I was advised by a professor who taught undergrad at the University of Houston, and who was very knowledgeable about the qualities of this school. [LSR]

Self: The responses of African-American law students regarding the law school choice decision and self were as follows:

No one - I retrieved the reputation background and input about the overall atmosphere of each institution by myself. [LSR]

No one - I always wanted to go to law school. I was never influenced by anyone but myself. [LSR]

No one - I researched the schools and applied to the ones I felt would accept me. I selected ______ because it was in Texas and inexpensive. [LSR]

The decision was my own. I love the school. [LSR]

No other individuals affected my law school selection process. [LSR]

No one had a major influence. I just wanted to live in a different city. [LSR]

It was my own choice to enter law school. [LSR]

Because I live in Houston and work full-time, my options were limited to the two part-time programs in the area. [LSR]
Lack of contentment in my job! Law school has always been a dream of mine and since I was not satisfied with my current job this seemed like a good opportunity. [LSR]

No one had an influence on my decision. [LSR]

I made the decision based on cost. [LSR]

Process of elimination, guidance, what factors to consider when choosing a school; financial aid, reputation and specialization. [LSR]

I don’t know anyone or anything about the law schools. I was more concerned with location because I could not move. [LSR]

I selected _______________ because of location and price. [LSR]

As a part of my research into various schools, I visited schools where I applied or was very interested in applying to. This assisted me in getting a true feel for the respective schools. Interaction with school representatives either heightened or diminished my interest in a particular school. The representative at ________ (Dean ________) obviously heightened my interest, as I went on to apply to and visit the school. [LSR]

I decided I was going to be a lawyer when I was 8 and 22 years later I’m making that happen. [LSR]

[I] Clarified what the schools had to offer and what would be the best fit for me. [LSR]

Researching and comparing different schools for me. [LSR]

I personally performed my own research on the schools in which I was interested in attending and chose the __________ based on school rank, location, scholarships awarded and how I was treated on my visit. [LSR]

Other. The responses of African-American law school respondents and the law school choice process regarding the influence of others were as follows:

Lawyer that represents the patients & my job. [LSR]

I put my faith in the Lord. [LSR]

I was accepted at several schools and God told me to choose _________ School of Law.

They were attorney’s practicing in Houston. [LSR]
They are lawyers and they pressured me to go through with law school. [LSR]

My life is directed by prayer and faith. I hold my school in higher esteem; however, I follow direction of the Holy Spirit and feel this is where I should be. I got accepted at every school I applied to including the ________ and _________. I’m pleased with ____________ School of Law. [LSR]

Much faith and prayer and reliance on Him. [LSR]

I am relatively local to this school. I was accepted to Howard, SUNY-Buffalo, [University of] Penn, Hofstra, etc. But they asked me to stay locally and I agreed. [LSR]

Open-Ended Questions for Law School Respondents

Question Number Seven

The seventh question inquired about African-American students’ perceptions of the different recruiting strategies of Texas law schools. Therefore, African-American law school respondents were asked two survey questions. Survey question twenty-one asked respondents: What are your perceptions of the minority recruiting strategies of the law school you have chosen to attend in relation to African-American students? Likewise, survey question twenty-two asked respondents: What suggestion(s) do you have for the law school you have chosen to attend in regards to their recruiting strategies of minority students, specifically African-American students?

African-American Law School Respondents’ Responses to Survey Question Twenty-One

Seven themes emerged based on the responses of African-American law students. First, African-American law school respondents indicated that Texas law schools’ recruiting strategies were non-existent. Second, respondents stated that although Texas law school administrators were trying hard to recruit African-American students, they needed to try harder. Third, law school respondents indicated that Texas law schools’
recruiting strategies of African-American students were best described as adequate, okay, good, excellent, and/or effective. Fourth, respondents stated that they were unfamiliar with Texas law schools’ recruiting strategies of African-American students. Fifth, law school respondents indicated that Texas law schools’ recruiting strategies of African-American students needed to be more aggressive. Seventh, respondents stated that Texas law schools’ recruiting strategies of African-American students were insincere and did not reach out to Blacks.

*Texas law schools’ recruiting strategies were non-existent.* Law school respondents’ comments regarding the non-existence of recruiting strategies for African-Americans in Texas law schools were as follows:

They were non-existent as far as I was concerned. [LSR]

Non-apparent! [LSR]

There are none. [LSR]

I haven’t noticed any minority recruiting strategies. [LSR]

I think that __________ is not doing much to recruit African-American students …. [LSR]

___________ recruiting strategies for African-Americans are non-existent. [LSR]

I believe the recruiting strategies of African-Americans at _______________ are non-existent. [LSR]

I didn't observe the law school's recruiting strategies, if any. [LSR]

I don't think __________ has recruiting strategies specifically for African-Americans, at least, not in my opinion. [LSR]

I don't think any special steps are taken to recruit African-Americans since _______________ is an _______________. [LSR]

The recruiting efforts were minimal. In fact, I’m unclear as to what strategies they really use in regards to recruiting African-American students. [LSR]
The recruitment is not heavy and no aid seems to be offered. [LSR]

I didn’t know they existed. [LSR]

Actually I wasn’t aware that a minority recruiting strategy existed here at ______ for African-American students. [LSR]

I believe there is a great disparity between African Americans in law school we make up less than 10% of the law school student population. [LSR]

Lots of Black faces in the printed materials, but few on campus. No Black Alumni assistance with recruitment. [LSR]

There weren’t any. I didn’t know about any recruiting. [LSR]

They are basically non-existent. Except for the small diversity scholarship I received, I have no other relationship with the school I attend. [LSR]

They really did not have any minority recruitment efforts. I came to ______ because they offered me a dean’s scholarship and because I favored their geographic location. [LSR]

I don’t know that they have a strategy. They admit blacks but don’t seem to do much to get them to come. There seems to be a lot of reliance on the current black students on getting admitted students to come but they can’t offer them scholarships so I’m not much help. [LSR]

I don’t think they actively recruit minorities. [LSR]

I don’t think they really recruit Black students – not more than other students. [LSR]

I think that there were not many strategies used by the law school in an attempt to attract more African-American students. [LSR]

I don’t feel that the recruitment tactics are strong. ______ was more active than the law school itself. [LSR]

My perception of the minority recruiting strategies at ______ in relation to African-American students is that they are not very active at all. [LSR]

*Texas law schools were trying hard to recruit African-American students, but they needed to try harder.* Law school respondents’ comments regarding how Texas law schools needed to try harder to recruit African-American students were as follows:
They are trying very hard, but losing blacks to other schools. [LSR]

I perceive that the law school is not actively pursuing minorities and they are under represented in the law school. [LSR]

They’re trying but may not be putting enough money into marketing to black students. [LSR]

The "majority white" schools only select African-Americans who have a specific GPA, background, household income, etc. My school seems to accept more minorities, but unfortunately chooses some who they know will not return. [LSR]

Not good enough. In our class, only 21 of the 67 law students are African-American. [LSR]

There is so much in my mind about this experience that I don’t know where to start. I must say that I have met some wonderful people here. During orientation, I conversed with a woman who said she always though law school was beyond her reach. Once she had children, she realized she had to reach for this goal because she wanted to teach her children to reach for what seems unreachable in their own lives. Many people have wonderful stories about how they came to this place, and as a (somewhat) older student, I have found _____________ to be most accommodating to their efforts to make a law education accessible without compromising the quality of education. They are genuinely interested in helping us succeed. At orientation, the academic support director, made it very clear that they were there to help. I must admit that I am disappointed with the very low number of black and Hispanic men (and women for that matter) at the law school. I’m sure the recruitment office is working to increase these numbers, but looking at the photos of previous classes, it seems that the numbers of “minority” students have dwindled over the years. Most people say that this happens when a school raises their standards, but I’m a firm believer that there are always good “minorities” to recruit. [LSR]

________ is an active minority recruiter, but it is difficult to draw minorities into the __________ area because of the geography … and the size of the city (smaller than Houston, Dallas, Austin, etc). [LSR]

The law school makes a conscience effort to recruit minority law students, but it is somewhat difficult to attract minorities to __________. [LSR]

[There is a] very strong effort in increasing effective strategies. The numbers are still not where we would like them to be. [LSR]

I think that they are trying to recruit African-Americans, but they could do a lot more. The percentage of African-Americans at this school speaks for itself. [LSR]
Not as good as it can be. The school needs to give more minority scholarships to minorities, especially African-Americans. [LSR]

They have an open house, but more could be done. [LSR]

I think ___________ needed to improve their recruiting strategies of minorities and African-American students. [LSR]

I think all law schools, majority institutions especially, can and should do a better job of recruiting. [LSR]

Our school is a gem that not too many people have found out about. _______ needs to step up their recruiting. [LSR]

It appears that a greater effort is currently being made to improve the school’s numbers. [LSR]

[They are] dedicated to recruiting minorities but low number of enrolled African-American students. [LSR]

I think _______ tries to get the word out to prospective African-American law students, but very few are actually interested in moving to _______. Furthermore, the students may feel that their numbers just don’t add up (i.e., LSAT and GPA). [LSR]

The strategies are effective but seem like they could be improved. [LSR]

I feel based on just the class, the university did a good job of recruiting African-American students from other HBCUs, but coming from a small university I did not feel they recruited in my area. [LSR]

I think they recruit well for minorities, but they could do better in recruiting African-Americans specifically. [LSR]

_Texas law schools’ recruiting strategies of African-American students were best described as adequate, okay, good, excellent and/or effective._ Law schools respondents’ comments regarding the effectiveness of Texas law schools’ recruiting strategies of African-American students were as follows:

Effective! [LSR]
The law school is making a valiant attempt at recruiting minority students. I think the strategies are good. I received a phone call from an African-American law student the day after I received my acceptance letter. [LSR]

I think __________ recruiting strategies of African-Americans are good. [LSR]
__________ recruiting strategies of African-American students are great. [LSR]
______ recruiting strategies for African-American students are excellent. [LSR]
I like that the school shows a more "family" aspect as opposed to a competitive arena. [LSR]

The law school actively recruits minority students, especially African-Americans and takes pride in being one of the most diverse law schools in the nation. [LSR]

Superb! This is the House that determination built. [LSR]

__________ does an okay job of recruiting African-American students. [LSR]
__________ does a good job in recruiting African-American students. [LSR]
They seemed really active in recruiting qualified African-American students. [LSR]
________________ recruiting strategies are good. [LSR]

Obviously, ____________ is one of the best schools at recruiting minorities, especially African-Americans to their law school. They strive to uphold this diversity as they also strive to make the school better. [LSR]

Its effort is great. The school is very diverse. [LSR]

My law school is extremely racially diverse, being an …. [LSR]

I think ______________ recruiting strategies for African-American students and minorities in general are excellent, as evident by their reputation and progress. [LSR]

I feel the recruitment efforts of ____________ in relation to African-American students are adequate. [LSR]

I think ________ recruiting strategies are good. [LSR]

Good recruitment program. The numbers (diversity) speak for themselves. [LSR]

They do an excellent job of recruiting a diverse student body, especially African-American students. It helps that ____________ is an ________. [LSR]
________ does a good job of recruiting not only African-American students, but also students of other ethnicities. We have a very diverse class. [LSR]

I believe the school has done an excellent job of recruiting African-American students and promoting diversity. [LSR]

My perceptions of ______ minority recruiting strategies is that they recruit African-Americans, primarily, as well as people who have low LSAT scores, but high grade point averages. [LSR]

I think that the minority recruiting strategies of ______ is excellent. [LSR]

I think _____ does a good job of recruiting African-American students. [LSR]

I think the recruiting strategies of _____ are fine. We definitely need more minority attorneys. [LSR]

______ makes a point to recruit at HBCUS as well as predominantly white schools. The focus is to provide an excellent legal education to those who might otherwise not have been afforded the opportunity to do so. [LSR]

I think ______ minority recruiting strategies are wonderful. [LSR]

______ does an extremely good job of attracting minority students, specifically African-American students. They take into account more than just a high LSAT score. They understand that standardized tests can be discriminating. [LSR]

______ does a very good job of recruiting minority students in general, and African-American students, specifically. ______ is a very diverse campus. [LSR]

______ does a good job of recruiting African-American students. [LSR]

In my opinion, ______ doesn't need a recruiting strategy for minorities or African-Americans specifically because they are an ________. Minorities naturally come to this school. [LSR]

I think ____________ does an excellent job of recruiting African-American students. [LSR]

I believe that ________ makes a great effort to reach out to the African-American community. I do however feel that the school sometimes extends its generosity too far. Many majority students use ____________ as a platform; take its valuable knowledge, and carry-on elsewhere (such as transfer). [LSR]

I believe that ________ is very diverse in their selection process. There are many different cultures and races that attend __________, which is not the norm in the law schools in America. [LSR]
I think their recruiting strategies for African-American students are wonderful and effective. [LSR]

_________ has always done a good job of recruiting minorities, especially African-Americans. [LSR]

I think ________ minority recruiting strategies actively seek out African-American students. [LSR]

In my opinion, ________ minority recruiting strategies are wonderful. [LSR]

I think ________ recruiting strategies are quite successful. In fact, we graduate the most minority, specifically African-American, lawyers at least in the state of Texas. [LSR]

I believe my school (__________) does an excellent job of recruiting minorities, especially African-Americans. It is definitely the most diverse law school in the country and of my educational experience. [LSR]

I feel that ________ extends minorities, specifically African-Americans, more scholarship opportunities during the recruiting process. [LSR]

_________ does a good job of recruiting African-American students, but it's also .... [LSR]

I think the recruiting strategies regarding African-American students are moderate considering that the law school (__________) started admitting more Whites and Hispanics. ________ School of Law should not be less than 60% Black. [LSR]

Well, as an African-American student at a __________ law school, it seems that the "minority" recruitment here is more targeted at Hispanic and white students, which I think are great. [LSR]

The school (______________) gives everyone an equal chance to get in. [LSR]

In my opinion, (______________) makes a decent effort to recruit African-American students. [LSR]

The school I attend is a very diverse school that does not only include African-Americans, but also Hispanics and Asians. [LSR]

My perception is that the strategy is to foster a "truly" diverse and competent student body. [LSR]

Being an African-American myself makes me perceive ______ as a very diverse school that prides itself by not only choosing minorities, but people of all races/ethnicities. I feel they try to heavily recruit more non-African-Americans to keep diversity. [LSR]
I believe _______________ recruiting strategies of minorities, specifically African-American students, are extremely sufficient. [LSR]

I have a high (good) perception of ___________ recruiting strategies for African-Americans as evident by the large population of students. [LSR]

I believe ___________ minority recruiting strategies are excellent, especially regarding African-Americans. [LSR]

I believe that _____________ does a good job of recruiting African-American students. They prefer minorities because they actively seek to give minorities' opportunities. [LSR]

I think this school is ranked #1 for promoting and indulging in a diversified legal education. [LSR]

I think it is fair. [LSR]

They were very effective. [LSR]

I find the school to be receptive to the unique needs of African-American students, while making it clear that once accepted there is no preference. [LSR]

I felt that they were fair, welcoming, and helpful. I never felt alienated or that I was missing something during the admissions process. [LSR]

When I came here, I did not feel that I was here because Tech had to enroll a certain number of African-American students. That was a big deal to me because you never want to go where you do not feel like you are wanted. One of the deans was very helpful and very honest about my true chances of getting into school. [LSR]

I thought that the recruiting strategies afforded to me were very good personally, but on a public level, I didn’t hear much in the way of recruiting for Black students as a whole. [LSR]

I’m not aware of everything ______ does, but I do not think the recruiting strategies are strong or easily apparent. There was always someone that I could email to get a question answered, and I was paired with an African American Student for preview days and to answer my questions, but other than that there weren’t any. [LSR]

I actually thought that ________ used great recruiting strategies. They were active and they got everyone involved. Whether it was true or not, I really felt as though they thought I would be an asset to the school. [LSR]

I think _______ does a good job, especially because of the ________ (__________) banquet and the fact that we have _________ and _________ in the
Admissions Office. I think it makes students more comfortable to see minorities in positions of power in the Admissions Office. [LSR]

I think that by having prospective students weekend during the weekend of the Texas … is a great strategy. I also think the ______ (__________) is a huge recruiting tool. [LSR]

It’s okay. I did receive a number of letters from _____ (_________________) and the Admissions Counselor made herself available to me. [LSR]

There are good efforts to recruit African-American students and what worked best for me was having actual African-American students talk to me before I decided to come to ______ Law school. They made me feel welcomed. [LSR]

______ relies on their minority students to recruit other minority students. [LSR]

I think they do a fairly decent job of recruiting students to come to ______. [LSR]

I think the strategies are okay. I think the strategies could target a broader group of African-American students. [LSR]

I appreciate ________ efforts at minority recruitment. _______ flew me out for prospective [students’] weekend (something that I otherwise could not have done), had a ______ banquet for prospective students during “Prospective [students’] Weekend,” and ______ members allowed us to stay at their homes. [LSR]

I think ______ does a good job of recruiting students after they have been accepted. I don’t really know about their recruiting strategies of students who have not been accepted. [LSR]

I felt the law school had very good recruiting techniques. Of all the law schools I visited, this one seemed to have the most minorities. [LSR]

Good strategies! [LSR]

I feel that they targeted minorities during their recruiting process. [LSR]

While they are an _______ and do a good job of recruiting African-American students; I think they are focusing more on reaching out to other minority students to get a more diverse student body, which is good in my opinion. [LSR]

I think the school does exceptionally well at recruiting minority students, especially African-American students. [LSR]

In my opinion, they pursue all minorities heavily. [LSR]
Their recruiting strategy makes it easier to get admitted. [LSR]

In my opinion, ____________ recruiting strategies for African-American students are very active and effective. [LSR]

__________ recruiting of African-American students is strong and aggressive. [LSR]

I think its okay. [LSR]

It’s good. [LSR]

I think their recruiting strategies are effective. I wanted to be around more blacks, but I’m starting to regret that choice. {LSR]

Excellent – most diverse law school. [LSR]

The school does a great job. [LSR]

I think they do a good job. [LSR]

Good job, we are #1. [LSR]

I think their recruiting strategies for African-American students are wonderful and effective. [LSR]

They are vigorous about recruiting and catering to minorities especially African-Americans. [LSR]

They do a decent job of recruiting African-American students, as evident by our class make-up of students. [LSR]

The university is very diverse, so I would conclude that the recruiting strategies are effective. [LSR]

The school has done a reasonable job of recruiting African-American students. [LSR]

__________ recruiting strategies are okay. [LSR]

*We were unfamiliar with Texas law schools’ recruiting strategies of African-American students.* Law school respondents’ comments on how they were unfamiliar with their institution’s recruiting strategies for African-American students were as follows:

I don’t know much about ______________ recruiting strategies. [LSR]
I'm not sure about the minority recruiting strategies of _________. However, I'm inclined to think that they are acceptable because they enroll quite a few African-American students. [LSR]

I am unfamiliar with __________ recruiting strategies. [LSR]

I did not participate in recruitment activities. [LSR]

Unknown! [LSR]

I was not recruited. I was unaware until I actually came here that minority students were recruited. [LSR]

I have not witnessed recruiting strategies geared toward minority students. [LSR]

There was none to my knowledge, but the school does not recruit on my campus. I researched them about their school. [LSR]

Based upon my first impression (at a forum), all students who sought information were entertained equally. I felt I was treated well in respect to the attention I was given and the time it took to answer all of my questions. On the other hand, I had little information on ________ prior to visiting the booth at the forum. [LSR]

I have no perceptions of the minority recruiting strategies other than to say I have not been privy to them if we have them at the ________. I did not feel that there was anything geared to me because I was a minority while recruiting and quite frankly, I don’t know it would have persuaded me different if the selling strategy was more focused than the one given to the average student. [LSR]

I did not participate in the minority recruiting strategies used by the _______. [LSR]

I did not really experience any recruitment strategies prior to applying, so unless I was from Texas I would have not have considered this school. [LSR]

I’m not sure nor am I aware of the school’s strategy because I was not recruited by _________ law school. [LSR]

I have no perceptions of ______ recruiting strategies for African-Americans. [LSR]

I really haven’t perceived any minority recruiting strategies. [LSR]

I was not aware of any. [LSR]

I don’t know much about it. [LSR]

I don’t have any perceptions. [LSR]
I am unable to answer this as I do not know enough regarding recruiting. I am attending this institution because of a retraction of acceptance from ________. I applied a few weeks prior to classes. [LSR]

Texas law schools’ recruiting strategies of African-American students need to be more aggressive. Law school respondents’ comments about how Texas law schools need to be more aggressive in recruiting African-American students were as follows:

I think that it should be more aggressive. There are only 2 full-time and about 6 part-time African-American students in the incoming class. I never observed any efforts by the recruiters that directly advertised to the African-American community. [LSR]

Not aggressive enough. [LSR]

I was not recruited. I chose this law school because it was one of the four ________ law schools.

I noticed that there are a decreasing number of African-American students being admitted to the law school and that they are increasing the number of Hispanic and Caucasian students being granted admission. [LSR]

___________ needs to be more proactive around the country in recruiting minorities, specifically African-American students. The school has a good legacy which needs to be sold. [LSR]

Typical, but not aggressive! [LSR]

It is very weak. I don’t think a valid effort has been made as far as recruiting is concerned. [LSR]

Not very aggressive. [LSR]

Long way to go. We need more understanding of why law is important to the African-American community and the role it played in our struggle. [LSR]

I think ________________ recruiting strategies of African-American students is limited. [LSR]

Texas law schools’ recruiting strategies of African-American students were insincere and did not reach out to Blacks. Law school respondents’ comments about the
insincerity and indifference of Texas law schools’ recruiting strategies regarding Blacks were as follows:

Based on my experience the recruiters were insincere, no one wants to feel as though the only reason they are wanted is based on their color—to decorate the classrooms and help create a mirage of diversity. [LSR]

I feel that they do not take the time to reach out to blacks. [LSR]

I think ____________ recruiting strategies regarding African-Americans are indifferent. [LSR]

I believe the law school (__________) focuses more on recruiting other minority groups than African-Americans. I believe African-Americans are still in the selection process because that was the school’s …. I think this is evident because African-Americans are only 50% of the population at ________ and this group is steadily decreasing. [LSR]

The school is ____________ African-American; as such their recruitment strategies of African-American students are not as obvious as their recruitment strategies of "non-minority" students, which is for the sake of diversity. [LSR]

I believe that they are a priority and other minority students are admitted only to diversify the academic atmosphere, but are not a significant factor to the law school. [LSR]

I don’t feel that they did anything special to recruit me. [LSR]

They do not make it a priority to recruit quality African-American students. I think they are comfortable with low diversity. [LSR]

I was not a favorable impression. Law schools focus on minority does not mean African Americans. [LSR]

There was nothing really that suggested that there was an expressed outreach to African-Americans. Of course, the door was obviously not shut in our faces either. [LSR]

Recruiting is largely left to the black students and not a priority for the law school, aside from paying for students to come and visit. [LSR]

They are geared mostly toward those African-American students that have already been accepted. It doesn’t (didn’t) seem to be much done in increasing African-American students’ interested in the school, especially those that might have wanted to apply. [LSR]
I don’t think this school does a great job of recruiting minorities. It does not seem to be a priority. [LSR]

My perception of ___________ recruiting strategies of African-American students is not good. [LSR]

In my opinion, the school is more concerned with diversity than recruiting African-American students. [LSR]

In addition to African-Americans, they need to work on all of their recruiting strategies. I attended an HBCU and yes __________ came to our school, but the assumption was that because we were African-American we didn’t need the song and dance. The recruiter spent most of his time with students that were not African-American. [LSR]

I feel that the law school uses the same recruiting strategies for all groups. I have seen no difference. [LSR]

I personally believe that it is little to none due to the fact that the law school is on the campus of a …, so African-Americans should want to come. [LSR]

*African-American Law School Respondents’ Suggestions to Texas Law Schools’ Recruiting Strategies*

Survey question twenty-two asked African-American law school respondents:

*What suggestions do you have for the law school you have chosen to attend in regards to their recruiting strategies of minority students, specifically African-American students?*

Seven themes emerged from the responses of African-American law students who participated in the survey. First, it was suggested that Texas law school administrators aggressively recruit at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). Second, law school respondents suggested that Texas law schools offer more scholarships to minority students. Third, African-American law school respondents suggested that Texas law schools enlist current African-American law students as recruiters. Fourth, it was suggested that Texas law schools maintain an environment that embraces ethnic diversity. Fifth, law school respondents suggested that Texas law schools maintain contact with African-American alumni to assist in the recruitment of African-American students.
Sixth, African-American law school respondents suggested that Texas law schools
develop a relationship with LSAC, CLEO, high schools, undergraduate institutions, and
undergraduate Black organizations through liaisons. Finally, law school respondents
suggested that Texas law schools strongly encourage minority students to visit the law
school by providing financial assistance. The responses of African-American law school
respondents are shown in the next seven sections.

   *Texas law school administrators need to aggressively recruit from HBCUs.*

African-American respondents’ comments regarding the idea of Texas law schools
recruiting aggressively from HBCUs were as follows:

- Recruit from HBCUs. [LSR]
- Aggressively recruit at HBCUs. [LSR]
- They should consider recruiting more from HBCUs. [LSR]
- Recruit from HBCU because it seems like many of us are from predominantly
  white undergraduate universities. [LSR]
- Widen the pool of schools that you go to. Go to predominantly white schools and
  focus recruitment of Blacks there as well as HBCUs. [LSR]
- To try to recruit at school with higher percentages of African-Americans, like
  HBCUs. [LSR]

   *Texas law schools need to offer more minority scholarships.* Law school
respondents’ comments regarding the suggestion that Texas law schools offer more
scholarships to African-American students were as follows:

- Offer scholarships! [LSR]
- I feel that a campaign that is specific to the interest and needs of African-
  Americans should be devised. There should be more scholarships and grants that
  are directed to African-American students. [LSR]
Generally, the key is to employ effective recruitment and outreach efforts and to fund scholarships. (I worked in various recruitment offices at _______. I’ve seen money talk!). [LSR]

Offer minority scholarships and fee waivers. [LSR]

Stop relying on the fact that you are a ________ and actively recruit African-American students that are qualified and have earned scholarships.

Give more minority scholarships. [LSR]

MORE MONEY! - African-Americans consistently find it difficult to pay for law school, so more scholarship funding would be great! [LSR]

Give more academic based scholarships (full and partial). [LSR]

They should offer more scholarship/financial aid opportunities for disadvantaged students. [LSR]

They should provide the same scholarship opportunities that are offered by historically black law schools. [LSR]

Qualified minorities should receive scholarships. [LSR]

I suggest that they offer more scholarships to African students. [LSR]

I think they need to provide more scholarships to African-Americans and offer application fee waivers. [LSR]

More scholarships! [LSR]

_______ needs to offer more scholarships. [LSR]

Black students who get good grades are used to getting scholarships. I was shocked that I have to pay for school. Seeking a specific endowment for scholarships for black students, that involves real money not just a token amount that will cover no more than books, will probably go a long way. [LSR]

Realize recruiting African Americans is not diluting the quality of your school and saying you don’t have the money is a cop out. [LSR]

If anyway possible, can they reach out to people of color because I had no idea and possibly having a minority scholarship? [LSR]

Offer more scholarship money to African-American students. [LSR]

I think they should offer more scholarships. [LSR]

Increasing scholarship offers to well-qualified black undergrads. [LSR]
Texas law schools need to enlist current African-American law school students as recruiters. Law school respondents’ suggestions that Texas law schools utilize current African-American students to assist in the recruitment process were as follows:

______ should use more of their current African-American students to promote the university and recruit students. [LSR]

Employ African-American student recruiters to draw others. [LSR]

Get to know your current minority students and have them attract more minority students. [LSR]

Communicate with current African-American law students about friends, family, etc. who are interested in law school. [LSR]

Law schools need to make sure that African-American students have an African-American law student to talk to about the school and their experiences. [LSR]

_______ should provide student contacts from the law school - mainly current students should call/e-mail (basically correspond) with prospective students and provide their honest opinion about the school. This will allow prospective students to evaluate the school better. [LSR]

They need to use the students that are currently enrolled (African-Americans) to help recruit more African-American students. After all, _______ is a _______ and was established primarily for African-Americans. [LSR]

I feel that more qualified prospective law students should be recruited and retained by using their current African-American population. [LSR]

One suggest is to showcase the minorities they have during their visitation days, put them into contact with Black students, and point to the overall general benefits of the institution. I honestly don’t know what else they could do on a general level. [LSR]

The _____ needs to get more former and current students involved in active recruitment. [LSR]

They should recruit current minority students to personally call African Americans and answer questions. [LSR]

They should consider using current African-American students and faculty to assist in their recruiting efforts. [LSR]

When there are black prospective students, let them speak to the black students who currently attend the law school. [LSR]
If at all possible you should have minority students assist in recruiting other minority students. [LSR]

Perhaps, have a minority open house day at the law school where African-Americans can meet the professors, address questions to a panel, and have a question and answer to ________ members. Perhaps prospective students can talk to current law students about how they are willing to help. [LSR]

Have more African-American students or employees recruiting. [LSR]

As for in-state students, I think that encouraging current African-American students to be available to visiting prospective students and participating in the Admissions/Recruitment processes is the key. [LSR]

Just to be sure the African-American students are actively involved in getting other African-Americans to go to that school. [LSR]

Increase the numbers of ______ students that actually come to ______ after they have been accepted. I think the BLSA (Black Law Students Association) should have a larger role in recruitment. [LSR]

They need to accept more black students. One way would be to introduce them to the current black students attending the law school. [LSR]

When African-American students are admitted, to my knowledge, there is no push to make sure they matriculate to ______. When ______ came to ______ Law Day, there was no effort to discuss programs available for African-Americans or anything related to actual recruitment of African Americans. The numbers provided were misleading as to the number of African Americans at the school. I understand that with a small school there are few resources, but there is inexpensive recruitment strategies that ________ should invest in, like getting the few African-American students involved in the recruitment process by allowing them to offer a recommendation for interested students. Another idea is create a phone bank that would allow current students to contact admitted students who have not confirmed to talk to actual students, allowing them perhaps persuade “maybe” students into “yes” students. [LSR]

Texas law schools need to maintain an environment that embraces ethnic diversity. Law school respondents’ suggestions to maintain a law school environment that embraces diversity were as follows:

Increase diversity at campus which will make diverse students feel welcome and invited to apply. [LSR]
Be mindful of the general cultural experiences of most African-American students. Be authentic when approaching African-American students and encouraging their consideration of this institution. [LSR]

Maintain a law school environment that embraces ethnic diversity. [LSR]

The school needs to figure out what is most important to African-Americans in their choice of a law school, and also be more mindful of some of the obstacles they experience.

Although I’m contradicting myself, there needs to be a little more diversity so that African-Americans can develop the skills to deal with all types of people and races in the real world, such as Caucasian, Hispanic, Asian, etc. [LSR]

The suggestions are not to my school, but to the other law schools in Texas. If one of their goals is diversity, then they should act on it and not just talk about it. [LSR]

Be honest about the small number of minorities enrolled in the school and most importantly be honest about why you want more minorities to attend. [LSR]

Diversity should be emphasized more at the school and the African-American student organizations should be showcased more because they are great ________ needs to highlight their diverse faculty. [LSR]

Texas – as state – probably has a hard time of getting African-American students because of perceptions of widespread racism in the state. I don’t know how we could overcome that in attracting out of state students. [LSR]

They need to demonstrate and emphasize that minority recruitment and retention is a top priority. The more they admit, the more students will come. [LSR]

Seek out African-American students. [LSR]

Texas law schools need to maintain contact with African-American alumni to assist in the recruiting of African-American students. Law school respondents’ comments regarding the idea of utilizing alumni to assist in the recruitment process of African-American students were as follows:

Hold minority information seminars, have alumnus call on perspective students to inform them about the school. [LSR]
Maintain contact with African-American alumni to assist in the recruitment effort. [LSR]

___________ needs to attract the brightest African-American students, and in order to accomplish this objective they need to enlist their alumni to help sell the school. [LSR]

Get Black Alumni involved. Get local Black attorneys, and the Black community involved. [LSR]

They may want to provide an example of African-American students who have achieved success in the law school and others who have graduated and gone on to have successful careers. [LSR]

_______ might consider getting African-American alumni to telephone, email and write prospective students. [LSR]

*Texas law schools need to develop a relationship with CLEO, LSAC, high schools, undergraduate institutions, and undergraduate Black organizations through liaisons.* Law school respondents’ suggestions to establish relationships with high schools, undergraduate institutions and Black organizations through liaisons were as follows:

Have a presence at undergraduate institutions. Many students have not heard of ________. [LSR]

Start in the high school and colleges, but not just majority black school but any place that has blacks. Run ads on TV and Radio and churches. [LSR]

Maybe they should target undergraduate black law student associations or pre-law societies a well as continuing with the LSAC conferences. [LSR]

To recruit at minority focused events like CLEO. [LSR]

Create a relationship with undergraduate black organizations through liaisons. [LSR]

They need to increase their standards in order to recruit the best and brightest African-American students. They should consider starting at the grade school/high school level. [LSR]
needs to speak with high school and college students - they need to start earlier recruiting African-American students to become lawyers. [LSR]

Go to different universities around the country to recruit, but they should plan the seed of law school in high school students in the Houston area before graduating. [LSR]

I think they should visit minority pre-law association meetings, or at least contact these organizations to answer questions students may have. [LSR]

I think that many, if not most African students, are first generation graduate/professional students. A higher proportion of our white counterparts have family and social connections to law school faculties and law firms than we do. I would suggest that ________ put together a specialized portfolio of services to bring the social divide between black (and other) first generation law students. Those missing professional and social connections can be greatly impacted. Also LSAT scores and undergraduate GPAs are often predictors of first year grades. I would do outreach early to underclassmen at historically black colleges to encourage LSAT prep and study skills prep. [LSR]

Recruit more, include those from lower economic backgrounds and take the LSAT score disadvantage into consideration, start early at the high school level, have more in each section. [LSR]

Start earlier in undergrad explain career options after completing law school. [LSR]

I feel they should increase efforts to recruit minority students by informing young undergraduates of the law school process and by discussing law school as an option after they obtain their undergraduate degree. [LSR]

They also need to actively reach out to the undergraduate students at ______ since it is one of the most diverse college campuses in the country. [LSR]

Speaking to undergraduate minority organizations to increase awareness where there might not be awareness already. [LSR]

I would suggest direct mailings to those who identify themselves as a minority with LSAC and any other means to reach the (usually) unreachable. [LSR]

Go visit undergraduate institutions to increase visibility of the school outside of Texas. [LSR]

First of all, just come and recruit. African-American schools NEVER came to my school. [LSR]
To wait until applications roll in to see how many African-Americans are enrolling is TOO LATE. Recruiting efforts need to be made beforehand. We need to set ourselves apart and do things to make our school look more attractive to African-Americans. I think my school is satisfied with the low minority turn-out that it has…and that is very sad and a HUGE problem. [LSR]

I think that they should go to area schools and state universities. [LSR]

They need to recruit at minority focused effects, such as CLEO. [LSR]

*Texas law schools should strongly encourage minority students to visit the law school by providing financial assistance.* Law school respondents’ suggestions that Texas law schools should strongly encourage and financially assist African-Americans in visiting the law schools were as follows:

They should invite students to campus, pay for accommodations, and actively recruit them while they are here. [LSR]

The law school should do everything in its power to get minority students to the law school for a visit. [LSR]

________ should provide sponsored visits and trips to the University. [LSR]

They should think about developing a program that will allow prospective students to interact more with current students during campus visits. [LSR]

Pay for them to visit here. Once they visit they will love it. People have many misconceptions about Texas. They need to see it’s great to believe (here)? Also accept more blacks. [LSR]

I really did not feel the effects of recruiting minority students until I made an appointment to come and talk to one of the deans about admissions. I kept in touch with him, but other than that I am not aware of any recruiting strategies. [LSR]

Open-Ended Questions for Law School Administrators

In order to answer the last three research questions (#9, #10, and #11), a survey was submitted to law school administrators regarding the factors that influence African-American students’ enrollment in Texas law schools. Seven of the eight administrators
agreed to participate in the survey, which is a response rate of 87.5%. The survey comprised of seven open-ended questions and was submitted to law school administrators in a Microsoft Word document electronically by e-mail. A copy of the survey is available in Appendix C. The law school administrators’ responses will be identified generically as LSA in order to protect the administrators and the law schools participating in the study.

**Question Number Nine**

The ninth research question inquired about the effectiveness of Texas law schools’ recruiting strategies in relation to African-American students from an institutional standpoint. Subsequently, law school administrators were asked to respond to the fifth survey question. *From an institutional standpoint, how do you perceive the effectiveness of your institution’s minority recruiting strategies in relation to African-American students?*

**Results of the law school administrators’ responses.** In reviewing the law school administrators’ responses, several themes emerged. First, administrators’ indicated that there was/is an overwhelming national demand for prospective African-American law students. However, the applicant pool is steadily decreasing. Second, law school administrators’ stated that although their recruiting strategies had improved; they were weak, and at best marginally effective. Third, law school administrators’ responded that recruitment on the admissions side needed to be increased, as well as financial resources, such as scholarships. In summary, while some Texas administrators were content with their law school’s recruiting strategies of African-American students, other administrators stated that their law school’s recruiting strategies were weak and that they were
dissatisfied with the overall results of the enrollment of African-American students in Texas law schools.

*Law school administrators’ responses.* The responses of the law school administrators’ were as follows:

We are not satisfied with the results of our recruiting strategies, especially in relation to African-American students, but we also understand that we are competing for a group of students who are highly sought after. While we continue to work aggressively to boost racial diversity among our student population, we recognize that we are not alone among law schools and we are facing significant challenges to our efforts to increase minority student enrollment, especially given our geographical locale and the need to compete against schools in larger urban and metropolitan areas of minority students. [LSA]

The effort and resources expended with regards to recruiting African-American students is excellent. The reality is that there is an overwhelming national demand coupled with an increasingly lower supply of African-American students pursuing legal degrees. Being a relatively young law school, geographically isolated, and lacking a national reputation hinders our ability to attract qualified African-Americans. [LSA]

Weak! We lose out to schools better “ranked” than we are. [LSA]

I think that we are doing a better job with our recruiting strategies in relation to African-American students. Before *Hopwood* the majority of our African-American students were recruited out-of-state. This is partly due to the racist stigmatism that was associated with the University. It was perceived that if you were African-American, the ________________ was the last institution that you would want to attend, especially considering that in the past; African-Americans weren’t allowed to play on the football team. After the *Hopwood* decision, the situation has reversed and now the majority of African-Americans that attend the University come from the state of Texas. I think that part of the reason for the reversal stemmed from the fact that finally people understood what we were trying to do…, which involved leveling the playing field. I think that as a result of our recruiting strategies and the *Hopwood* decision, our African-American applicant pool has increased and has become more competitive. As a result of this, it has allowed our institution to continue it’s commitment to educating African-American students and our ability to add to the employment base at the regional and national levels. [LSA]
Our recruitment strategies have been only marginally effective. Until recently, we have been unable to put significant financial resources into scholarships and direct CRS solicitations. Our hope is to continue to increase the financial resources available for these efforts. We have also increased the number of minority faculty teaching at the law school. [LSA]

Although presently satisfied, we are always seeking even more successful results. [LSA]

The recruiting strategies were fine, but we need to do more on the actual admissions side. We were getting the applicants, but they were not being admitted. [LSA]

*Question Number Ten*

The tenth research question inquired about the effect(s) that *Hopwood v. State of Texas* and *Grutter v. Bollinger* had on the recruitment of prospective African-American law students in Texas. Therefore, law school administrators were asked to answer two survey questions. The fourth survey question asked law schools administrators: *In your opinion, what effect(s) has Hopwood v. State of Texas had on the recruitment strategies of the nine law schools in the state of Texas overall?* Likewise, the seventh survey question asked law school administrators: *In your opinion, what effect(s) will Grutter v. Bollinger have on the recruitment strategies of the nine law schools in the state of Texas overall?*

*Results of the Law school administrators’ responses to the Hopwood decision.*

Four themes emerged from the responses of law school administrators regarding the *Hopwood* decision and its effects on Texas law schools. First, law school administrators stated that even though the *Hopwood* decision had little impact on the level of recruitment activities and the pre-admission process of prospective African-American students, the decision forced law schools to become more creative in their efforts to
determine an applicant’s ethnicity. Additionally, the *Hopwood* decision forced law schools to effectively use the Candidate Referral Service (CRS) of the Law School Admission Council (LSAC).

Second, law school administrators indicated that on the one hand, the *Hopwood* decision placed Texas law schools at a disadvantage regarding the aggressive recruitment of minority students. But on the other hand, the *Hopwood* decision had a positive effect in that the decision made Texas law school administrators more aggressive in their recruiting strategies. Third, law school administrators stated that they were not privy to how the *Hopwood* decision affected other Texas law schools and could only speak about how the decision affected their law school. Fourth, law school administrators’ asserted that the *Hopwood* decision sent a negative message to applicants about the state of Texas and the importance of diversity.

*Law school administrators’ responses regarding the Hopwood decision.* The responses of the law school administrators were as follows:

I think it forced schools to be “more creative” in their efforts to determine whether an applicant was a minority student but probably did not have as much of an impact on the actions taken once that determination was made. Schools may have used “clues” in the personal statement, implemented an interview process to meet the applicant, or noted the activities the applicant was involved in to determine the minority status and then still treated the candidate in the same way they would have treated a minority candidate prior to *Hopwood*. [LSA]

In terms of the level and type of recruitment activities pre-admission, I do not believe that *Hopwood* has affected the nine law schools (other than the ability to effectively use the CRS). These things are affected by an institution’s budget and personnel. Due to the applicants’ racial/ethnic anonymity, the law schools bound by *Hopwood* were placed at a competitive disadvantage with regards to aggressively recruiting minority students after admitting them. [LSA]

In my opinion, I believe that the *Hopwood* decision sent a negative message to applicants about the state of Texas and our opinion of the importance of diversity. [LSA]
In my opinion, the *Hopwood* decision changed the perception about our law school. I believe that while *Hopwood* sent a negative message to applicants about the state of Texas and our opinion of diversity, African-Americans within the state of Texas gained a better understanding of what we were trying to accomplish with our recruitment and admissions strategies. [LSA]

We are not privy to the recruitment strategies of other law schools. [LSA]

I can only respond as it relates, or not, to my own law school. I would have no idea how recruitment strategies may, or may not, have changed at other Texas law schools. [LSA]

It made us more aggressive in our recruiting. That is not a bad thing. [LSA]

*Results of the law school administrators’ responses to the Grutter decision.* From the responses of the law school administrators, several themes emerged regarding the effect(s) the *Grutter* decision will have on the nine law schools in Texas. First, law school administrators indicated that the *Grutter* decision would bring integrity and a holistic approach to the recruitment and admissions process. Second, administrators affirmed that while *Grutter* would not affect the level and type of recruitment activities, the decision would enable Texas law schools to devote the resources necessary to aggressively recruit African-American students. Third, law school administrators responded that they were not privy to the recruitment strategies of other Texas law schools. Fourth, law school administrators indicated that the *Grutter* decision would level the playing field.

*Law school administrators’ responses regarding the Grutter decision.* The responses of the law school administrators’ were as follows:

I think it will allow schools to be more transparent in their efforts which will bring more integrity to the Admissions process as a whole. [LSA]

In terms of the level and type of recruitment activities pre-admission, I do not believe that *Grutter* will affect the nine law schools (other than the ability to
effectively use the CRS). These things are affected by an institutions budget and personnel. Being able to identify the race/ethnicity of admitted students enables the Law School to devote the resources necessary to aggressively recruit African-American students. [LSA]

Perhaps that the “climate” is better or more accepting of using a holistic review approach during the recruitment and admissions process. [LSA]

*Grutter v. Bollinger* applies to the whole country because it is a Supreme Court decision. I think that *Grutter* will help leveling the playing field. Under *Hopwood* schools in the 5th Circuit were hurt by the decision. Consequently, schools that were outside of the 5th Circuit had an advantage. The caliber of teaching and our school didn’t change. However, we can’t deny that *Grutter* will provide us with some tools and flexibility to help minority students, especially African-American students feel more welcomed. [LSA]

We are not privy to the recruitment strategies of other law schools. Our strategies will not change. We will continue to increase the financial resources dedicated to our existing strategies. [LSA]

I would have no idea on whether or not recruitment strategies will change at other Texas law schools, or what potential changes would entail. However, I firmly believe that all ABA approved law schools have actively and aggressively recruited prospective African-American and other diverse students in the state of Texas and elsewhere, I would not imagine that any other than a continued and even perhaps a renewed and invigorated, effort to continue so in the state of Texas and elsewhere would take place. [LSA]

It is extremely competitive to enroll top African-American students. The recruitment strategies will continue to be aggressive. [LSA]

**Question Number Eleven**

The eleventh research question inquired about the effect(s) that *Hopwood v. State of Texas* and *Grutter v. Bollinger* had on the recruitment strategies of each Texas law school in relation to African-American students. Therefore, law school administrators were asked to respond to four survey questions (#1, #2, #3, and #6). The first survey question asked law school administrators: *What recruitment strategies did your institution have in place for African-American students prior to Hopwood v. State of Texas?* The second survey question asked administrators: *What effect(s) has Hopwood
v. State of Texas had on your institution regarding the recruitment of prospective African-American students? The third survey question asked law school administrators: How have your institution’s recruiting strategies of African-American students changed as a result of the Hopwood decision? The sixth survey question asked administrators: Will your recruiting strategies of African-American students change as a result of the Grutter v. Bollinger decision? How?

Results of the law school administrators’ responses to the type(s) of recruiting strategies that were in place prior to the Hopwood decision. Two themes emerged from the law school administrators’ responses to the first survey question. First, law school administrators indicated that an individual’s minority status was the main strategy during the consideration of admissions and the awarding of diversity scholarships. Second, law school administrators confirmed that the Law School Admission Council’s Candidate Referral Service (CRS) was instrumental in recruiting African-American students because the service enabled law schools to recruit potential applicants based on the following characteristics: (1) LSAT score, (2) GPA, (3) age, (4) citizenship, (5) geographic background, and (6) race or ethnicity.

Law school administrators’ responses regarding the type(s) of recruiting strategies that were in place at their institution before the Hopwood decision. The responses of the law school administrators were as follows:

Our main strategy was awarding scholarships based on minority status. [LSA] The Law school participates in a variety of events designed to encourage a diverse group of competitive candidates to apply for admission. Some events occur in regions with a high percentage of minority students. Other events may place a special emphasis on attracting minority students to the function; however, these events are strictly race neutral. The Law School will not participate in any
recruiting events that exclude persons because of race or ethnicity. Its goal is to attend as many functions as economically feasible to broaden the overall quantity, quality, and diversity of its applicant pool. The Law School selects locations corresponding to the geographic diversity of its applicant pool, the location of Texas expatriates, and the level of racial, ethnic, age, gender, and socioeconomic diversity of participants. The school’s recruiting efforts are supported by the realization that Texas residents are being lured away by out-of-state law schools due to aggressive recruiting and marketing techniques. Moreover, the School is firmly committed to increasing the number of qualified applicants. Examples of recruiting events include the following: University organization or department sponsored campus visits, LSAC sponsored law forums, Southwest Association of Pre-Law Advisors law school caravan, and Kaplan Test Prep sponsored events. Prior to Hopwood, the Law School heavily participated in the Law School Admission Council Candidate Referral Service (herein after “CRS”). This service makes information about law school candidates available to law schools. Law schools may recruit potential applicants on the basis of specific characteristics; for example, LSAT score, grade-point average (GPA), age, citizenship, race or ethnicity, and geographic background. [LSA]

Before the Hopwood decision, the fact that an individual was a minority was part of considering the student for admission to the law school. It was incorporated in our recruiting strategies in an effort to recruit more African-American students. [LSA]

I was a student when the Hopwood decision occurred, so I am not sure about the recruiting strategies. However, there were strategies in place that took race & ethnicity into consideration. [LSA]

We recruited at HBCUs and graduate education fairs specifically focused on minority candidates. We utilized the Candidate Referral Service (CRS) of the Law Services Admissions Council to solicit applications. We provided diversity scholarships. [LSA]

We employ the same recruitment strategies for potential African-American students as we do for all perceived students of minority status, those to identify the largest audience within our awareness, to whom we can promote the possibility of our legal educational program providing both the attainment of their legal educational goals and the expansion of lawyer representation in previously under-represented populations. [LSA]

I was not here pre-Hopwood. From my understanding, they visited college campuses and participated in the Law Services Admissions Council (LSAC) recruiting forums. [LSA]
Results of the law school administrators’ responses regarding the effect(s) of the Hopwood decision on their institution’s recruitment process of prospective African-American students. Three themes emerged from law school administrators’ responses to the second survey question. First, the primary effect of the Hopwood decision was the mandatory removal of race or ethnicity as a factor in the admissions process and the awarding of scholarships in Texas law schools. Second, the inability to identify minority students made it more difficult to provide the necessary resources during the recruitment process, which resulted in African-American enrollment dropping significantly in Texas law schools. Additionally, administrators stated that the inability to identify minority students placed Texas law schools at a competitive disadvantage nationwide. Third, law school administrators indicated that although race was no longer a factor in the admissions process, the rest of their institution’s recruiting strategies remained the same.

Law school administrators’ responses regarding the effect(s) of the Hopwood decision on their institution’s recruitment process of African-American students. The responses of the law school administrators were as follows:

The primary effect was not being able to consider race or ethnicity in admissions decisions or in the awarding of scholarships. [LSA]

The low supply of minority students, particularly African-American males, enrolling in law school creates a high demand. Consequently, it requires a greater amount of resources to successfully recruit those individuals to the Law School. Under Hopwood, the Law School received no information with regards to an applicant’s race or ethnicity. Unless an applicant self-disclosed his/her race/ethnicity, the Law School was unable to identify those highly sought after minority students and devote the necessary resources to successfully recruit them. The Law School was placed at a competitive disadvantage. [LSA]

Other than the fact that we were unable to use race as a factor in the admissions process, the rest of our recruiting strategies remained the same. Essentially, it had no effect. [LSA]
The Law School was required to remove the race/ethnicity question from the admissions application. We also had to re-evaluate the way we recruited minority students. It became more difficult to identify minority students and to provide the necessary resources during the recruitment process. Therefore, our African-American enrollment dropped significantly. Prior to the Hopwood decision, people struggled to understand what the university was trying to accomplish. However, after the decision, I think that the people in the state of Texas understood that our initial recruitment process and admissions standards were designed to create a diverse student body. [LSA]

None! [LSA]

To be perfectly frank, - none at all. We continue to proceed just as before. [LSA]

During the earlier years, the effects were very minimal, but we were in a national applicant downturn and the effects became more evident with single digit classes of African-American students entering in the first year. [LSA]

Results of the law school administrators’ responses of how their institution’s recruiting strategies of African-American students changed as a result of the Hopwood decision. Although two law school administrators stated that their institution’s recruiting strategies did not change as a result of Hopwood, three themes emerged from the remaining law school administrators’ responses. First, law school administrators identified other plus factors to incorporate in the admissions process and the awarding of scholarships instead of race or ethnicity. Some of these “plus” factors included (1) first generation graduate students, (2) military experience, (3) worked while pursuing an undergraduate degree, and (4) outreach programs. Second, Texas law school administrators increased their concentration of recruiting from Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). Third, law school administrators continued to obtain applicant information from the LSAC Candidate Referral Service (CRS) and became a sponsored member of the Council on Legal Educational Opportunity (CLEO).
Law school administrators’ responses on how their institution’s recruiting strategies of African-American students changed as a result of the Hopwood decision.

The responses of the law school administrators were as follows:

Questions regarding race and ethnicity were removed from our application, so we turned to other factors we considered to be “plus” factors that often correlated with – although not absolutely so – race, in order to seat a racially diverse class. Those plus factors, in addition to their correlation with race, bore significance in and of themselves and included: first generation graduate, military experience, worked while completing undergraduate degree, overcame significant obstacles, English was not the first language, economic disadvantage, community involvement, non-traditional student, college athlete, and significant work experience. We used those “Hopwood-permissible” plus factors, in conjunction with the applicants’ objective measures to make admissions decisions. We also created Dean’s Achievement Scholarships, which were awarded based on the Hopwood-permissible factors and required a lower GPA (2.0) than the other merit-based scholarships to maintain. [LSA]

Prior to Hopwood, the Law School heavily participated in the CRS. This service makes information about law school candidates available to law schools. Law schools may recruit potential applicants on the basis of specific characteristics; for example, LSAT score, grade-point average (GPA), age, citizenship, race or ethnicity, and geographic background. In recent years, the Law school has elected not to use the CRS. When considering the CRS characteristics available, the School’s admissions process, and the limitations set forth in Hopwood, the School could not sufficiently narrow its search to benefit our recruiting efforts. Because of changes in the law, the School will reinstate the use of CRS. [LSA]

Our recruiting strategies really have not changed since the Hopwood decision, other than we do not allow ethnicity to be a major consideration in the recruitment and admissions process. We still strive to recruit a large population of African-American students. [LSA]

Yes, our recruiting strategies have changed as a result of the Hopwood decision. In the 2002-2006 academic year, we implemented several Admissions Race-Neutral Recruitment Programs, which we also refer to as Outreach Programs. We have also historically recruited at prominent Historically Black Colleges and Universities including Fisk University, Florida A&M University, Morehouse College, Southern University, Spellman College, and Texas Southern University. Additionally, recruiting events were held at North Carolina A&T, North Carolina State University, Shaw University, Fayetteville State University, Winston-Salem State University, and University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill. Moreover, the CLEO conference is normally in Atlanta, so we also bring a minority student, possibly African-American, with us to allow them to make new contacts. When we recruit in areas that have a high concentration of African-American students,
such as Atlanta, an HBCU, or from other areas, we also try to bring a current African-American law student who is from that area. [LSA]

Our recruiting strategies did not change as a result of Hopwood. [LSA]

To be perfectly frank, - none at all. We continue to proceed just as before. [LSA]

We have done more recruiting, targeting HBCUs. We purchase names from the LSAC Candidate Referral Service to encourage student to apply and we offer them fee waivers. We have done some outreach with high schools to try to encourage young people to consider law school. [LSA]

Results of the law school administrators’ responses to whether or not the Grutter decision will change their institution’s recruiting strategies of African-American students. Three themes emerged from law school administrators’ responses to the sixth survey question. First, the Grutter decision allowed law school administrators to update the admissions application to disclose the race and ethnicity of an applicant. Second, law school administrators reinstated the use of the CRS after the Grutter decision. Third, administrators indicated that the Grutter decision had no effect because their recruiting strategies were revamped to be more effective and aggressive after the Hopwood decision.

Law school administrators’ response to whether or not the Grutter decision changed their institution’s recruiting strategies of African-American students. The responses of the law school administrators were as follows:

Since Grutter, we have added racial/ethnic minority status as one of the plus factors that is considered in the admission process. Also, we have continued to make a concerted effort to ensure that all representations made by the Law School – from written publications to the web site – demonstrate our desire to enroll a racially and ethnically diverse student body. This effort, while increasing our minority student population even while we were under the mandates of the Hopwood decision, has still not yielded the results that we would like to see. Most recently, in 2005, we have matriculated classes with a minority enrollment of 9.58% (Spring 2005), 15.15% (Summer 2005) and 15.85% (Fall 2005). Our
minority recruitment strategies, which we always are seeking to refine to achieve greater effectiveness and success, currently include the following programming and approaches: (1) availability of a minority law school advisor, (2) direct mail solicitation using CRS mail outs, (3) open houses, (4) city luncheons, (5) a comprehensive website, (6) an update of our admissions application, and (7) recruiting in heavily minority populated areas. As noted, in light of the Grutter decision regarding affirmative action in educational contexts, we have updated our application form in order to make disclosure of race and ethnicity an option for our applicants. We also have reworded the description of our personal statement segment of the application form in order to more aggressively seek information that will better enable the admissions committee to seat a more diverse class. Through these changes in the application, we communicate to our applicants that all are welcome and that Baylor Law School truly values the creation of a diverse legal community. Though the LSDAS Candidate Referral Service, we obtain names and contact information for qualified minority candidates. In addition to the materials sent to all applicants, we include a brochure specifically designed to address the needs of minority law students. We also include with this brochure a letter written by the Minority Law Student Advisor inviting further inquiry from minority applicants. As with all of our CRS mail outs, the unsolicited contact encourages highly desirable candidates to consider why ________ may be the best school for them and waives the application fee. Along with comprehensive general information about the law school, the Web site contains a page that is dedicated exclusive to minority issues. The page is authored by the minority law student advisor and includes a list of answers to questions that are frequently asked by prospective minority students. This resource serves as an aid to minority students who may not have received our written materials and further communicates the emphasis that we place on diversity. [LSA]

Yes. We have reinstated the use of the CRS. This program allows the Law School to target students that (1) may not have considered applying to the Law School and (2) have a reasonable opportunity of being admitted into the School. Other changes that we will implement are based upon factors such as personnel and budget not the Grutter decision. [LSA]

No! [LSA]

No, because our recruiting strategies were revamped to be more effective after Hopwood. As a result of the recruiting strategies that were implemented after Hopwood, we have the ability to recruit more African-American students because our applicant pool became larger. Even if we deny an applicant, we want to make sure that they have a positive experience when the come to our campus. We will continue to also rely on world-of-mouth references and host an Alumni Breakfast in which prospective students are able to meet former African-American students. Additionally, we will continue to use ______ (______ Legal Society) as a viable and effective avenue to assist with the recruitment of new students. We will also continue to take the President of ________ to the ABA annual meetings to meet
new contacts because this provides us with an opportunity to bring “young blood” into the National Bar Association. [LSA]

Our strategies will not change. We will continue to increase the financial resources dedicated to our existing strategies. [LSA]

We have no current plans to change recruitment strategies. [LSA]

No, we will continue to be aggressive, if not more so. We currently have a program where we reimburse students up to $200 on their airline ticket to visit campus. [LSA]

Summary

This chapter has presented the results of a descriptive analysis regarding the factors that influenced African-American students’ enrollment in Texas law schools. These findings included an analysis of the data derived from responses to questions on a survey that was submitted to African-American students attending eight of the nine Texas law schools in 2004 and 2005. A demographic analysis was presented to provide the reader with more information about the population participating in the study. Moreover, the SPSS descriptive procedure was utilized to determine the mean and standard deviation of the 20 law school selection factors and the group of “marketing” factors included in the survey.

The 20 law school choice factors were grouped into four categories: (1) faculty and staff factors, (2) social factors, (3) financial aid factors, and (4) career factors. Additionally, the “marketing” factors were grouped into two categories: (1) primary and (2) secondary. Primary marketing factors are those used in the initial phase of the recruitment process, such as the importance of financial aid, financial communications, and contact with the admissions staff. Secondary marketing factors are those that are incorporated into the recruitment process at a latter date to personalize each law school,
such as contact with current students and faculty. Chi-square ($\chi^2$) statistics using cross-tabulations were used to determine the significance level of each law school choice factor (1) by type of law school, (2) by type of law school based on gender, and (3) by type of law school based on academic year.

Law school respondents were also asked three open-ended questions. The first open-ended question addressed how individuals, such as family, friends, professors and mentors affected the law school selection process. The second and third open-ended questions asked law school respondents about their perceptions of Texas law schools’ recruitment strategies in relation to African-American students and inquired about any suggestions they might have to improve Texas law schools’ recruitment strategies. Finally, law school administrators were administered a survey that consisted of seven open-ended questions regarding the recruitment strategies of their institution and the effect(s) of the *Hopwood* and *Grutter* decisions on those strategies.
CHAPTER FIVE
Discussion and Recommendations

Introduction

This chapter consists of five sections: (1) an introduction, (2) a discussion of the findings, (3) recommendations to law school administrators, (4) recommendations for future research, and (5) final comments. The introduction explains the intent, rationale, and problem of the study. This section also provides the reader with a brief description of the respondents participating in the study. The discussion incorporates the literature review into the findings. The third section provides recommendations for law school administrators based on the findings in the study. The fourth section provides the reader with some opportunities for additional research. The fifth section provides the reader with the researcher’s final comments regarding the study.

This study was intended to create a description of the factors that influence the law school choice process of African-American students enrolled in Texas law schools. Additionally, the rationale of this study was to determine how past and present legal cases, such as Hopwood v. State of Texas and Grutter v. Bollinger, affected the recruiting strategies of Texas law schools in regards to African-American students. The problem of the study was to identify the factors that affect the law school choice of prospective African-American students. Therefore, data from a survey submitted to African-American students enrolled in Texas law schools in 2004 and 2005 were examined to address the problem of the study. Furthermore, law school administrators participated in
an open-ended survey to ascertain data about how past and present legal cases have affected the recruiting strategies of Texas law schools in relation to African-Americans.

Discussion of the Findings

Discussion of the Law School Choice Factors by Type of Law School

There were several interesting findings from this study that reinforced the notion that there are differences in the factors that affect the law school choice of African-American students attending private Texas law schools, public Texas law schools, and a historically Black Texas law school. Thomas (1998) and Otuya (1994) acknowledged that Black females were more likely to attend college than Black males because of the: (1) differences in achievement levels, grades, and educational aspirations; (2) family structure; (3) different employment opportunities for men and women; and (4) different experiences and expectations in school. Similar to Thomas’ (1998) and Otuya’s (1994) studies, the findings in this study also indicated that there were more African-American females attending Texas law schools than African-American males by the mere fact that 61.3% of the population surveyed was female. Therefore, law school administrators will need to develop an instrument that identifies the reasons African-American females and males decide to pursue a legal education when creating or modifying their recruiting strategies.

Alexander Astin (1982) compared the United States educational system to a pipeline that led ultimately to positions of leadership and influence in our society. However, he contended that the pipeline had five leakage points that resulted in disproportionately large numbers of minority students dropping out of the pipeline.
These leakage points included: (1) the completion of high school; (2) the entry into college; (3) the completion of college; (4) the entry into graduate or professional school; and (5) the completion of graduate or professional school. Based on the findings in this study, one might conclude that there are fewer African-American males attending Texas law schools because of these five leakage points. Therefore, administrators in higher education at the undergraduate, graduate, and professional level will need to determine where the leakage points are in this applicant pool of highly sought after students in order to develop a more diverse student body in which African-American students attending law schools reflect their percentages in the general population.

Jones’ (1979) study revealed that the enrollment decisions of African-American students were not solely based on the encouragement of parents, teachers, counselors, or alumni, but instead financial aid. In Jones’ (1979) study, three-fourths of the respondents stated that financial aid was the most important factor in the college choice process. Moreover, the majority of the financing for these respondents came from federal grants and loans, college or university grants and loans, parents’ earnings or savings, and/or a combination thereof. In this study, historically Black and Texas law school respondents overall indicated that total cost (tuition plus room and board) was the most important factor in selecting a law school. Public Texas law school respondents ranked total cost (tuition plus room and board) as the third most important factor in selecting a law school. Historically Black Texas law school respondents not only wanted to know the total cost of obtaining a legal education, but also how they were going to pay for their legal education. Therefore, the four financial aid factors were ranked high as one of the eight most important factors in selecting a law school.
Conversely, private Texas law school respondents ranked total cost (tuition plus room and board) tenth in the law school selection process. These findings revealed that private Texas law schools respondents were concerned the least about the financial aid factors, which included net cost (cost minus aid), the financial aid offer, and scholarships (amount offered by the law school). The ranking of these factors implied that private Texas law school respondents were concerned the least about the financial aid factors either because they knew how they were going to finance their legal education, such as student loans and scholarships, or financial aid was a moot point because their legal education was being funded by family members, a spouse, or possibly an employer.

Instead, private and public Texas law school respondents indicated that academic reputation was the most important factor in the law school choice process. Private Texas law school respondents also identified quality of faculty as being of equal importance in the selection process. In the final stages of selecting a law school, private Texas law school respondents were concerned the least about how they were going to finance their legal education. Instead, they were concerned more about the factors that had the potential to lead to assurance of employment after graduation, such as the academic reputation of the law school, the quality of the faculty, and wide-ranging curriculums that provide more job opportunities. Conversely, the financial aid factors for public and historically Black Texas law school respondents were considered the most important factors in the selection process. In the final stages of selecting a law school, these respondents were more concerned about how they were going finance their legal education while they were in law school, as well as the assurance of employment after graduation.
Discussion of the Law School Choice Factors by Gender

Thomas (1998) stated that Blacks had an equal or higher probability of attending college as White students when the controlling factors were income and academic performance. Subsequently, the rising costs of college and the different options available for financing a college education increased the importance of a family’s socioeconomic status. The researcher further stated that for students of color, their family’s financial resources were the primary determinant between wanting to go to college and actual college enrollment. Moreover, the shift from grants to loans during the 1980s played a crucial role in the declining enrollment of Blacks.

Similar to the findings mentioned above, African-American female respondents attending a historically Black law school in Texas were more concerned about (1) total cost, (2) quality of faculty, and (3) net cost. In contrast, African-American females attending private Texas law schools were more concerned about the quality of faculty. Academic reputation and geographic location were the second most important factors in the law school choice process. Likewise, African-American female respondents attending public Texas law schools were more concerned about (1) academic reputation, (2) assurance of employment after graduation, and (3) total cost.

African-American male respondents attending private and public Texas law schools were more concerned about the academic reputation of the law school. Male public Texas law school respondents were also concerned about wide-ranging curriculums. Conversely, African-American male respondents attending a historically Black Texas law school were more concerned about (1) total cost, (2) net cost, (3) assurance of employment after graduation, and (4) the financial aid offer. Although
African-American female and male respondents attending private Texas law schools indicated that academic reputation was important, the respondents differed regarding the order of importance. Moreover, male respondents enrolled in private Texas law schools indicated that the financial aid factors were the least important in selecting a law school. Despite the findings that indicated the importance of financial aid was the most important primary marketing factor, these respondents were concerned the least about how they were going to finance their legal education.

While the order of importance differed, African-American female and male respondents attending public Texas law schools were more concerned about the factors that increased the assurance of employment after graduation, such as academic reputation and wide-ranging curriculums. The ranking of the financial aid factors by both groups also indicated that these respondents were concerned about the financing of their legal education during the law school selection process. Likewise, African-American female and male respondents attending a historically Black Texas law school were concerned the most about how they were going to pay for their legal education, as well as assurance of employment after graduation.

One might assert that financial aid is an important factor in the law school selection process because many African-American students and their families have fewer assets and access to the finances needed to pursue a legal education specifically and higher education in general. Additionally, as the costs associated with obtaining a degree in higher education continues to increase without sufficient financial support from state and federal government agencies, African-American students and other minority students are at a greater risk of being unable to obtain a legal degree, especially if their only option
is a student loan. The rising costs of a legal education and the lack of funding from state and federal government agencies might also hinder African-American students from making a decision earlier in their collegiate careers about whether or not to pursue a legal education. If professional schools and institutions of higher education continue to increase their costs, while state and federal government agencies continue to decrease their funding; once again we run the risk of creating a society in which only the “elite” and “affluent” students will be able to afford and obtain a legal education, which would be detrimental to Texas as former Dean Mike Sharlot asserted “in a state that will soon be one of the first in the nation to have no racial majority group” (Smith, 1998, p. 11). Moreover, the lack of African-Americans in the legal profession will leave this population inadequately represented in many instances and without responsible, effective leadership in the general population.

**Discussion of the Marketing Factors**

Texas law school respondents overall ranked the importance of financial aid as the most important primary marketing factor in the law school selection process. This can best be explained by the fact that 53.2% of the African-American respondents financed their legal education using student loans. Moreover, African-American respondents ranked financial aid communications and contact with the admissions staff as the second and third most important primary marketing factors in the law school selection process. Therefore, law school administrators will need to make sure that these offices are fully-staffed with competent individuals who are customer service oriented. Since the *Grutter* decision did not address the awarding of scholarships, law school administrators
will also need to be more creative in how they award and create scholarships programs geared toward African-American students and other minority students.

Respondents further indicated that contact with current students and contact with faculty were the two most important secondary marketing factors in the law school decision-making process. In summary, this population of students indicated that expensive, glossy university publications were the least important secondary marketing factor in the selection process. Subsequently, this finding might indicate that these students have a better understanding of the admissions and recruitment process at this level of their education. They are not undergraduate students who are easily swayed by a glossy brochure. These respondents are sophisticated individuals who know what they are looking for in a law school. Therefore, law school administrators must be cognizant of this when developing or modifying their recruiting strategies.

Discussion of the Primary Influencers in the Law School Choice Process

Galotti and Mark (1994) stated that personal and social factors, such as parents’, friends’, and peers’ advice affected the college choice decision of undergraduate students. However, the findings in the study indicated that family, friends, professors and mentors had minimal influence on African-American students during the final stages of selecting a law school. Moreover, the influence that was exhibited usually involved (1) assisting the student in researching the law schools by weighing the pros and cons, (2) providing financial support, and/or (3) writing a letter of recommendation. Hence, law school administrators will need to be more creative in their recruiting strategies to attract African-American law students.
Discussion of the Respondents’ Perceptions of Texas Law Schools’ Recruiting Strategies

Although 42.5% of the African-American respondents attending Texas law schools earned a bachelor degree from an undergraduate institution in Texas, African-American law school respondents indicated that Texas law schools’ recruiting strategies were either non-existent or that they were unfamiliar with the institution’s recruiting strategies. Moreover, several law school respondents indicated that Texas law schools’ recruiting strategies of African-Americans were insincere and did not reach out to Blacks. In contrast, there were some African-American law school respondents who described Texas law schools’ recruiting strategies as good, excellent, and effective. While other African-American law school respondents stated that although Texas law school administrators were trying hard to recruit African-American students, they needed to try harder and be more aggressive.

Therefore, several suggestions were provided by African-American law school respondents to Texas law school administrators. First, African-American law school respondents suggested that Texas law school administrators recruit from Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). Second, law school respondents suggested that Texas law school administrators offer more scholarships to African-American students. Third, respondents suggested that law school administrators enlist their current African-American law students and alumni to promote the university and recruit prospective African-American students. Fourth, it was suggested that Texas law school administrators strongly encourage minority students to visit their law school by providing financial assistance. Moreover, Texas law schools administrators needed to promote an environment that embraces ethnic diversity. Finally, African-American law school
respondents suggested that Texas law schools develop a relationship with CLEO, LSAC, high schools, undergraduate institutions, and undergraduate Black organizations through liaisons.

Discussion of Texas Law School Administrators’ Perceptions about their Recruiting Strategies

In summary, Texas law school administrators agreed that although there was/is an overwhelming national demand for prospective African-American students, the applicant pool is steadily decreasing. Moreover, law school administrators stated that although their recruiting strategies had improved; they were still weak, and at best marginally effective. Therefore, in order to recruit more African-American students, financial resources such as scholarships needed to be increased. Although there were several law school administrators who were content with their recruiting strategies; overall, these law school administrators were dissatisfied with the enrollment of African-American students in Texas law schools.

Discussion of the Hopwood and Grutter Decisions by Texas Law School Administrators

Law school administrators further indicated that the Hopwood decision had little impact on the level of recruitment activities and the pre-admission process of prospective African-American students; however, the decision did force law schools to become more creative in their efforts to determine an applicant’s ethnicity. Likewise, the Hopwood decision placed Texas law schools at a disadvantage regarding the recruitment of minority students, while at the same time prompting Texas law school administrators to be more aggressive in their recruiting strategies. Law school administrators further
asserted that the *Hopwood* decision sent a negative message to minority applicants about the state of Texas and the importance of diversity.

While the *Hopwood* decision mandated Texas law schools to remove the race or ethnicity question from the admissions application, law school administrators stated that the *Grutter* decision would bring integrity and a holistic approach to the recruitment and admissions process of Texas law schools. Moreover, the allowing of race or ethnicity as a factor in the admissions process will enable Texas law school administrators to devote the resources necessary to aggressively recruit African-American students, as well as other minority students. Furthermore, law school administrators indicated that the *Grutter* decision would level the playing field not only for Texas law schools, but also law schools nationwide.

*Recommendations for Law School Administrators*

While few people would openly contend that minorities have no place in legal institutions, achieving racial diversity in legal education and the profession will not be an automatic process. Despite the increase in enrollment of African-Americans and other minorities in Texas law schools, their presence in legal education and the profession remains less than would be expected from their percentages in the general population (Fontaine, 1995). Moreover, Adams (1993) found that African-Americans have a tendency to delay the law school decision process until after they have graduated from college. Lundwall (1994) stated that until law schools focus on students who have not already chosen legal careers, the enrollment of minority students will remain appallingly low. As the applicant pool of African-Americans continues to decrease, so does the
percentage of African-Americans in the legal profession. Therefore, law school administrators should consider the following recommendations:

**Recommendation One:**

Texas law school administrators need to develop a survey instrument that ascertains why African-American students who have been admitted to their law school choose not to attend. The point being that it is difficult to develop effective recruiting strategies for African-American students if you do not know why they are choosing not to attend your law school.

**Recommendation Two:**

Law school administrators should begin the recruitment process of African-American students earlier by developing mentor programs with elementary schools and high schools that have a large population of African-American students, as well as other minority students. Through mentor programs or classroom law projects, current African-American law students should be encouraged to assist in the education of elementary school and high school students. Law schools could implement these programs by working with the American Bar Association and the Texas State Bar Association. Such programs would elevate law school administrators’ efforts to recruit more minority students, especially African-American and Hispanic/Latino students, which will be imperative in a nation where the majority population is steadily changing.

**Recommendation Three:**

Law school administrators should also incorporate mentor programs with Black student organizations and other multicultural organizations at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and predominantly white institutions. Moreover, current African-American law students, faculty, staff and alumni should be incorporated into the mentoring programs to assist in the recruitment process. For example, current African-American students could collaborate with alumni to offer a minority open house, in which students interested in the legal profession could learn more about the law school and the legal profession. Law school administrators could also develop a program that assists African-American students with the admissions process, such as workshops on how to write a personal mission statement, or advice on how to select the best individuals to write letters of recommendation. These programs would be a proactive approach in helping African-American students avoid the pitfalls of the admissions process and might assist African-Americans in making a decision about law school before they complete their undergraduate degree.

In the study, African-American respondents suggested that Texas law schools’ recruiting strategies needed to embrace diversity. Unfortunately, this is often easier said than done. Fontaine (1995) stated that the problem of achieving racial diversity in
recruitment continues to be rooted in systematic attitudes and fear generated from stereotypes and myths. Moreover, until these feelings are recognized, embraced and resolved, the result will continue to be reflected in the exclusion of African-Americans and other minorities in law schools and the legal profession.

Although the implementation of affirmative action programs at many law schools was designed to provide socioeconomically disadvantaged students of color an equal opportunity to attain a legal education, law school politics and political developments have not only compromised these programs, but also the speed at which minority students enter law school. These developments have also resulted in a legal education and profession that consists of an overwhelmingly White student body from middle to upper-class families that often overshadows the obligation of law schools to educate people whose diversity reflects that of America (Lundwall, 1994; Romero, 1988). Therefore, serious questions must be addressed and resolved about the proper use of current law school admissions practices. Although some law school administrators indicated in the survey that the *Grutter* decision allowed Texas law schools to disclose the race or ethnicity of an applicant during the admissions process and that the decision would level the playing field, there was no indication from administrators of how these practices would present a compelling interest in the recruitment of a diverse student body. Moreover, the *Grutter* decision failed to address how the awarding of scholarships and other financial aid would be affected in the admissions and recruitment process. Hence, the following recommendations are being offered to law school administrators regarding, admissions practices, the offering of scholarships, and diversity:
**Recommendation Four:**

Simien (1987) stated that the underrepresentation of minority students in law schools can be attributed to facially neutral admissions practices and heavy emphasis on the Law School Aptitude Test (LSAT). Furthermore, Hathaway’s (1984) findings indicated that the test is an inaccurate predictor of academic success for minority students. Hence, to address the problems associated with LSAT scores and minority students who are viewed as at-risk students, law school administrators might offer LSAT mentoring programs that help prepare students to take the LSAT. Additionally, students in the program could compete for an LSAT prep-course certificate that would further prepare them to take the standardized test and assist with the cost of the course.

**Recommendation Five:**

Law school administrators should also consider conducting programs like Legal Education and Participation (LEAP). In this program, public, private and parochial high school students are given the opportunity to compete in a Mock Trial for a chance to advance to the National level of competition. Texas law school administrators could establish a Mock Trial Camp in which current African-American law students and local minority attorneys are encouraged to participate by coaching, judging, or providing financial assistance to students in the program. The benefits of this program would be that high school students are given a preview of court cases while working and developing relationships with attorneys and current law students. Moreover, African-American high school students would receive guidance from the legal professionals in how to develop theories, speeches, and examinations for a trial.

In order to promote this program, Texas law school administrators could establish a relationship with CLEO, LSAC, legal organizations, and/or law firms in the community to develop and finance a program similar to LEAP that would introduce at-risk applicants to the rigors of law school. Additionally, financial assistance should be incorporated into the program to increase the probability that African-American students and other minorities would be able to participate in the program. In the long-run, these programs might assist African-Americans and other minorities in making a decision about law school before they complete their undergraduate degree, and assist in graduating at-risk minority students; thereby, increasing the yield of African-Americans specifically, but minority students overall entering the legal profession.

**Recommendation Six:**

African-American law school respondents stated that Texas law schools should offer more scholarships in an effort to aggressively recruit African-American students. Although the *Grutter* decision allowed Texas law schools to disclose race or ethnicity in the admissions process, the decision was not clear regarding the awarding of scholarships and other financial aid. Therefore, Texas law schools will need to be creative in how these awards are determined and offered to minority students overall. For example, maybe Texas law schools could commit scholarship financial resources to students who are first generation graduate students, or who worked while pursuing an undergraduate
degree. Law school administrators might also offer a full-tuition scholarship to African-American students who have graduated from an HBCU. Additionally, outside organizations that provide funding and scholarships to African-American law students and other minority law students need to increase their efforts because these funds have allowed law schools to progress tremendously in the recruiting of African-American students and other minorities.

Recommendation Seven:

Bellamy (1990) stated that the most important policy makers in fostering racial diversity in legal education were law school deans. Moreover, law schools without minority faculty lack intellectual diversity and are depriving their students of the rich diverse opinions that African-Americans and other minorities bring to the classroom discussion (Bellamy, 1992). Therefore, in an effort to cultivate the promotion of African-American law professors and administrators in legal education, law school administrators should hire local minority attorneys as adjunct or part-time faculty. Additionally, African-American alumni and other minority alumni should take a more active role in providing support and counseling to current African-American law students, as well as other minority law students.

Recommendation Eight:

The American Bar Association (ABA) and the legal profession should encourage African-American students and other minorities to consider legal careers by exposing elementary and high school students to minorities in the legal profession. For example, a variety of education programs could be developed using minority lawyers to educate minority youth about the legal system in a positive manner. Moreover, Texas law schools could partner with the ABA to establish a partnership with public and private schools in Texas to provide seminars that educate African-American students and other minorities about the career opportunities in the legal profession and the academic achievement necessary to achieve the goal of becoming a lawyer. For example, current African-American law students and faculty could provide “pro bono” services that encourage youth to consider a career in the legal profession by being guest speakers and mentors in high school programs.

Recommendation Nine:

Texas law school administrators should incorporate into the curricula lectures or presentations that focus on how cultural differences affect legal rights. Additionally, all law school students and faculty should be required to participate. These lectures would not only provide law school students and faculty with a better understanding of cultural differences, but also Texas law schools would be one step closer to developing an educational environment that embraces diversity. Moreover, Texas law school administrators should develop mentor programs that better assist African-American law students and other minorities with passing the bar because the theme that continues to arise is that Texas law schools are doing somewhat well in attracting African-American students, poorly at graduating them, and abysmally in equipping them to pass the bar,
which is another reason why the percentage of African-American lawyers in the legal profession is appallingly low when compared with their numbers in the general population.

Recommendations for Future Research

This description of the factors that influence the law school choice of African-Americans enrollment in Texas law schools raises additional questions. Therefore, the following questions might be considered as a basis for investigation:

1. What are the factors preventing African-American males from pursuing a legal degree or other graduate program?

2. What are the primary motivators that influence African-American females to pursue a legal education or other graduate program?

3. What are the factor(s) influencing the enrollment of other minority students, such as Hispanics/Latinos, Asians, etc in Texas law schools?

4. Are there differences in the factor(s) that influence the law school choice of African-American students, Hispanic/Latino students, and minority students in Texas law schools?

5. What are the perceptions of Hispanic/Latino or other minority students regarding Texas law schools’ recruiting strategies of minority students?

6. What suggestions would Hispanic/Latino students and other minority students have regarding Texas law schools’ recruiting strategies of minority students?

7. Who influences the law school choice of Hispanic/Latino or other minority students, such as family, friends, professors, mentors, etc?

Other considerations for further research include: A longitudinal study involving all eight law schools should be conducted regarding the effect(s) of the Grutter decision on Texas law schools’ recruitment strategies over a period of 5 years. With the recent occurrence of the Grutter decision, Texas law school administrators have yet to experience the true effects of the decision. Further research might involve a longitudinal study of the eight Texas law schools regarding the factors that influence the law school
choice of African-American and Hispanic students attending Texas law schools. This study would be conducted over a period of 5 years and would survey prospective African-American and Hispanic students. Furthermore, the study would address the similarities and differences between the factors based on ethnicity, academic year, and gender. A final recommendation for research would involve a longitudinal study over a period of 5 to 10 years comparing the effect(s) of Hopwood v. State of Texas and Grutter v. Bollinger on the recruitment process of African-American students and other minorities in Texas law schools.

Final Comments

This study has provided a general description of the factors influencing the law school choice of African-Americans enrolling in Texas law schools. Despite the overwhelming national demand for prospective African-American students, the applicant pool is steadily dwindling. Therefore, hopefully this study has created a platform for more detailed investigations of the subject. Moreover, perhaps this study will assist Texas law school administrators in developing a survey instrument that ascertains why African-American students and other minorities choose not to attend Texas law schools thus improving their recruiting strategies. Likewise, this study might assist other researchers in developing a college choice model for African-American students and other minorities in relation to Texas law schools as well as law schools nationwide. An effective college choice model for minority students in relation to law schools would be of immense value to all law school administrators in their plight to diversify Texas law schools and law schools nationwide.
APPENDIX A

Law School Selection Survey

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS: This is a survey to determine the characteristics that were important to you in selecting the public or private law school you chose to attend in the state of Texas. Your time is greatly appreciated. BE FRANK as your responses are completely anonymous. No one will ever know the answers you give, so please be honest. If you are unsure how to answer a question, just choose the best answer for you. There are no right or wrong answers. Please try to answer all of the questions asked. Use the number two pencil provided and please fill in the circle completely.

Part A – Instructions: Respond to each item by marking in the appropriate response or by filling in the blank. Please mark the number of choices indicated. When in doubt pick the best answer(s).

1. Which of the following law schools will you be attending? (listed in alphabetical order)
   - ○ Baylor University School of Law
   - ○ South Texas College of Law
   - ○ Southern Methodist University Dedman School of Law
   - ○ St. Mary’s University School of Law
   - ○ Texas Southern University Thurgood Marshall School of Law
   - ○ Texas Tech University School of Law
   - ○ Texas Wesleyan University School of Law
   - ○ University of Houston Law Center
   - ○ University of Texas School of Law

2. Where will you be coming to law school from (state)?

   __________________________________________

3. I have earned the following degrees to date:
   Choose all that apply:
   ○ bachelor
   ○ professional
   ○ master’s
   ○ doctoral
4. I earned my first bachelor degree at ______________________ in ______
   (Please fill in the undergraduate institution and the correct year.)

5. Age:
   Choose one: ○ 24 or less ○ 31-35 ○ 46-60
   ○ 25-30 ○ 36-45 ○ 61+

6. Sex:
   Choose one: ○ Female ○ Male

7. Marital Status:
   Choose one: ○ Single ○ Divorced ○ Married for the First Time
   ○ Separated ○ Widowed ○ Steady Relationship
   ○ Remarried

8. Number of children and/or dependents in my home.
   Choose one: ○ 0 ○ 1 ○ 2
   ○ 3 ○ 4 ○ 5+

9. I was actively involved in a full-time career or occupation (including childcare or maintaining the household) prior to entering law school.
   Choose one: ○ Yes (please continue to answer all questions)
   ○ No (please skip ahead to question 12)

10. For how many years were you involved in that (those) career(s)?
    Choose one: ○ 1-4 ○ 9-12 ○ 17-21
    ○ 5-8 ○ 13-16 ○ 22+ years

11. I left that position because I:
    Choose one: ○ retired ○ took a leave ○ was laid off
    ○ quit ○ still work in the position
    ○ was fired
    ○ had my position eliminated/business closed
    ○ Other, Please Specify ____________________________
12. The best term(s) to describe these occupation(s) prior to law school is(are) ________________________________ (e.g. teacher, nurse, etc.)

13. Up to today, I have been enrolled in post-secondary education, full-time for:  
   Choose one: ☐ 0 ☐ 1-4 ☐ 5-8 ☐ 9-13 ☐ 14 + years

14. Up to today, I have been enrolled in post-secondary education, part-time for:  
   Choose one: ☐ 0 ☐ 1-4 ☐ 5-8 ☐ 9-13 ☐ 14 + years

15. My undergraduate major(s) was(were) ________________________________

16. Ten years after law school graduation, I would like to be a(n):  
   Choose one: ☐ law firm partner ☐ judge  
              ☐ corporation’s lawyer ☐ politician  
              ☐ public interest lawyer ☐ government employee  
              ☐ other____________________

17. My household’s income last year was $:  
   Choose one: ☐ under 10,000 ☐ 20,001-35,000 ☐ 75,001-125,000  
              ☐ 10,001-15,000 ☐ 35,001-50,000 ☐ 125,001-200,000  
              ☐ 15,001-20,000 ☐ 50,001-75,000 ☐ 200,001+

18. Who had a major influence in your law school selection process?  
   ☐ no one ☐ parents ☐ spouse ☐ friends  
   ☐ other family members ☐ professor ☐ mentor ____________  
   ☐ other __________________

   Please elaborate on how the individual(s) affected your law school selection process.
19. What are your perceptions of the minority recruiting strategies of the law school you have chosen to attend in relation to African-American students?

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

20. What suggestion(s) do you have for the law school you have chosen to attend in regards to their recruiting strategies of minority students, specifically African-American students?

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________
Part B – Instructions: Please rate each of the characteristics below based on YOUR PERCEPTION OF HOW IMPORTANT EACH CHARACTERISTIC was in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. There are no right or wrong answers: just choose the best answer for you. Please mark only one choice for each characteristic given.

(1 = Not at All Important; 2 = Not Important; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Important; 5 = Very Important)

Characteristics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01. The admissions process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02. Racial/Ethnic diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03. Academic reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04. Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05. Financial aid offer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06. Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07. Quality of faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08. African-American Student/Faculty ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09. Social atmosphere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Size of law school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Geographical location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Campus visit experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Opportunities for part-time employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Scholarships (amount offered by the law school)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Distance from home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Assurance of Employment after Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Supportive on-campus/off-campus organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Faculty sensitivity to minority needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Minority faculty as role models and mentors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more jobs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using the previous 20 characteristics, select in order of importance the FIVE characteristics that were most important to you in selecting the law school you have chosen to attend. ENTER THE NUMBERS “1-5” IN THE SPACE PROVIDED BELOW. PLEASE REMEMBER THAT “1” REPRESENTS THE CHARACTERISTIC THAT IS MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU AND “5” REPRESENTS THE LEAST.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To help improve communication with the students, please rate HOW IMPORTANT the information and contacts you received from the law school you have chosen to attend WERE IN THE LAW SCHOOL SELECTION PROCESS.

(1 = Not at All Important; 2 = Not Important; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Important; 5 = Very Important)

21. Contact with admissions staff
22. Frequency and quality of mail communications
23. Frequency and quality of telephone contacts
24. Financial aid communications
25. University publications
26. Contact with current students
27. Contact with faculty
28. Contact with alumni
29. Off-campus receptions in your area
30. On or off-campus interviews
Part C – Instructions: Financial Aid Information: Respond to each item by marking in the appropriate response or by filling in the blank. When in doubt pick the best answer(s) for you.

1. How important were financial considerations in your college decision?
   - Very Important
   - Important
   - Neutral
   - Not Important
   - Not at All Important

2. My legal education is financed primarily by:
   Choose one: ……
   - myself
   - my spouse
   - loans
   - scholarships
   - my family
   - my employer
   - military V.A. benefits
   - tuition waiver
   - other (Please explain: __________________________)

3. Did you receive a scholarship or financial aid award from the law school you chose to attend?
   - Yes
   - No  (If no skip to #5)

4. How did the scholarship or financial aid award compare to the other law schools you were interested in attending?
   - The law school you are attending was better.
   - The financial aid award packages were about the same.
   - The law school you are attending financial aid awards’ package was less.
5. How did the loan amount in the financial aid award package of the law school you chose to attend compare to the award you received at the other law schools you were considering?
   o The law school I plan to attend had more money.
   o All of the law schools were about the same.
   o The law school that I plan to attend had less money.
   o No loan in either package.

   How much more or less loan? ________________

6. Would it have cost you more to attend another law school next year (out of pocket) than you’ll be paying at the law school you chose to attend?
   o The law school I plan to attend was more.
   o All of the law schools were about the same.
   o The law school I plan to attend was less.

   How much more or less per academic year? __________

In addition to the law school that you chose to attend, what other law schools did you apply to? WHY?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Additional Comments (Please provide any additional comments or suggestions that you think would be helpful but were not addressed in the survey.)
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX B

Initial E-mail Sent to the Deans of Texas Law Schools

Good morning Dean __________.

This e-mail is being sent to you based on the recommendation of Dr. Robert C. Cloud, Chairman of the Educational Administration Department at Baylor University and chair of my dissertation. Little empirical research has been conducted on law students, especially African-American law students relative to college choice in the state of Texas. Although most institutions of higher education are making strides to increase their minority enrollment, the under-representation of Blacks is almost nowhere as visible as in the nation’s law schools. Thus, I am requesting a formal meeting with you at your convenience to discuss my dissertation topic: *Factors Influencing African-American Students Enrollment in Texas Law Schools* and the possibility of your dynamic and forward moving law school participating in this significant project.

The problem of this study will be identifying the factors that affect the law school choice of prospective African-American students. In addition, the study will have the following purposes:

1. To identify the relative factor(s) affecting the law school choice of prospective African-American students in the state of Texas;
2. To determine if there are differences in the choice determinants of African-American students in public and private Texas law schools;
3. To describe certain demographic characteristics of African-American students enrolled in Texas law schools;
4. To determine the perceptions of African-American students related to the minority recruiting strategies of Texas law schools;
5. To determine the perceptions of Texas law schools from an institutional point of view regarding the effectiveness of their minority recruiting strategies in relation to African-American students;
6. To determine the effect(s) of certain legal cases in Texas and Michigan on the recruitment and/or college choice of African-American law students; and
7. To determine the effect(s) of certain legal cases in Texas and Michigan on the recruitment strategies of Texas law schools in relation to African-American students.

Should you choose to participate in this study, I wish to assure you that results of the survey will not be tied to any individual person or school. I would be pleased to prepare an individualized report of your school’s results and send it to you upon your request. It is the investigator’s wish to maintain anonymity, professionalism and ease of administration during the course of the study. If you have any questions, please contact me by e-mail at Janis_Hunter@baylor.edu or by telephone at (254) 710-8935.
Thank you for your time in advance and I look forward to hearing from you soon. Have a blessed day.

Janis A. Hunter, M.S.Ed.
Doctoral Candidate – Scholars of Practice Program (Department of Educational Administration)
Office of Academic Scholarships and Financial Aid
One Bear Place #97028
Waco, TX 76798-7028
1-800-BAYLOR-U
(254) 710-2611 (office)
(254) 710-2695 (fax)
Financial_Aid@baylor.edu
APPENDIX C

Interview Protocol for Deans/Administrators of Texas Law Schools

Question #1: What recruitment strategies did your institution have in place for African-American students before *Hopwood v. State of Texas*?

Question #2: What effect(s) has *Hopwood v. State of Texas* had on your institution regarding the recruitment of prospective African-American students?

Question #3: How have your institution’s recruiting strategies of African-American students changed as a result of the *Hopwood* decision?

Question #4: In your opinion, what effect(s) has *Hopwood v. State of Texas* had on the recruitment strategies of the nine law schools in the state of Texas overall?

Question #5: From an institutional standpoint, how do you perceive the effectiveness of your institution’s minority recruiting strategies in relation to African-American students?

Question #6: Will your recruiting strategies of African-American students change as a result of the *Grutter v. Bollinger* decision? How?

Question #7: In your opinion, what effect(s) will *Grutter v. Bollinger* have on the recruitment strategies of the nine law schools in the state of Texas overall?
APPENDIX D

Informed Consent Form

I have agreed to participate in the research project titled: *Factors Influencing African-American Students Enrollment in Texas Law Schools*, conducted by Janis A. Hunter, a doctoral candidate in the Scholars of Practice program at Baylor University. I have been informed that the purpose of this study is to identify the relative factors affecting the law school choice of prospective African-American students in the state of Texas.

I understand that if I agree to participate in this study, I will be asked questions about my background and to identify the relative factors that affected my college choice decision. I will be asked these questions in the *Law School Selection Survey* that will be administered during the orientation process. It is estimated that this survey will last approximately 15-30 minutes.

I am aware that my participation is voluntary and that my refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which I would otherwise be entitled. I further understand that my participation may be withdrawn at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which I would otherwise be entitled and that if I have additional questions concerning this research, I may contact Janis A. Hunter at 1215 W. 7th Street, Apt. A., Clifton, Texas 76634 or telephone her at 254-709-4758. In addition, I understand that questions may be directed to Dr. Robert C. Cloud, Ms. Hunter’s Faculty Advisor, at 254-710-6110.

I understand that the intended benefits of this study include empirically identifying the relative factors that affect the law school choice of prospective African-American students in the state of Texas.

I have been informed that the foreseeable risk of participating in this study may be that I experience some discomfort in being candid with the researcher. I further understand that I may choose not to answer any question on the *Law School Selection Survey*. Additionally, I understand that all information gathered during this study is confidential and that my confidentiality will be protected by assigned code numbers, by limitations of who has access to data, by data storage in locked cabinets, by locked computer files, etc.

I understand that inquiries regarding my rights as a subject, or any other aspect of the research as it relates to my participation as a subject, can be directed to Baylor’s *University Committee for Protection of Human Subjects in Research*. The chairman is Dr. Matthew Stanford, Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, P.O. Box 97334, Waco, Texas 76798, phone number 254-710-2236.
I understand that my consent to participate in this project does not constitute a waiver of any legal rights or redress I may have as a result of my participation, and I acknowledge that I have received a copy of this consent form.

Signature of Subject        Date
APPENDIX E

Cover Letter Sent to Law School Administrators

Date:

Name
Title
School
Address

Dear Dean __________________:

Your school’s willingness to participate in this study is greatly appreciated. For your convenience, enclosed you will find the materials needed to administer successfully the Law School Selection Survey.

This packet contains the following items:

• 1 - Instructions for Administration Sheet
• # copies of the Law School Selection Survey
• # number 2 pencils which can be used by the students and are theirs to keep as a “Thank You” for completing the survey
• # copies of Informed Consent Forms to be completed by the students and returned with the completed surveys. (Please note that the students must keep one copy of the Consent form.)
• 1 - Administrator’s Information Sheet to be completed and returned with the completed surveys.
• 1 - Self-addressed, stamped, priority mail envelope.

The administrator of the survey should double-check to make sure that all the above items are present and read the Instructions for Administration Sheet prior to the administration of the survey. On the day of the survey, follow the instruction sheet as closely as possible. Any deviations from the listed instructions should be noted on the Administrator’s Information Sheet.
If you have any questions or should there be any confusion in any of the instructions, please contact Janis A. Hunter at 254-709-4758 or 254-710-8935. I am also available by Internet at Janis_Hunter@baylor.edu or superj@rapidcable.com.

Again, I thank you for your time and effort in this matter. I look forward to sharing the results of this study with you.

Sincerely,

Janis A. Hunter  
Doctoral Candidate – Scholars of Practice Program  
Department of Educational Administration  
Baylor University  
JAH/jah  
Enclosure
APPENDIX F

Instructions for Administration Sheet:

(2004-2005 Pilot Study)

Law School Selection Survey

Administration of the survey:

1. The Law School Selection Survey is designed to be administered in a proctored situation during the first-year.

2. For the pilot study, the form should be completed by your recently enrolled 2004-2005 African-American class.

3. In regards to the remainder of the study, this form should be completed by your entering African-American students for the 2005-2006 academic year at a date and time agreed upon by the researcher and institution participating in the study.

4. This survey is designed to identify the relative factors affecting the law school choice of prospective African-American students in the state of Texas. In order for the results of the survey to be reliable and valid, these instructions must be followed. Since the data collected here will be used with data obtained at other schools, a uniform method of administering the survey is needed.

Who to survey:

1. For the pilot study, this survey should be administered to ALL African-American students who were recently enrolled in the 2004-2005 academic year.

2. In regards to the remainder of the study, this survey should be administered to ALL entering African-American students for the 2005-2006 academic year at a date and time agreed upon by the researcher and institution participating in the study.

3. The administrations should be monitored and done in a manner similar to a classroom test.

4. The total time estimated for administration of this survey is approximately 15-30 minutes; however, it is not a timed test and students should be allowed ample time to complete the survey.
Participation and administration:

1. Participation in this survey must be voluntary. However, the scale is designed to be administered in a proctored setting. Therefore, it is essential that the statements below be read exactly as written. Students must be aware that their participation is voluntary.

2. Please ask the students for their attention. State:

For the pilot study:
“Today, all currently enrolled, first-year African-American students for the 2004-2005 academic year are being asked to participate in a survey to identify the relative factors affecting the law school choice of prospective African-American students in the state of Texas. Before you begin the survey, I will be passing out an “Informed Consent Form” that explains your rights as a participant in this study, that your responses will be kept anonymous, and that your participation is voluntary. Once you have completed the “Informed Consent Form,” please pass one copy forward, keep one copy for your records and we will continue with the survey.

As I read the instructions, I will be passing out the survey. Please do not separate the survey or write your name on the survey. Please wait for my signal before beginning.” (At this point, pass out the survey and the pencils.)

“This study is designed to help future generations of African-American law students. Results of your participation may also be beneficial to (name of your school), since we will receive complete tabulations of your responses to compare with the responses of other schools. You need to know, however, that your participation is voluntary. If you choose not to participate, please sit quietly, the survey will be completed shortly.”

After all students who are going to participate have their form and pencil, state:

“Please use the number 2 pencil provided and read all of the instructions carefully.

When you have completed the survey, please return it to the front of the room. You may keep the pencil as a small “Thank You” for completing the survey. You may begin now.”

3. The researcher will collect the completed surveys and place them along with any unused surveys.

4. The completed surveys will be analyzed by the researcher at a later date.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE!
Instructions for Administration Sheet:

(2005-2006)

Law School Selection Survey

Administration of the survey:

1. The Law School Selection Survey is designed to be administered in a proctored situation during the first-year.

2. For the pilot study, the form should be completed by your recently enrolled 2004-2005 African-American class.

3. In regards to the remainder of the study, this form should be completed by your entering African-American students for the 2005-2006 academic year at a date and time agreed upon by the researcher and institution participating in the study.

4. This survey is designed to identify the relative factors affecting the law school choice of prospective African-American students in the state of Texas. In order for the results of the survey to be reliable and valid, these instructions must be followed. Since the data collected here will be used with data obtained at other schools, a uniform method of administering the survey is needed.

Who to survey:

1. For the pilot study, this survey should be administered to ALL African-American students who were recently enrolled in the 2004-2005 academic year.

2. In regards to the remainder of the study, this survey should be administered to ALL entering African-American students for the 2005-2006 academic year at a date and time agreed upon by the researcher and institution participating in the study.

3. The administrations should be monitored and done in a manner similar to a classroom test.

4. The total time estimated for administration of this survey is approximately 15-30 minutes; however, it is not a timed test and students should be allowed ample time to complete the survey.

Participation and administration:

1. Participation in this survey must be voluntary. However, the scale is designed to be administered in a proctored setting. Therefore, it is essential that the statements
below be read exactly as written. Students must be aware that their participation is voluntary.

2. Please ask the students for their attention. State:

For the entering class during orientation:
“Today, all currently enrolled, first-year African-American students for the 2005-2006 academic year are being asked to participate in a survey to identify the relative factors affecting the law school choice of prospective African-American students in the state of Texas. Before you begin the survey, I will be passing out an “Informed Consent Form” that explains your rights as a participant in this study, that your responses will be kept anonymous, and that your participation is voluntary. Once you have completed the “Informed Consent Form,” please pass one copy forward, keep one copy for your records and we will continue with the survey.

As I read the instructions, I will be passing out the survey. Please do not separate the survey or write your name on the survey. Please wait for my signal before beginning.”

(At this point, pass out the survey and the pencils.)

“This study is designed to help future generations of African-American law students. Results of your participation may also be beneficial to (name of your school), since we will receive complete tabulations of your responses to compare with the responses of other schools. You need to know, however, that your participation is voluntary. If you choose not to participate, please sit quietly, the survey will be completed shortly.”

After all students who are going to participate have their form and pencil, state:

“Please use the number 2 pencil provided and read all of the instructions carefully.

When you have completed the survey, please return it to the front of the room. You may keep the pencil as a small “Thank You” for completing the survey. You may begin now.”

3. Collect the completed surveys and place them along with any unused surveys.

4. The completed surveys will be analyzed by the researcher at a later date.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE!
APPENDIX G

Administrator’s Information Sheet:

(2004-2005 Pilot Study)

*Law School Selection Survey*

SURVEY ADMINISTRATORS – PLEASE COMPLETE THIS FORM AND RETURN IT WITH THE COMPLETED SURVEYS.

1. We have __________ entering African-American Students for the 2004-2005 academic year.

2. Of those enrolled for the 2004-2005 academic year, __________ entering African-American students chose to participate in the study.

3. Of those enrolled for the 2004-2005 academic year, __________ entering African-American students were excused or chose not to participate in the study.

4. I, ____________________________________, certify that I administered the *Law School Selection Survey* to our African-American students entering in the 2004-2005 academic year on __________________, 2005. I further certify that the students were informed of the voluntary nature of their participation. I additionally certify that I followed the Instructions for Administration Sheet enclosed in the administration packets, except for those stated below.

   **Exceptions in this administration:**
   
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

   Signature: ___________________________ Date: ____________

   Title: __________________________________________________
Administrator’s Information Sheet:  
(2005-2006 Study)

Law School Selection Survey

SURVEY ADMINISTRATORS – PLEASE COMPLETE THIS FORM AND RETURN IT WITH THE COMPLETED SURVEYS.

1. We expected ________ First-Year African-American Students for the 2005-2006 academic year during orientation.

2. Of those expected, ________ First-Year African-American students actually attended orientation.

3. Of those that attended orientation ________ First-Year African-American students chose not to participate in the study.

4. ________ First-Year African-American students will actually matriculate, but were excused from orientation.

5. I, ____________________________________, certify that I administered the Law School Selection Survey to our First-Year African-American students entering in the 2005-2006 academic year on August ________________, 2005. I further certify that the students were informed of the voluntary nature of their participation. I additionally certify that I followed the Instructions for Administration Sheet enclosed in the administration packets, except for those stated below.

Exceptions in this administration:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Signature: _________________________________________ Date: ____________

Title: __________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX H

Letter to Mr. Kelly Frels: President – State Bar of Texas

Date: ________________

Kelly Frels
President - State Bar of Texas
South Tower – Pennzoil Place
711 Louisiana Street, Suite 2900
Houston, TX 77002-2781

Dear Mr. Frels:

This letter and prospectus are being sent to you based on the recommendation of Dr. Robert C. Cloud, Chairman of the Educational Administration Department at Baylor University and chair of my dissertation. Little empirical research has been conducted on law students, especially African-American law students relative to college choice in the state of Texas. Although most institutions of higher education are making strides to increase their minority enrollment, the under-representation of Blacks is almost nowhere as visible as in the nation’s law schools. Despite the amount of resources and new recruitment strategies that have been employed by the University of Texas law school, Mike Sharlot, dean of the UT law school stated that under Hopwood, there is no way that the University of Texas can achieve the level of diversity that they had obtained in the past.

The purpose of this study will be to identify the relative factors affecting the law school choice of prospective African-American students in the state of Texas. Mr. Frels, if you believe that the State Bar of Texas would be interested in a study of this nature, it would be my pleasure to prepare a final copy of the report and send it to you upon your request. I wish to assure you that the results of the survey will not be tied to any individual person or law school. It is the investigator’s wish to maintain anonymity of the law schools and subjects, as well as professionalism during the course of the study. If you have any concerns, please write or call me at (254) 709-4758.

Please note that each Dean will receive a copy of the study. For your convenience, I have enclosed a prospectus for your review regarding the contents of my study. I would like to thank you in advance for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Janis A. Hunter
Doctoral Candidate – Scholars of Practice Program
Baylor University’s Department of Educational Administration
APPENDIX I

Reply Form

From: Dean ____________________

To: Janis A. Hunter
    Doctoral Candidate – Scholars of Practice Program
    Baylor University

☐ Yes, I wish to allow ______ name of the institution ______ to participate in this study:
    *Factors Influencing African-American Students Enrollment in Texas Law Schools.*

    You may contact _________________________________________ of my
    staff at (__________) _________ - ______________ to coordinate the
    administration of the surveys during the 2005 spring semester/quarter and
    during the 2005-2006 academic year.

    Our first-year class for the 2004-2005 academic year consists of
    _________________ African-American students.

    We expect our first-year class for the 2005-2006 academic year to consist of
    _________________ African-American students.

    I understand that name of law school will be provided with all the needed
    forms and that the completed surveys need to be returned immediately.

☐ No, we cannot participate in this study.
APPENDIX J

Follow-Up E-mail Sent to the Deans of Texas Law Schools

Good afternoon Dean _____________________,

This is a follow-up e-mail to the one sent on January 31, 2005 requesting a meeting to discuss African-American law students. As stated in the previous correspondence, this e-mail is being sent to you based on the recommendations of Dr. Robert C. Cloud, Chairman of the Educational Administration Department at Baylor University and chair of my dissertation. Little empirical research has been conducted on law students, especially African-American law students relative to college choice in the state of Texas. Although most institutions of higher education are making strides to increase their minority enrollment, the under-representation of Blacks is almost nowhere as visible as in the nation’s law schools. Thus, I am requesting a formal meeting with you at your convenience to discuss my dissertation topic: *Factors Influencing African-American Students Enrollment in Texas Law Schools* and the possibility of your dynamic and forward moving law school participating in this significant project.

The problem of this study will be identifying the factors that affect the law school choice of prospective African-American students. In addition, the study will have the following purposes:

1. To identify the relative factor(s) affecting the law school choice of prospective African-American students in the state of Texas;
2. To determine if there are differences in the choice determinants of African-American students attending public and private Texas law schools;
3. To describe certain demographic characteristics of African-American students enrolled in Texas law schools;
4. To determine the perceptions of African-American students related to the minority recruiting strategies of Texas law schools;
5. To determine the perceptions of Texas law schools from an institutional point of view regarding the effectiveness of their minority recruiting strategies in relation to African-American students;
6. To determine the effect(s) of certain legal cases in Texas and Michigan on the recruitment and/or college choice of African-American law students; and
7. To determine the effect(s) of certain legal cases in Texas and Michigan on the recruitment strategies of Texas law schools in relation to African-American students.

Should you choose to participate in this study, I wish to assure you that results of the survey will not be tied to any individual person or school. I would be pleased to prepare an individualized report of your school’s results and send it to you upon your request. It
is the investigator’s wish to maintain anonymity, professionalism and ease of administration during the course of the study. If you have any questions, please contact me by e-mail at Janis_Hunter@baylor.edu or by telephone at (254) 709-4758 (cell) or (254) 710-8935 (work).

Thank you for your time in advance and I look forward to hearing from you soon. Have a blessed day.

Janis A. Hunter, M.S.Ed.
Doctoral Candidate – Scholars of Practice Program (Department of Educational Administration)
Counselor
Office of Academic Scholarships and Financial Aid
One Bear Place #97028
Waco, TX 76798-7028
1-800-BAYLOR-U
(254) 710-2611 (office)
(254) 710-2695 (fax)
Financial_Aid@baylor.edu
Initial E-mail Sent for the Dean/Administrators Interview Protocol Form

Good afternoon ____ name of the administrator ___,

This e-mail is being sent to you based on our previous discussion regarding my study titled: *Factors Influencing African-American Students Enrollment in Texas Law Schools*. The primary objective of this study will be to identify the factors that affect the law school choice of prospective African-American students. In order to complete this task, I need you to complete the “Deans/Administrators Interview Protocol Form”. For your convenience, the form has been enclosed in this e-mail in a word document. Please answer the eight questions in as much depth as possible and forward the information back to me via e-mail.

I believe that your participation in my study will provide valuable feedback in determining the factors that influence African-American students’ enrollment in Texas law schools. Additionally, I wish to assure you that the results of the survey will not be tied to any individual person or school. It is the investigator’s wish to maintain anonymity, professionalism and ease of administration during the course of the study.

If you have any questions, please contact me by e-mail at Janis_Hunter@baylor.edu or by telephone at (254) 709-4758 (cell) or (254) 710-8935 (work).

Thank you in advance for your participation. It is greatly appreciated and your feedback is important.

Sincerely,

Janis A. Hunter, M.S.Ed.
Office of Academic Scholarships and Financial Aid
One Bear Place #97028
Waco, TX  76798-7028
1-800-BAYLOR-U
(254) 710-2611 (office)
(254) 710-2695 (fax)
Financial_Aid@baylor.edu

Your inquires regarding your rights as a subject, or any other aspect of the research as it relates to your participation as a subject can be directed to Baylor’s University Committee for Protection of Human Subjects in Research. The chairman is Dr. Matthew Stanford, Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, One Bear Place #97334, Waco, Texas 76798, phone number (254) 710-2236.
Follow-up E-mail Sent for the Deans/Administrators Interview Protocol Form

Good afternoon _____ name of the administrator ___,

This follow-up e-mail is being sent to you based on our previous discussion regarding my study titled: *Factors Influencing African-American Students Enrollment in Texas Law Schools*. The primary objective of this study will be to identify the factors that affect the law school choice of prospective African-American students. In order to complete this task, I need you to complete the “Deans/Administrators Interview Protocol Form”. For your convenience, the form has been enclosed in this e-mail in a word document. Please answer the eight questions in as much depth as possible and forward the information back to me via e-mail.

I believe that your participation in my study will provide valuable feedback in determining the factors that influence African-American students’ enrollment in Texas law schools. Additionally, I wish to assure you that the results of the survey will not be tied to any individual person or school. It is the investigator’s wish to maintain anonymity, professionalism and ease of administration during the course of the study.

If you have any questions, please contact me by e-mail at Janis_Hunter@baylor.edu or by telephone at (254) 709-4758 (cell) or (254) 710-8935 (work).

Thank you in advance for your participation as I know that you are very busy individuals. It is greatly appreciated and your feedback is important.

Sincerely,

Janis A. Hunter, M.S.Ed.
Doctoral Candidate – Scholars of Practice Program
Office of Academic Scholarships and Financial Aid
One Bear Place #97028
Waco, TX 76798-7028
Office: 254-710-8935
Cell: 254-709-4758
Janis_Hunter@baylor.edu

Your inquiries regarding your rights as a subject, or any other aspect of the research as it relates to your participation as a subject can be directed to Baylor’s University Committee for Protection of Human Subjects in Research. The chairman is Dr. Matthew Stanford, Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, One Bear Place #97334, Waco, Texas 76798, phone number (254) 710-2236.
APPENDIX M

Initial Request Sent for the Electronic Version of the Survey by E-mail

Greetings,

This is being sent to you based on the recommendations of Dean __________ and Assistant Dean ___________. Little empirical research has been conducted on law students, especially African-American law students relative to college choice in the state of Texas. Although most institutions of higher education are making strides to increase their minority enrollment, the under-representation of Blacks is almost nowhere as visible as in the nation's law schools. Thus, I am conducting a study titled: Factors Influencing African-American Students Enrollment in Texas Law Schools and I need your help.

The primary objective of this study will be to identify the factors that affect the law school choice of prospective African-American students. In order to accomplish this task, I need the African-American students that were admitted for the _________ academic year to complete this survey. I believe that your participation in my study would provide valuable feedback in determining the factors that influence African-American students' enrollment in Texas law schools. Just click on the link below to take the survey.


The survey should take 15-30 minutes to complete and will not use any information that could be used to personally identify you. The survey will be available online until the study is concluded, but please consider taking a moment right now to complete it. Your participation and feedback will provide valuable information for Texas law schools as they strive to recruit more African-American students.

Should you choose to participate in this study, I wish to assure you once again that the results of the survey will not be tied to any individual person or school. It is the investigator's wish to maintain anonymity, professionalism and ease of administration during the course of the study. In an effort to maintain anonymity of the respondents and for statistical purposes, this survey can be taken ONLY ONCE from the SAME COMPUTER.

If you have any questions, please contact me by at Janis_Hunter@baylor.edu or by telephone at (254) 709-4758 (cell) or (254) 710-8935 (work).
Thank you in advance for your participation. It is greatly appreciated and your feedback is important.

Sincerely,

Janis A. Hunter, M.S.Ed.
Office of Academic Scholarships and Financial Aid
One Bear Place #97028
Waco, Texas 76798-7028
1-800-BAYLOR-U
(254) 710-8935 (office)
(254) 710-2695 (fax)
Financial_Aid@baylor.edu

Your inquiries regarding your rights as a subject, or any other aspect of the research as it relates to your participation as a subject can be directed to Baylor's University Committee for Protection of Human Subjects in Research. The chairman is Dr. Matthew Stanford, Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, One Bear Place #97334, Waco, Texas 76798, phone number (254) 710-2236.

Electronic communication may be subject to interception while the information is in transit. It is possible that a third party could see the information you submit through the web-based survey mentioned above; however, you will not be asked to provide any information (name, email address, etc.) that could be used to identify you personally.
APPENDIX N

First Follow-Up Sent for the Electronic Version of the Survey by E-mail

Greetings,

My name is Janis Hunter and I am a doctoral candidate at Baylor University conducting a study about African-American law students. This follow-up is being sent to you based on the recommendations and approval of Dean ______________ and Assistant Dean ________________.

Several weeks ago you received a request to participate in a survey about the factors that influence African-American students’ enrollment in a Texas law school. If you are one of those who have already completed the questionnaire, please accept my sincere thanks.

For the others who have not yet had an opportunity to respond, please take a few minutes to read the information below and complete the survey. Your response is important to the success of this project because it will provide valuable information for Texas law schools as they strive to recruit more African-American students. According to the Law School Admissions Council (LSAC), there were approximately 11,000 African-American students that applied to at least one law school in the nation during the 2004-2005 academic year. Of the number of students that applied, only 754 applied to law schools in the state of Texas, less than 7 percent. Of the 7 percent that applied, a smaller percentage of those students actually attended law schools in the state of Texas.

Therefore, the feedback that you provide in this survey would be instrumental in helping Texas law schools better understand what is needed to recruit and retain more African-American students. Please help me in this plight to assist law schools in recruiting and retaining more African-American students.

For your convenience, a copy of the original I sent you is provided below with the link to access the survey on-line.

My name is Janis Hunter and I am a doctoral candidate at Baylor University conducting a study about African-American law students. This is being sent to you based on the recommendations and approval of Dean ______________ and Assistant Dean _________________. Little empirical research has been conducted on law students, especially African-American law students relative to college choice in the state of Texas. Although most institutions of higher education are making strides to increase their minority enrollment, the under-representation of Blacks is almost nowhere as visible as in the nation’s law schools. Thus, I am conducting a study titled: Factors Influencing African-American Students Enrollment in Texas Law Schools and I need your help.
The primary objective of this study will be to identify the factors that affect the law school choice of prospective African-American students. In order to accomplish this task, I need the African-American students that were admitted for the ____________ academic year to complete this survey. I believe that your participation in my study would provide valuable feedback in determining the factors that influence African-American students’ enrollment in Texas law schools. Just click on the link below to take the survey.


The survey should take 10-15 minutes to complete and will not use any information that could be used to personally identify you. The survey will be available online until the study is concluded, but please consider taking a moment right now to complete it. Your participation and feedback will provide valuable information for Texas law schools as they strive to recruit more African-American students.

Should you choose to participate in this study, I wish to assure you once again that the results of the survey will not be tied to any individual person or school. It is the investigator’s wish to maintain anonymity, professionalism and ease of administration during the course of the study. In an effort to maintain anonymity of the respondents and for statistical purposes, this survey can be taken ONLY ONCE from the SAME COMPUTER.

If you have any questions, please contact me by at Janis_Hunter@baylor.edu or by telephone at (254) 709-4758 (cell) or (254) 710-8935 (work).

Thank you in advance for your participation. It is greatly appreciated and your feedback is important.

Sincerely,

Janis A. Hunter, M.S.Ed.
Doctoral Candidate – Scholars of Practice Program (Baylor University)
Office of Academic Scholarships and Financial Aid
One Bear Place #97028
Waco, Texas 76798-7028
1-800-BAYLOR-U
(254) 710-8935 (office)
(254) 710-2695 (fax)
Financial_Aid@baylor.edu

Your inquiries regarding your rights as a subject, or any other aspect of the research as it relates to your participation as a subject can be directed to Baylor's University Committee for Protection of Human Subjects in Research. The chairman is Dr. Matthew Stanford, Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, One Bear Place #97334, Waco, Texas 76798, phone number (254) 710-2236.
Electronic communication may be subject to interception while the information is in transit. It is possible that a third party could see the information you submit through the web-based survey mentioned above; however, you will not be asked to provide any information (name, email address, etc.) that could be used to identify you personally.
Greetings,

My name is Janis Hunter and I am a doctoral candidate at Baylor University conducting a study about African-American law students. This follow-up is being sent to you based on the recommendations and approval of Dean ________________ and Assistant Dean ________________.

Several months ago you received a request to participate in a survey about the factors that influence African-American students’ enrollment in a Texas law school. If you are one of those who have already completed the questionnaire, please accept my sincere THANKS.

For the others who have not yet had an opportunity to respond, please take a few minutes to read the information below and complete the survey. *I know that you are busy individuals, but the survey will only take 5-10 minutes of your time.* Your response is important to the success of this project because it will provide valuable information for Texas law schools as they strive to recruit more African-American students.

In addition, the feedback that you provide in this survey would be instrumental in helping Texas law schools better understand what is needed to recruit and retain more African-American students. Please help me in this plight to assist law schools in recruiting and retaining more African-American students.

In order to accomplish this task, I need the African-American students that were admitted for the ________________ academic year to complete this survey. I believe that your participation in my study would provide valuable feedback in determining the factors that influence African-American students’ enrollment in Texas law schools. Just click on the link below to take the survey.


The survey should take 5-10 minutes to complete and will not use any information that could be used to personally identify you. The survey will be available online until the study is concluded, but please consider taking a moment right now to complete it. Your participation and feedback will provide valuable information for Texas law schools as they strive to recruit more African-American students.
Should you choose to participate in this study, I wish to assure you once again that the results of the survey will not be tied to any individual person or school. It is the investigator’s wish to maintain anonymity, professionalism and ease of administration during the course of the study. In an effort to maintain anonymity of the respondents and for statistical purposes, this survey can be taken ONLY ONCE from the SAME COMPUTER.

If you have any questions, please contact me by at Janis_Hunter@baylor.edu or by telephone at (254) 709-4758 (cell) or (254) 710-8935 (work).

Thank you in advance for your participation. It is greatly appreciated and your feedback is important.

Sincerely,

Janis A. Hunter, M.S.Ed.
Doctoral Candidate – Scholars of Practice Program (Baylor University)
Office of Academic Scholarships and Financial Aid
One Bear Place #97028
Waco, Texas 76798-7028
1-800-BAYLOR-U
(254) 710-8935 (office)
(254) 710-2695 (fax)
Financial_Aid@baylor.edu

Your inquires regarding your rights as a subject, or any other aspect of the research as it relates to your participation as a subject can be directed to Baylor's University Committee for Protection of Human Subjects in Research. The chairman is Dr. Matthew Stanford, Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, One Bear Place #97334, Waco, Texas 76798, phone number (254) 710-2236.

Electronic communication may be subject to interception while the information is in transit. It is possible that a third party could see the information you submit through the web-based survey mentioned above; however, you will not be asked to provide any information (name, email address, etc.) that could be used to identify you personally.
APPENDIX P

E-mail Sent for the Electronic Version of the Survey at the Law School

To: ______ Academic year ______ Entering Law Students
   ____ Name of the Law School

From: Janis Hunter, M.S.Ed.
       Doctoral Candidate
       Department of Educational Administration – Scholars of Practice
       Baylor University

This memo is being sent to you based on the recommendations of Dean ____________
and Assistant Dean ____________. Little empirical research has been conducted on
law students, especially African-American law students relative to college choice in the
state of Texas. Although most institutions of higher education are making strides to
increase their minority enrollment, the underrepresentation of Blacks is almost nowhere
as visible as in the nation’s law schools.

In a study conducted by the Law School Admissions Council (LSAC), there were
approximately 10,674 African-American students that applied to at least one law school
in the nation during the fall 2004. Of this number, 3,717 African-American were offered
admissions nationwide and 3,101 chose to accept the admissions offer. In Texas, only
754 African-Americans applied to law school, which is less than 7 percent. And of the 7
percent that applied to Texas law schools, an even smaller percentage of those students
actually attended law schools in the state of Texas.

Therefore, I am conducting a study titled: Factors Influencing African-American Students
Enrollment in Texas Law Schools and I need your help. The primary objective of this
study will be to identify the factors that affect the law school choice of prospective
African-American students. In order to accomplish this task, I need the African-
American students that were admitted for the ________ academic year to complete
this survey. I believe that your participation in my study would provide valuable
feedback in determining the factors that influence African-American students’ enrollment
in Texas law schools.

Should you choose to participate in this study electronically on the day that I attend your
law school, I wish to assure you that the results of the survey will not be tied to any
individual person or school. It is the investigator’s wish to maintain anonymity,
professionalism and ease of administration during the course of the study.
If you have questions, please contact me by e-mail at Janis_Hunter@baylor.edu or by telephone at 254-709-4758 (cell) or (254) 710-8935 (work).

Thank you in advance for your participation. It is greatly appreciated and your feedback is important.
APPENDIX Q

Law School Tables and Factor Tables

TABLE Q.1

Racial and Ethnic Composition of Applicants and Those Admitted to the University of Texas at Austin, 1996-1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law School</th>
<th>APPLICANTS</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>% of Total 1996</th>
<th>% of Total 1997</th>
<th>Ratio of 1997% to 1996%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>2,693</td>
<td>2,511</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian &amp; Other</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,910</td>
<td>3,484</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMITS</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>% of Total 1996</th>
<th>% of Total 1997</th>
<th>Ratio of 1997% to 1996%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian &amp; Other</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE Q.2

Racial and Ethnic Composition of Applicants and Those Admitted to Public Law Schools in Texas, 1996-1997

University of Houston Law School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>APPLICANTS</th>
<th></th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Ratio of 1997% to 1996%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>1,628</td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>2,147</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                  | ADMITS     |          | % of Total       | % of Total       |                         |
|                  |            | 1996     | 1997             | 1996             |                         |
| Anglo            |            | 678      | 490              | 79.5%            | 57.4%                   | 0.72                    |
| African American |            | 32       | 32               | 3.8%             | 3.8%                    | 1.00                    |
| Hispanic         |            | 79       | 89               | 9.3%             | 10.4%                   | 1.13                    |
| Other            |            | 64       | 242              | 7.5%             | 28.4%                   | 3.78                    |
| Total            | 853        | 853      | 100.0%           | 100.0%           | 1.00                    |

Racial and Ethnic Composition of Applicants and Those Admitted to Public Law Schools in Texas, 1996-1997

Texas Southern University School of Law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>% of Total 1996</th>
<th>% of Total 1997</th>
<th>Ratio of 1997% to 1996%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPLICANTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>1,086</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **ADMITS** |      |      |                 |                 |                        |
| Anglo      | 67   | 53   | 22.3%           | 18.9%           | 0.85                   |
| African American | 161  | 122  | 53.7%           | 43.6%           | 0.81                   |
| Hispanic   | 66   | 78   | 22.0%           | 27.9%           | 1.27                   |
| Other      | 6    | 27   | 2.0%            | 9.6%            | 4.82                   |
| **Total**  | 300  | 280  | 100.0%          | 100.0%          | 1.00                   |

### TABLE Q.4

Racial and Ethnic Composition of Applicants and Those Admitted to Public Law Schools in Texas, 1996-1997

Texas Tech University School of Law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,343</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Admits</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# TABLE Q.5

Racial and Ethnic Composition of Applicants and Those Admitted to Public Law Schools in Texas, 1996-1997

Three Law Schools Above Plus UT Austin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICANTS</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>% of Total 1996</th>
<th>% of Total 1997</th>
<th>Ratio of 1997% to 1996%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>5,516</td>
<td>4,611</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>1,354</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,006</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,858</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMITS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>2,063</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,836</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,655</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority faculty as role models and mentors</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from home</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The admissions process</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty sensitivity to minority needs</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by the law school)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of law school</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic diversity</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus visit experience</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for part-time employment</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social atmosphere</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American Student/Faculty ratio</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from home</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority faculty as role models and mentors</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The admissions process</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty sensitivity to minority needs</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by the law school)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of law school</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic diversity</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social atmosphere</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American Student/Faculty ratio</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for part-time employment</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus visit experience</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table Q.8

*Ranking of Law School Selection Factors by Male Private Law School Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority faculty as role models and mentors</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus visit experience</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The admissions process</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty sensitivity to minority needs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of law school</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for part-time employment</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from home</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social atmosphere</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic diversity</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by the law school)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American Student/Faculty ratio</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority faculty as role models and mentors</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from home</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty sensitivity to minority needs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of law school</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The admissions process</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by the law school)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus visit experience</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic diversity</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social atmosphere</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American Student/Faculty ratio</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for part-time employment</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table Q.10

**Ranking of Law School Selection Factors by Private Law School Respondents in 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The admissions process</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from home</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty sensitivity to minority needs</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for part-time employment</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority faculty as role models and mentors</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by the law school)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of law school</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic diversity</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American Student/Faculty ratio</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus visit experience</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social atmosphere</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by law school)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic diversity</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty sensitivity to minority needs</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The admissions process</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority faculty as role models and mentors</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social atmosphere</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from home</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus visit experience</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American Student/Faculty ratio</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of law school</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for part-time employment</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.304</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table Q.12

_Ranking of Law School Selection Factors by Female Public Law School Respondents_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>.628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by the law school)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The admissions process</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from home</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty sensitivity to minority needs</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic diversity</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority faculty as role models and mentors</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social atmosphere</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus visit experience</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American Student/Faculty ratio</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of law school</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for part-time employment</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table Q.13

**Ranking of Law School Selection Factors by Male Public Law School Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by the law school)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic diversity</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social atmosphere</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty sensitivity to minority needs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority faculty as role models and mentors</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus visit experience</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American Student/Faculty ratio</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The admissions process</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from home</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of law school</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for part-time employment</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.519</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table Q.14

*Ranking of Law School Selection Factors by Public Law School Respondents in 2004*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by the law school)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic diversity</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty sensitivity to minority needs</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The admissions process</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social atmosphere</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus visit experience</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority faculty as role models and mentors</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American Student/Faculty ratio</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from home</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of law school</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for part-time employment</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.351</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table Q.15

*Ranking of Law School Selection Factors by Public Law School Respondents in 2005*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by the law school)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from home</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority faculty as role models and mentors</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The admissions process</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic diversity</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty sensitivity to minority needs</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social atmosphere</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus visit experience</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American Student/Faculty ratio</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of law school</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for part-time employment</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ranking of Law School Selection Factors by Historically Black Law School Respondents in Texas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by the law school)</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic diversity</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The admissions process</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority faculty as role models and mentors</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty sensitivity to minority needs</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from home</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American Student/Faculty ratio</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of law school</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social atmosphere</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus visit experience</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for part-time employment</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table Q.17

**Ranking of Law School Selection Factors by Female Historically Black Law School Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic diversity</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by the law school)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The admissions process</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority faculty as role models and mentors</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty sensitivity to minority needs</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American Student/Faculty ratio</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from home</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of law school</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social atmosphere</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus visit experience</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for part-time employment</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table Q.18

*Ranking of Law School Selection Factors by Male Historically Black Law School Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by the law school)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic diversity</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority faculty as role models and mentors</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from home</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The admissions process</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty sensitivity to minority needs</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American Student/Faculty ratio</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social atmosphere</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of law school</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus visit experience</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for part-time employment</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table Q.19

*Ranking of Law School Selection Factors by Historically Black Law School Respondents in 2004*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic diversity</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by the law school)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The admissions process</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority faculty as role models and mentors</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty sensitivity to minority needs</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American Student/Faculty ratio</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from home</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of law school</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social atmosphere</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus visit experience</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for part-time employment</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table Q.20

*Ranking of Law School Selection Factors by Historically Black Law School Respondents in 2005*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by the law school)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic diversity</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from home</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority faculty as role models and mentors</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The admissions process</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty sensitivity to minority needs</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of law school</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American Student/Faculty ratio</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social atmosphere</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus visit experience</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for part-time employment</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by the law school)</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic diversity</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority faculty as role models and mentors</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The admissions process</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty sensitivity to minority needs</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from home</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American Student/Faculty ratio</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social atmosphere</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of law school</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus visit experience</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for part-time employment</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table Q.22

**Ranking of Law School Selection Factors by all Female Texas Law School Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by the law school)</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic diversity</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The admissions process</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority faculty as role models and mentors</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty sensitivity to minority needs</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from home</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American Student/Faculty ratio</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of law school</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social atmosphere</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus visit experience</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for part-time employment</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table Q.23

*Ranking of Law School Selection Factors by all Male Texas Law School Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by the law school)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority faculty as role models and mentors</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic diversity</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty sensitivity to minority needs</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The admissions process</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from home</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social atmosphere</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American Student/Faculty ratio</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus visit experience</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of law school</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for part-time employment</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic diversity</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by the law school)</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority faculty as role models and mentors</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The admissions process</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty sensitivity to minority needs</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from home</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American Student/Faculty ratio</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social atmosphere</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of law school</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus visit experience</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for part-time employment</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table Q.25

*Ranking of Law School Selection Factors by all Texas Law School Respondents in 2005*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (tuition plus room and board)</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of employment after graduation</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost (cost minus aid)</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (amount offered by the law school)</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid offer</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-ranging curriculums (provide more job opportunities)</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from home</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The admissions process</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority faculty as role models and mentors</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic diversity</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty sensitivity to minority needs</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive on-campus and off-campus organizations</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social atmosphere</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American Student/Faculty ratio</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of law school</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus visit experience</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for part-time employment</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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