

© 1979

WILLIAM EDWIN THOMPSON

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

University  
Microfilms  
International

N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

THE IMPACT OF COLLEGE SOCIALIZATION: PHASE I  
OF A LONGITUDINAL COHORT ANALYSIS

By

WILLIAM EDWIN THOMPSON

Bachelor of Arts in Education  
Northeastern Oklahoma State University  
Tahlequah, Oklahoma  
1972

Master of Science in Education  
Southwest Missouri State University  
Springfield, Missouri  
1974

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College  
of the Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
May, 1979

Thesis  
1979D  
T478c  
cop. 2



THE IMPACT OF COLLEGE SOCIALIZATION: PHASE I  
OF A LONGITUDINAL COHORT ANALYSIS

Thesis Approved:

*Jack C. Byrum*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Thesis Adviser

*Larry M. Gerkin*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Gene Huff*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Daniel Selakovich*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Norman N. Durban*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean of the Graduate College

1032793



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study is intended to serve as the first phase of a much larger research project which will attempt to assess the impact of college socialization. Collecting data from complete cohorts of entering freshmen at the four different institutions necessitated a great deal of cooperation from many people who cannot be thanked personally without divulging the identities of the schools under study. Suffice it to say, that thanks are extended to the faculty members and administrators at each of the four participating schools for their help and cooperation. Especially appreciated is the cooperation of the 1,120 entering freshmen who participated in the study.

The technical format and general appearance of the final draft of this dissertation are attributed to the typing skills of Joyce Gazaway.

Appreciation and thanks are extended to Drs. Dan Selakovich, Gene Acuff, and Larry Perkins for serving on my committee, and for their helpful suggestions on this study. A very special thanks is extended to my adviser, and friend, Jack Bynum, who originally conceptualized the study and provided a great deal of assistance and guidance throughout its duration. His keen insight, determination, thoughtfulness, and sense of humor were greatly appreciated throughout the course of this project and my entire doctoral program.

I would also like to thank my parents, Mr. and Mrs. E. N. Thompson, who, despite their own limited formal educations, continually encouraged

me to pursue my education. Their high regard for education and knowledge along with their support and encouragement helped instill in me the values and attitudes necessary to pursue and complete a doctoral degree.

Finally, I would like to express my sincere thanks and appreciation to the two people who sacrificed the most throughout my doctoral program and the completion of this dissertation. To my wife, Marilyn, who deferred her own career in art in order to provide financial support for me to pursue my career, I give sincere thanks and love. Needless to say, her support was much more than financial--her constant understanding and encouragement helped me through many difficult times. To my son, Brandon, I offer an apology for making him do without a father at times, and for yelling at him when he walked on and wrinkled my rough draft. In the heat of action, priorities often become distorted. I also offer him love and thanks for brightening up every single day of my life since his birth.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. PROBLEM DEFINITION . . . . .	1
Introduction . . . . .	1
The Scope of this Study . . . . .	5
Research Objectives . . . . .	5
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE . . . . .	7
Theoretical Perspective . . . . .	7
Differential Recruitment, Attraction, and College Selection . . . . .	11
Attitudes, Values, and Behavior of College Freshmen . . . . .	17
Demographic and Other Sociological Variables and Success in College . . . . .	25
The Impact of College . . . . .	26
Summary . . . . .	29
III. RESEARCH METHODS . . . . .	31
Data . . . . .	31
Method of Data Collection . . . . .	32
Methods of Analyses . . . . .	36
IV. CULTURAL CONTEXTS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE FOUR COLLEGES . . . . .	40
Introduction . . . . .	40
Sanctuary Hill College . . . . .	41
Eden University . . . . .	43
University of Soul . . . . .	45
State University of Middle America . . . . .	48
Summary of Cultural Contexts and Objectives . . . . .	50
V. FINDINGS . . . . .	52
Demographic Profiles of Students . . . . .	52
Age . . . . .	52
Sex . . . . .	61
Race . . . . .	62
Marital Status . . . . .	62
Number of Children . . . . .	63
Size of Hometown . . . . .	64

Chapter	Page
Number of Siblings . . . . .	64
Birth Order . . . . .	65
Religious Preference . . . . .	66
Political Preference . . . . .	67
Most Common High School Grade . . . . .	68
Participation in Extracurricular Activities in High School . . . . .	69
Residence While in College . . . . .	70
Hours Worked per Week . . . . .	70
Summary . . . . .	71
Demographic Profiles of Parents . . . . .	73
Marital Status . . . . .	74
Religious Preferences . . . . .	80
Political Preferences . . . . .	81
Educational Level . . . . .	82
Annual Income . . . . .	84
Occupational Status . . . . .	85
Socioeconomic Status of Parents . . . . .	86
Summary . . . . .	87
Comparison of Selected Attitudes and Values Among the Freshman Cohorts . . . . .	88
Racial Integration . . . . .	88
Homogamy . . . . .	91
Legalization of Marijuana . . . . .	97
Religion . . . . .	100
Sexual Permissiveness . . . . .	104
Traditional Sex Role for Women . . . . .	107
Academic Honesty . . . . .	109
Most Influential Person . . . . .	112
Use of Automobile and Its Importance . . . . .	114
Purpose in Life . . . . .	116
Going Steady . . . . .	120
Plans for Marriage . . . . .	122
Plans for Children . . . . .	123
Major Field of Study . . . . .	123
Occupational Selections . . . . .	127
Dominant Motives for Attending College . . . . .	132
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	137
Summary . . . . .	137
Conclusions . . . . .	139
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	143
Suggestions for Further Study . . . . .	145
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	147
APPENDIXES . . . . .	155
APPENDIX A - RESEARCH INSTRUMENT . . . . .	156

Chapter	Page
APPENDIX B - OCCUPATIONAL STATUSES . . . . .	167
APPENDIX C - FACTOR ANALYSIS OF PIL SCALE . . . . .	176

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Demographic Profiles of the Freshman Classes of 1977-78 by College . . . . .	53
II. Demographic Profiles of the Parents of the Freshman Classes of 1977-78 by College . . . . .	75
III. Number of Friends from Other Racial Groups While in High School by College . . . . .	90
IV. Attitudes Toward Homogamy Based on Religion by College . . . . .	92
V. Attitudes Toward Homogamy Based on Race by College . . . . .	93
VI. Attitudes Toward Legalization of Marijuana by College . . . . .	98
VII. Comparison of Religion Variables by College . . . . .	101
VIII. Sexual Permissiveness for Males and Females by College . . . . .	105
IX. Attitudes Toward Traditional Sex Role for Women by College . . . . .	108
X. Reaction to Seeing a Classmate Cheat on an Exam by College . . . . .	110
XI. Most Influential Person in Life by College . . . . .	113
XII. Use of Automobile and Its Importance by College . . . . .	115
XIII. A Crosstabulation of Purpose in Life by Type of College . . . . .	118
XIV. One-Way Analysis of Variance for Purpose in Life by Type of College . . . . .	119
XV. One-Way Analysis of Variance for Purpose in Life by College . . . . .	120
XVI. Going Steady by College . . . . .	121

Table	Page
XVII. Plans for Marriage by College . . . . .	122
XVIII. Plans for Children by College . . . . .	124
XIX. Choice of Major Fields of Study by College . . . . .	125
XX. Occupational Statuses for Students and Parents by College . . . . .	129
XXI. Dominant Motives for Attending College in Order of Importance by College . . . . .	133

## CHAPTER I

### PROBLEM DEFINITION

#### Introduction

This research project is the first phase of a larger study dealing with the impact of college socialization. In order for this particular research project to be understood, it must first be placed in proper context in relation to that larger study. The overall study, code-named "Project Future", will be longitudinal in nature, following the entire freshman classes of 1977-78 at four colleges and universities in the Southwest through and beyond their academic careers. The overall study will identify demographic data, attitudes, values, occupational and marital selections, religious and political preferences, academic performance, and a variety of other variables. Over a four year period, the four cohorts will be: compared; patterns and changes in attitudes and values analyzed; realization of college expectations evaluated; and attrition rates established and analyzed. "Project Future" will consist of three research phases, culminating in an overall report on the impact of college socialization.

The first phase of "Project Future" is the establishment of a data baseline upon which all other phases of research will be based. Only Phase I is the subject of this doctoral dissertation; however, in order to illustrate its place in the much larger study, it is necessary to give



a very brief overview of the comprehensive project. After introducing and briefly explaining the other phases of "Project Future", all discussion throughout the remainder of this paper will refer specifically to Phase I, the scope of which is outlined in the following section of this chapter.

The second phase, scheduled to follow this study, and already underway at the time of this writing, will cover the sophomore, junior, and senior years for the four cohorts that entered college as beginning freshmen in the Fall of 1977. The general objective encompassing Phase II is to isolate any significant differences between students who drop out during their college experience and students who survive for four years in their cohort to ultimately graduate from their college or university (considered as successful in college). In discussing college impact studies, Feldman and Newcomb (1969:53) point out:

Longitudinal investigations of students who remain in college are, of course, incomplete in that they do not follow up the students who do not stay in college long enough to be tested a second time. Therefore, the changes of students who start but do not remain in college are not taken into account. While it is possible to obtain change information from these students, this has rarely been done.

The second phase of "Project Future" is designed to locate drop-outs and administer a survey instrument designed to ascertain reasons for leaving college. Solomon and Taubman (1973) indicate the necessity of comparing college attenders with non-attenders and drop-outs. This second phase which surveys drop-outs should facilitate comparisons in future studies between those who leave college and those who are successful in college (stay to graduate).

Phase III of "Project Future" is scheduled for the Spring and Summer of 1981. In the Spring of 1981, those students who remain in the four

college cohorts will be seniors preparing for graduation. Those cohort survivors will have experienced nearly four academic years, and will be the subjects involved in the ultimate objective of "Project Future", that is to measure and assess the impact of college socialization.

Those subjects will complete questionnaires comprised of many of the same items and scales included in Phase I. Responses will be compared to those made four years earlier, and compared to responses from those who dropped out. Through various multivariate techniques, the impact of college socialization will be analyzed.

Concern over the future of higher education continues to be a dominant topic in professional journals and in formal and informal conferences and discussions among educators. Unfortunately, declining student enrollments and high drop-out rates are more likely to focus on the survival of academicians rather than survival and preparation of our students for meaningful and satisfying participation in society (Dewey, 1915). Demographic projections indicate that while declining fertility rates in the United States will result in fewer children per family, the large numbers of children and youth already born will give us more potential mothers than ever before. Thus, the national population in general, and the potential college population in particular, probably will continue to manifest modest rates of growth (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1972). However, whether these potential students actually attend college will depend to a great extent upon the success of educational institutions in making higher education relevant to the future lives of these young people. There are those who believe that the dark picture painted for higher education in the future may be overdramatized (Chambers, 1974). Chambers (1974:12) concedes, however, that unless

stimulating curricula and improved extended education programs are implemented, the present panic in higher education may become a "self-fulfilling prophecy." Certainly, interest in obtaining higher education is not dying out in this country. Between 1920 and 1970, enrollment in institutions of higher learning multiplied 12 times, and in terms of dollars expended, an increase from 216 million to 25 billion occurred (Swift, 1976:144).

"Project Future" as an overall study, will address the research problem of the impact of college socialization, and will attempt to answer the following research questions: What are the demographic and attitudinal profiles of college students today, and how do they compare and change over time? What are the expectations of college students today, and how are they met by the various institutions of higher learning? Who survives to ultimately graduate from the original freshman cohort, and why? What findings, or clusters of traits can help enhance prediction of academic, social, and occupational success during the college experience and beyond? Are there identifiable clusters of demographic, attitudinal, and behavioral traits among college students that correlate with future patterns of occupational and marriage selection? Does college education still function as a major determinant of life chances (Borland and Yett, 1967), and ultimately, what is the overall impact of college socialization?

It seems apparent that the overall study of "Project Future" will attempt to answer important questions related to the sociology of education. While all three phases are extremely important, it is clear that Phase I is the foundation of the overall project, and is extremely

crucial if any worthwhile information is to be generated from the project in years to come.

### The Scope of this Study

This particular study, Phase I of a longitudinal cohort analysis on the impact of college socialization, will establish the data baseline from which all other phases will continue. As has been stated:

It is apparent that in order to study the effects of college, attention must be paid to the problem of 'input'--what the entering student is in intellectual disposition, emotional temperament, interests, motivations, attitudes, values, and goals (Clark et al., 1972:6).

The specific research problem to be addressed by this dissertation involves the following research questions: What demographic, attitudinal, value, and behavioral characteristics were brought to college by the members of each freshman cohort at the four schools? How do entering freshmen at state-supported universities compare with entering freshmen at church-related colleges on these characteristics? How do entering freshmen at a predominantly black state university compare on these variables with beginning freshmen at a predominantly white state university?

### Research Objectives

As an exploratory descriptive study, rather than investigate any specific theoretical hypotheses, this study is designed to pursue the following research objectives:

1. Ascertain the cultural context and the educational objectives at each of the four colleges and universities under study.
2. Develop a Demographic Profile for each freshman class. It will contain the demographic variables of sex ratio, marital status,

racial composition, religious preference, number of siblings, size of hometown, and other pertinent demographic data.

3. Develop a Demographic Profile for the parents of the members of each freshman class containing many of the variables in the student profiles, plus parents' level of education, occupation, and income.
4. Determine, measure, and compare selected attitudes and values held by each cohort in regard to variables such as racial integration, homogamy, legalization of marijuana, religion, sexual permissiveness, traditional sex roles for married women, academic honesty, most influential person in life, purpose in life, going steady, marriage plans, fertility, use of automobiles, choice of major field, and occupational selection. Idealized occupational status will be compared with the status of the occupations held by the students' parents.
5. Determine dominant motives within each cohort for attending college. Ranges of possible motives to be explored include going on to college out of sheer boredom through pragmatic reasons involving better jobs and higher income, and more idealistic motives such as serving God or mankind.
6. Conduct comparative descriptive analyses of the four freshman cohorts based on a multitude of variables, being sensitive to any patterns or combinations of variables that may emerge.

Accomplishment of these research objectives should provide a great deal of insight into what types of young people are currently graduating from high schools and embarking upon college degree programs. More importantly, this study should provide a substantial data baseline for each of the four freshman cohorts, providing a solid foundation and reference point for the further study of these young people in the future. While not exhausting all possibilities, it is believed that successful attainment of these six objectives will provide adequate answers to the research questions being explored within the scope of this study. In order to facilitate clear and concise understanding of the terminology utilized throughout this study, conceptual and operational definitions are provided within the context of discussion of the variables and concept where deemed necessary.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

#### Theoretical Perspective

This research project is not undertaken within the confines of any one particular sociological theory. Exploratory in nature, this study is not attempting to test specific research hypotheses in support or nullification of any theory. Instead, research objectives have been outlined in an attempt to establish specific goals for this project with the hope that after all phases of the overall research study have been completed four years from now, that a theoretical perspective on the impact of college socialization will emerge.

Although not united with any particular theory, this study is not without theoretical underpinnings. There are some basic theoretical assumptions inherent in the nature of this study. The general sociological theoretical nexus for this study is the consensus perspective of the educational institution as a major socializing agent which prepares individuals to assume meaningful roles in society, as outlined by Durkheim (1956) and Parsons (1959). More specifically, this study is based upon many of the theoretical ideas associated with social learning theory and the ongoing process of socialization. Social learning theory approaches the explanation of human behavior in terms of a ". . . continuous reciprocal interaction between cognitive, behavioral, and

environmental determinants" (Bandura, 1977:vii). Thus, this study was undertaken with the theoretical assumption that a significant amount of human ideas, attitudes, values, and behavior are socially learned. Sociological variables measured in this study are assumed to be largely a result of the socialization process experienced by these students prior to college entrance. Variables analyzed in this study represent what the students have "brought with them" to college in terms of attitudes, values, and behavior patterns. This facilitates the establishment of a data baseline from which the impact of college socialization can be measured and assessed four years later. From a social learning perspective, human nature is characterized as ". . . a vast potentiality that can be fashioned by direct and vicarious experience into a variety of forms within biological limits" (Bandura, 1977:13). Social learning theory has been most frequently used to explain deviant behavior (Akers, 1977; Bandura, 1977; Conger, 1976; McLaughlin, 1971; and Sutherland and Cressey, 1974; to name a few); however, through that explanation of deviance, it is implicitly also explaining conformity, or could be considered a theoretical explanation of behavior in general. In the social learning view of interaction, behavior, personality, and environment are reciprocally interdependent (Bandura, 1977). In attempting to explain why certain types of students are attracted to certain types of colleges, and what impact that environment has on their behavior, this theoretical construct seems quite promising.

The terms education and socialization are often considered to be synonymous in our society (McNeil, 1969). Therefore, it seems crucial that any study related to the sociology of education be cognizant of the socializing aspects of education. Socialization has been defined as

. . . the process whereby individuals acquire the knowledge, skills, attitudes, values, needs and motivations, cognitive, affective and conative patterns which shape their adaptation to the physical sociocultural setting in which they live (Inkeles, 1969:615-16).

Going further, Inkeles emphasizes the importance of recognizing that socialization is an on-going process that continues throughout the life cycle. Recognizing socialization as a continuous process, he indicates the emphasis in socialization research must shift from the nuclear family to the school as the primary socializing agent after early childhood (Inkeles, 1969). Similarly, Berger and Luckmann (1967) discuss and define secondary socialization. Defining primary socialization as "the first socialization an individual undergoes in childhood", they indicate that secondary socialization is "any subsequent process that inducts an already socialized individual into new sectors of the objective world of his society" (Berger and Luckmann, 1967:130). Parsons (1970) acknowledges undergraduate college education as a new level of socialization. Further acknowledgement of the socializing impact of education exists throughout the literature. Swift (1967:4) sees the primary concern of education to be the fulfillment of the basic function of socialization, "the process of preparing an individual to be a member of society." Higher education has been seen as "the principle agency for induction of youth into adulthood (Pifer, 1976:27). McNeil (1969) sees higher education as one of the most important socializing influences on the social, emotional, and psychological shape of the young adult. Likewise, it has been stated that, "College students are in a stage of personality development that permits expansion of the intellect and of the personality in ways that are not possible during the secondary school years" (Freedman, 1967:xi). Finally, the author of the prominent "Bennington



Study", an assessment of personality change in women students at Bennington College, indicates that "Colleges may be viewed as socializing organizations in which students, in varying degrees, come to accept normative attitudes and values . . ." (Feldman and Newcomb, 1969:269). The freshman finds himself in an unfamiliar social setting composed of new values, norms, and roles. Such an experience requires a certain amount of desocialization (pressure to unlearn certain past attitudes, values, and behavior patterns) and resocialization (pressures to learn the new culture and participate in the new social structure) (Feldman and Newcomb, 1969).

The theoretical assumptions underlying this study, then, involve the central ideas outlined above. Human beings learn values, attitudes, and behavior through the process of socialization. This socialization process begins at birth and continues throughout the entire life course. A crucial part of this socialization process, for those who choose to attend, occurs within the college environment. This conception of human development is not intended to view people as powerless objects totally controlled by their environment, nor as completely "free agents" who become whatever they choose. Rather, as emphasized by social learning theory, both people and their environment are reciprocal determinants of each other (Bandura, 1977). Centra and Rock (1971) found that college environmental features are related to student achievement (cited in Solmon and Taubman, 1973:16). It has even been suggested that college freshmen have actually undergone some "anticipatory socialization" while in high school, as indicated in a study done by Sibling (1961) that many high school students planning to attend college rehearsed the kind of behavior they thought would be associated with college students (cited

in McNeil, 1969:226). This would indicate that some socialization due to college attendance may in effect, take place before the student actually enters the college environment.

Based upon this theoretical perspective, it should be apparent why it is important for a study such as this one to establish a baseline of attitudinal, value, and behavioral variables. If future studies are to assess what impact socialization during the college experience has in individuals it is important to know what socialized aspects of personality and behavior those students bring with them to the college environment. It has been suggested:

The characterization of students at entry is a significant part of the story of college impact, for the 'product' is dependent on the initial qualities of the students as well as on the environment to which they respond. Student characteristics at entrance provide a baseline for assessing the ways in which the student changes, as well as for indicating in varying degrees the possibility of changing (Clark et al., 1972:101-02;143).

Hopefully, the end result of this study will be to provide such a data baseline including the relevant sociological and demographic variables, measured and described, as brought to college by the students under study.

#### Differential Recruitment, Attraction, and College Selection

Closely related to the theoretical perspective underlying this study involving reciprocal interaction between students and the college environment, is the idea that students are attracted to and purposely select college environments which appeal to them. "College attendance is a selective rather than a random phenomenon" (Feldman and Newcomb,

1969:106). Likewise, there seems to be a conscientious effort on the part of the college administrators and other officials to selectively recruit types of students they feel will be well-suited to the existent environment at their college. Feldman and Newcomb (1969) indicate that it seems probable that the particular environments of different colleges play a major role in the heightening of initial diversity of student bodies. They go on to indicate that ". . . whether knowingly or not, students differentially select themselves into and are differentially selected by different kinds of colleges" (Feldman and Newcomb, 1969:115). In attempting to assess differential impact, Feldman and Newcomb (1969) contend that much of the differences in impact can be explained by the difference in the student colleges attract and admit. A number of studies tend to support this assumption. Clark and his colleagues (1972:6) emphasize that different colleges attract different kinds of students indicating, "If one looks for differential effects of institutions, he must take into account their differential recruitment." Hurn (1978) indicates that different kinds of schools attract different kinds of students, as do Jencks and Riesman (1969), and Swift (1976).

An interesting study dealing with differential attraction of students to particular types of educational institutions is that of Stern (1970). Stern (1970:86) discusses the college as an "ecological niche." He indicates that different types of colleges--liberal arts, denominational, and university-affiliated--each attract and recruit a particular type of student. According to Stern (1970:86), "The independent liberal arts college caters to students concerned with intellectuality and autonomy . . . while the denominational college life appears more

purposive and goal oriented." He also found that schools with higher tuition attract students with higher intellectual interests. Stern (1970:168) did not perceive these differences as mere chance happenings, but found that colleges ". . . differ systematically in the kinds of students they attract and in the experiences to which they are exposed." Likewise, it has been indicated that each institution gathers students of certain ranges of ability, certain aspirations and intentions, and certain personality attributes, attitudes, and values (Clark et al., 1972).

If different types of students are attracted to and recruited by particular types of institutions, the obvious question is: How do the students differ? One contention is that students from middle and upper classes are more likely to apply and be admitted to more prestigious colleges, and more likely to complete their work and receive a college degree (Swift, 1976). Not surprisingly, Swift (1976) indicates that higher tuition at private colleges tends to attract students from higher socioeconomic status backgrounds. This coincides with the findings of Jencks and Reisman (1969) that with the exception of very small private colleges which are not very selective, students from more affluent families tend to enter private colleges.

Part of the difference between entering freshmen at private and public colleges may be explained in terms of religion. Many private colleges are affiliated with and supported by religious denominations. The purposes of the church-affiliated college to reinforce particular religious beliefs and practices often dictate a reach toward students of particular religious conviction (Clark et al., 1972). In the same

study, it is indicated that colleges with strong religious or denominational commitments are sometimes criticized for having goals inappropriate to higher education, and attract students with different values and attitudes than do public colleges. Wickenden (1932) and Nelson (1940) point out that students entering colleges and universities under sectarian control are more favorably disposed toward religion and are more religiously orthodox than students entering nonsectarian schools (cited in Feldman and Newcomb, 1969:118).

One way in which students at church-related private colleges might differ from their counterparts at state-supported universities may be related to the extent of "meaning" or "purpose in life". Religion is assumed to help an individual with the concept of identity and stabilize values, ideals, and aspirations (O'Dea, 1966), and would, therefore, appear to have definite impact upon purpose in life as defined by Crumbaugh and Maholick (1969). A study done on entering freshmen at all institutions of higher learning in Oklahoma in 1962, showed that there tends to be some type of "fit" between students and institutions (Coffelt and Hobbs, 1964:14). They go on to indicate that a student's choice of a particular institution is somewhat affected by the goals of the institution. Following this line of reasoning, it could be assumed that students who value religious development and have high purpose in life will be attracted to those educational institutions emphasizing those objectives. Durkheim (1954:416) in The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life states:

The believer who has communicated with his god is not merely a man who sees new truths of which the unbeliever is ignorant; he is a man who is stronger. He feels within him more force, either to endure the trials of existence, or to conquer them.

The Purpose in Life Scale (Crumbaugh and Maholick, 1969) will be used in this study to test the assumptions that part of the difference between entering freshmen at private, church-supported schools and freshmen at public, state-supported schools might be the difference in the extent of meaning or purpose in life.

The idea of "fit" between students and colleges is not new. After the Bennington study, Newcomb (1943) concluded that students tend to adopt attitudes and behavior approved by the college community where they attend. A study conducted in Oklahoma indicates that the process of selecting a college has significant impact upon the institution as well as on the student:

Since the decisions that students are at present allowed to make are critical in determining the viability of the higher education enterprise, it would appear that each institution should consciously seek to attract and retain the kind of student 'mix' that would be most likely to make educational choices consistent with institutional goals. A corollary assumption would seem to follow with regard to a student's choice of an institution. If there is a certain student blend which is 'just right' for a particular college or university, it would appear to suggest that there might also be one particular institution better suited to a given individual's needs and personality than any other (Coffelt and Hobbs, 1964:34).

There seems to be considerable variation among colleges and universities in their attitudes toward student development. Some of them, instead of encouraging students to approach social institutions critically and imaginatively, surround students with subtle limitations and constraints (Clark et al., 1972).

Differential recruitment, attraction, and college selection appear to be substantiated in the literature. It should not be misconstrued, however, that there is a general consensus as to why certain types of students choose to attend particular colleges. It has even been

suggested by some, that contrary to all the evidence previously cited (that college selection is a conscientious process), that many students attend college through no cognizant reason whatsoever. According to Yankelovich and Clark (1977:152), "A majority of college students appear to drift on to college rather than to make a deliberate choice."

Similarly, another author suggests that higher education, because it is the only large-scale institution designed to meet the needs of young people between the ages of 18 and 22, tends to attract some students who profit little from it, and "would prefer not to be there if desirable alternatives were available" (Pifer, 1976:28). Recent trends indicate that perhaps interest in a college education is slackening because of its high cost and lessening certainty of economic payoff (Parelius and Parelius, 1978). These authors go on to suggest that decreasing enrollments have already and will even more in the future, result in competition among colleges for students and thus, bring about new recruitment policies. One suggestion is that colleges will attempt to recruit older students to more vocationally oriented programs (Parelius and Parelius, 1978). Having stated this, it seems even these authors are acknowledging that college selection is not without purpose.

In attempting to determine why students attend college, there seem many possible explanations. As mentioned above, at least a few authors contend that students drift into college because they perceive no better alternatives. The literature as reviewed in this section overwhelmingly seems to indicate that certain types of colleges conscientiously attempt to recruit certain types of students. Likewise, it seems that students attempt to match their personal backgrounds with particular types of

college environments deemed most suitable to them. Probably the best treatments of this concept are those by Richards and Holland (1965), Feldman and Newcomb (1969), and Astin (1977). Richards and Holland (1965) used factor analysis and found six major considerations for college selection (cited in Feldman and Newcomb, 1969:110-11). Astin (1977) asked extensive samples of entering college freshmen to indicate why they chose to attend college and found that most students had future job opportunities and earnings in mind. According to Astin (1977:1), decision about college for most prospective students involves three issues: (1) whether or not to go; (2) where to go; and (3) how to go. The "where to go" involves which kind of institution: large or small, public or private, religious or nonsectarian, and single sex or coeducational (Astin, 1977:2). The idea of purposive college selection and differential attraction can best be summed up as:

The selection of a particular undergraduate institution is the outcome of a complex interaction of factors, which include the aspirations, abilities, and personality of the student; the values, goals, and socioeconomic status of his parents; the direction of the influence of his friends, teachers, and other reference persons; the size, location, tuition costs, curricular offerings, and other institutional characteristics of various colleges; and the image of these colleges held by the student and by those whose advice he seeks (Feldman and Newcomb, 1969:110).

#### Attitudes, Values, and Behavior of College Freshmen

A multitude of studies have been conducted to measure and assess attitudes, values, and behavior of college students. Campus unrest of the 1960's spawned numerous grants from government and private research institutions in an attempt to explain what was happening to American



college youth. It would be virtually impossible to attempt to cite all these studies. However, since one of the objectives of this research project is to measure, describe, and compare the attitudes, values, and normative patterns of the four freshman cohorts, it is necessary to view some of the major studies and their findings in order to provide some insight into what might be expected to be found in this study.

In keeping with the theoretical perspective underpinning this paper, it is assumed that the attitudes, values, and behavior of college students are for the most part, a result of the socialization process they have experienced, and are experiencing. The interaction between the individual and environment should once again be stressed. As pointed out by Selakovich (1973), the study of values is important in considering the role of education in society. He also acknowledges the relationship between values and environment, stating, ". . . the values an individual holds, or a group of individuals shares, are dependent upon the environment . . . the environment both in a time and place sense, has some effect on values" (17-18). In social learning theory, it is viewed that values determine behavior in that prized incentives can motivate activities required to gain them. Different people differ in the value they place on approval, money, social status, material possessions, and other rewards for behavior (Bandura, 1977). It seems apparent that attitudes, values, and behavior are all closely related, and mutually interact with environmental conditions.

In an attempt to help determine and explain student attitudes, values, and behavior, the early "classic" is Newcomb's study of Bennington College (conducted in 1939). Setting the stage for a multitude of following studies, the idea of studying college students'

attitudes, values, and behavior was given empirical impetus. Since that study, many studies of this type were conducted in the 1960's. In an attempt to explain collegiate behavior of the 1960's, surveys show three dominant student attitudes during that period: stress on community rather than on the individual, apparent anti-intellectualism, and a search for sacredness in nature (Yankelovich, 1977:231). In summarizing, he contends that there was a ". . . general tendency on the part of college students to reject power, manifesting itself in demonstrations, riots, and violence" (232).

An ongoing large-scale study based on a nationally representative sample of college students, surveying between 250,000 and 350,000 freshmen entering more than 300 institutions throughout the nation each fall (1968-1974), indicates a high level of political and social awareness (Bayer and Dutton, 1975). This study shows strong support for reform, and in general, today's college student body might be characterized as more effective for potentially mobilizing social criticism and dissent in a more positive and constructive nature than in the 1960's or any earlier time in history (Bayer and Dutton, 1975). Seemingly in direct opposition to this conception of college youth, are the findings of Yankelovich and Clark (1977). They contend, "Today's college youth have little commitment to changing society and are, instead, preoccupied with their own career planning and personal self-fulfillment" (Yankelovich and Clark, 1977:149).

It may be presumptuous to attempt to categorize college freshman activities in general, but as one author puts it, "College students' attitudes veer toward liberal, as distinct from conservative views" (Bowen, 1978:12). Another indicates that for the most part, college

students exhibit more liberal attitudes toward marijuana and premarital sexual activity (Swift, 1976). On the other hand, some representatives of higher education contend that students tend to be more conservative today than in the recent past (Magarrell, 1977). However, in the same article, Magarrell indicates that while many associated with higher education say students are more conservative today, there seems to be a feeling among business leaders that college students have a strong anti-business bias. He quotes Secretary of the Treasury, William E. Simon (cited in Magarrell, 1977:5), as saying:

No other society in my memory has reached such heights of prosperity for its people and yet has raised an entire new class of men and women who are hostile to the very institutions that make that progress possible. . . . They are the ones who have tilted many of our universities and colleges toward the Marxist teachings.

Somewhat supporting this contention, one author indicates that there seems to be emerging a definite dysfunction between higher education and the goals and aspirations of the rest of society (Mayhew, 1972). However, in direct contrast to this, a recent article on higher education in Oklahoma indicates that today's students are very practical and job-oriented (Fritze, 1978). While the Viet Nam War era students were enthralled with the humanities and social sciences, majoring in fields such as sociology and political science, today's students seem more drawn to fields which prepare them for an immediate job market, more likely majoring in fields such as business and engineering (Fritze, 1978). If there is an anti-business bias nationally, as contended by Simon (1978), it may be that students in the geographical area represented by the four schools in this study do not support that trend.

Probably the most publicized area of student values in the past decade, has focused on the question of mortality. Evidence supports that while sexual awareness and permissiveness have increased, there is no clearcut trend toward immortality. In Hettlinger's article, he points out that most of today's students are looking for a more honest approach to sex, but are not blindly rejecting moral values (cited in Havice, 1971:43). Yankelovich and Clark (1977:150) indicate: "Today many college students question marriage as an institution, support population control, and look to themselves rather than to family, spouse, or children for fulfillment and meaning in life." Expanding further upon current values as they relate to morality, Yankelovich and his associate consider some major value changes in American college youth as: more liberal sexual mores; lessening of automatic obedience to, and respect for, established authority; less reliance on the church and organized religion as a source of guidance for moral behavior; and less automatic allegiance to "my country right or wrong" (Yankelovich and Clark, 1977:150). While some may view these attitudes as "immoral", they may only reflect the interconnection among a variety of attitudes and values prevalent among college students. A study by Bowers indicates that four out of five college students disapprove of cheating, three out of five strongly disapproving (cited in Havice, 1971:70). There are undoubtedly, established moral codes among college students. In a study attempting to determine the extent to which attitudes of college students are a function of sex, politics, and religion, Clouse (1973) found that a student's religious and political views relate highly to his/her attitudes on a number of other issues as well. Thus,

any attempt to determine students' attitudes, values, and behavior patterns, should deal with a variety of religious, political, and social variables.

Sex role attitudes appear to have also undergone some change on college campuses. Comparing students' sex role attitudes between 1969 and 1973, Parelius (1975) found there was a definite trend toward feminism on the part of college females. The findings suggest that young women are:

. . . rejecting the economic dependence and household responsibilities of the traditional wife-mother role . . . yet these women remain basically positive about both marriage and motherhood. They reject neither men nor children. Their goals imply a restructuring of the family, but not its dissolution (Parelius, 1975:152).

Likewise, a study by Bayer (1975) indicates changing views toward traditional sex roles. While sexism is not non-existent, it seems to have diminished a great deal.

Since this research project deals with two church-related, private colleges and two state-supported universities, some studies involving the two types of schools should be briefly explored. Also, since one of the state institutions is predominantly black and the other is predominantly white, a few studies involving racial comparisons should also be briefly viewed.

DeJong, Faulkner, and Warland (1976) point out the multidimensionality of religiosity including belief, experience, religious practice, religious knowledge, individual moral consequences and social consequences. As has already been indicated in the section of this chapter dealing with the differential attraction of students to private and public colleges, it is assumed that private, church-affiliated colleges

attract students more religiously oriented. It seems reasonable to assume that these differences in the extent of religious conviction will be reflected in many of the attitudes, values, and behavior patterns expressed by entering college freshmen. Religion often serves to sacralize the norms and values of established society (O'Dea, 1966). The Purpose in Life Scale (Crumbaugh and Maholick, 1969) has been shown through factor analysis to measure religious beliefs and adherence to middle class values, indicating that these two variables can be considered subdimensions of the PII scale (Bourdette and Dodder, 1976). While the nature of the relationship between middle class values and religious beliefs and practices is not entirely clear, this lends credence to the idea that religion will have impact on attitudes and values, and should be reflected in educational studies. As indicated by O'Dea (1966:15), "Religion is related to the growth and maturation of the individual and his passage through age groupings in society, thus helping the individual with identity, an important part of the socialization process."

As with other issues in this study, the importance of religion is not viewed unanimously. Weeks (1978:196) contends that, "Religion is the most overrated of all the demographic characteristics." The major demographic impact of religion according to Weeks (1978) is on fertility. He refers to a 1975 General Social Survey of American Adults conducted by the National Opinion Research Center (NORC), suggesting that in regard to idealized family size, and actual family size, religion has more stated impact than actual behavioral impact. While Catholics and Protestants differ significantly in stated ideal family sizes, actual family sizes are quite similar (Weeks, 1978:196). With some disagreement over the impact of religion, it should be interesting to see if

this study indicates significantly different attitudes, values, and behavioral norms between students at church-related colleges and those at state-supported universities.

Studies also tend to indicate differences in attitudes, values, and behavioral patterns between white and black students. One contention is that college attendance for blacks often reflects a pattern of upward social mobility, while for white students, it may be a process for maintaining status (Watts and Gaier, 1969). Watts and Gaier (1969) deal with a comprehensive study comparing students at an all black college with students at a predominantly white church-related college. In looking at standard demographic data, as well as attitudinal responses, it was found that while the freshmen students at the all black college came from markedly lower socioeconomic backgrounds, professional aspirations were quite similar to the freshmen at the white college (Watts and Gaier, 1969). Extreme emphasis was placed upon finishing the degree among the freshmen at the all black school and it was felt that at least in part, this could be explained by the idea that non-graduation for black students means falling back into a non-specialized labor force where their race would tend to preclude any upward mobility (Watts and Gaier, 1969). Similarly, a study by Willie done in 1973 indicates that a unique function that college education performs for blacks and other racial minorities is that of emancipation--a feeling of worth and dignity (cited in Solmon and Taubman, 1973:234). Swift (1976) found that students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds view education as more instrumental in obtaining a good job. Similar findings are contained in a study comparing black and white freshman classmates at the University of Illinois (Davis et al., 1970).

While blacks seem to have lower academic preparation (based on ACT scores), they tend to have higher educational aspirations than their white counterparts (Davis et al., 1970). In a study of black students at predominantly white colleges, however, it was found that black and white students had very similar views about college as well as similar aspirations (Centra, 1970). The discrepancy here leads one to believe that there may be a difference in the aspirations of black students at all black colleges and those who attend predominantly white institutions. This idea relates back to the concept of differential recruitment, attraction, and college selection, and the concept of interaction between attitudes, values, behavior, and the environment.

Demographic and Other Sociological  
Variables and Success  
in College

Past studies indicate that there is a relationship between demographic and other sociological variables and success in college. Family background and socioeconomic status have been found to have impact upon success in school (Jencks, 1972; Astin, 1977; and Hurn, 1978). Jencks (1972) found that students who had more affluent parents showed higher educational aspirations. Aspirations for school achievement either on the part of the parents or the students are highly related to success in school (Hurn, 1978). Further, there is strong evidence that, "Students who have high self-esteem and confidence do better in school than those with lower self-esteem" (Hurn, 1978:166). Jones (1971) studied the relationship between students' socioeconomic background and the freshman year in college, finding a strong relationship between affluence and



success. Similarly, it has been found that selected demographic factors can be used to predict college grade point average (Sebok, 1971). In a study conducted by Haug and Sussman (1971), it was determined that the father's occupational level and student's occupation aspiration had a definite effect on the attitude of the student. This relationship between occupation and education is further emphasized by Weeks (1978: 186):

Occupation is an especially important demographic characteristic because it is without question the most defining aspect of a person's social identity in industrialized society . . . it gives clues to education, income, residence, and life style.

Similarly, it has been pointed out that, "In nearly every phase of our national life, years of school, economic status, and social mobility are tied closely together (Selakovich, 1973:71).

With college attrition rates around 50 percent (Jencks, 1972), increasing interest is being shown on the part of college administrators in attempting to predict which incoming freshmen are most likely to persist and remain in college successfully until graduation. Thus, any educational study which will eventually have as a goal to help identify drop-outs before they leave school, must first be based on a demographic study such as the one in this research project.

#### The Impact of College

Although this study will not actually be dealing with the impact of college, it will serve as the data baseline from which the impact of college socialization will later be assessed. Because the main thrust of the overall project, of which this study is the first phase, is the impact of college, it seems appropriate to briefly review some of the

major college impact studies that have previously been done. Many of their findings are the basis from which the ideas for this study arose. Many items in the research instrument used in this study were included precisely because of previous findings in studies dealing with the impact of college.

It goes almost without saying, that the students graduating each year from colleges and universities differ noticeably in attitudes, values, and behavior from the freshman students who entered those institutions some four years earlier. A great many factors can be attributed with having brought about the metamorphosis occurring between the stages of entering college freshman and graduating college senior. Changes in society in general, maturation, and a variety of other factors could be involved. Certainly, a factor not to be ignored, is the impact of having attended college for four years. As indicated by Feldman and Newcomb, "In a sense, every student who ever attends any college undergoes some impact from the experience--even if he withdraws at the end of one 'horrible week'" (cited in Stub, 1975:402). The entering freshman student it seems, is extremely susceptible to change in attitudes, values, and behavior. In dealing with human socialization, one author points out that the freshman student is usually uncertain of his ideas and needful of acceptance by his peers which makes him ". . . open to sudden and radical alteration of his view of life" (McNeil, 1969:226). Scully (1978) also indicates that college has a marked effect on individuals between their freshman and senior years, as do several other studies of this nature (Havice, 1971; Feather, 1973; Nosow and Robertson, 1973; Solmon and Taubman, 1973; Sewell and Hauser, 1975; Rich, 1976; Astin, 1977; and Bowen, 1978).

If the college experience brings about change as previous studies indicate, what types of change are most common? Again, it may be misleading to attempt to overgeneralize, but for the most part, college appears to have a liberalizing effect on students. Virtually all the studies cited above, indicate that seniors tend to be more liberal politically, religiously, and socially than freshmen. When dealing with the socializing aspect of college education, McNeil (1969:226) states:

The belief system of college students seems to become less opinionated and rigid no matter what kind of college they attend; Catholic universities, Protestant colleges, public and private universities, and junior colleges all report very much the same changes in their students.

Perhaps the most comprehensive study to date dealing with the impact of college, is Astin's Four Critical Years (1977). Using large samples from several universities across the United States, each year since 1967, Astin (1977:212) summarized that five distinct changes can clearly be considered due to college attendance: (1) increased interpersonal self-esteem; (2) increased liberalism; (3) decreased business interest; (4) decreased religiousness; and (5) increased hedonism. As he points out:

For many college students, entering as a freshman provides the first encounter with peers who have different beliefs, backgrounds, and attitudes; the first direct experience with drugs, sex, alcohol, and political activism. The fact that many students spend four or more years attending college under these circumstances highlights the great potential of the college experience for producing both short-range and long-range changes in values, attitudes, aspirations, beliefs, and behavior.

Astin's study has a great deal of relevance for the study being undertaken in this research project. Astin (1977) compares black and white students, private and public colleges, and relates demographic variables to success in college. Input from the Astin study is reflected in this research project in several ways. He strongly urges

for more studies dealing with the impact of college, and emphasizes the importance of "multi-institutional data collected simultaneously from students at contrasting universities . . ." (Astin, 1977:3). In addition, it is hoped that the technique of cohort analysis will prove superior to the sampling technique employed by Astin, and most other researchers in this area of study.

Finally, many of those who have studied the impact of college, contend that the impact of college is somewhat dependent upon the characteristics of entering students. According to Feldman and Newcomb (1969:333):

Whatever the characteristics of an individual that selectively propel him toward particular educational settings . . . those same characteristics are apt to be reinforced and extended by the experience incurred in these selected settings.

It is also contended by Feldman and Newcomb (1969:90), that students experience "culture shock" or "value shock" and the amount of difficulty and the nature of adjustments during the early college months depend to a great extent upon the background and personality of the student as well as the environment of the college being entered.

#### Summary

Briefly summarizing the review of literature contained in this chapter, the following points should be clearly established:

1. The theoretical perspective underpinning this study is that of social learning theory as it relates to the reciprocal interaction between the individual and the environment in the socialization process.
2. Socialization is a continual, ongoing process, and institutions of higher learning are major agents in the secondary socialization process.

3. College selection is not a haphazard process. Rather, students are differentially recruited by and attracted to different types of colleges based on a multitude of variables including demographic, attitudinal, value, and behavioral patterns. There tends to be some type of "fit" between students and the educational institutions they select to attend.
4. Past studies measuring and assessing attitudes, values, and behavioral norms of college students are often contradictory, providing no clear-cut view of current existing patterns among college freshmen on these variables. There is a need for studies which can provide some type of demographic, attitudinal, value, and behavioral profile of college freshmen.
5. Past studies indicate that demographic and other sociological variables are related to success in college. If potential drop-outs are to be isolated and helped, and success in college predicted to any extent, there is a need for studies which indicate what demographic and sociological variables are indeed related to success in college.
6. The impact of college is of great interest currently in both sociology and education. All studies indicate that great changes occur in students between their freshman and senior years in college. It has been indicated, however, that whatever impact college has, it is directly related to attributes of incoming freshmen. Thus, to effectively assess the impact of college socialization on any group of students, the first essential prerequisite is a thorough study indicating what demographic characteristics, attitudes, values, and behavioral patterns the students brought with them upon college entrance.

## CHAPTER III

### RESEARCH METHODS

#### Data

The data used in this research project consist of demographic data, attitudes, values, and opinions collected from the 1977-78 freshman classes at four colleges. While the four educational institutions involved are all located in the same southwestern geographical region, they represent diverse educational situations. Two of the colleges are state-supported. One of these is predominantly comprised of white students, while the other is predominantly black. The predominantly black school is situated about half way between two large metropolitan areas, approximately 60 miles from each. The predominantly white state university is much more rurally situated, over 100 miles from the nearest metropolitan area. The other two schools under study are privately owned, operated, and financially supported by two different protestant denominations. Virtually the same situation in terms of rural-urban setting exists between these two schools, with one fairly close to two large cities, while the other is a much greater distance from any large metropolitan area. All four colleges are coeducational, insuring data from both males and females. A previous weakness of this type of study has been that most samples consisted of only white males (Patterson, 1973, cited in Solmon and Taubman, 1973:225).

To preserve anonymity, pseudonyms have been given to each of the four educational institutions under study. The two state-supported schools will be designated as State University of Middle America (SUMA) and the University of Soul. The two church-related schools will be called Sanctuary Hill College and Eden University. A brief overview of the cultural contexts and educational objectives of each of these four schools is presented in Chapter IV of this paper.

Personal anonymity has been guaranteed to the research subjects, and every member of the four freshman cohorts has given written permission to use their information. The target population was the entire freshman class at each of the four colleges. Data collected represent from 95% to 98% of each freshman cohort. The University of Soul had the smallest freshman class, and data were collected from 130 entering freshmen there. From Eden University, data were collected from 184 subjects, while 208 and 598 students participated at Sanctuary Hill College and State University of Middle America respectively. Thus, data collected represent a total number of 1,120 freshmen students. This relatively large N should guard against the misleading results often involved in studying small samples (Scully, 1978).

#### Method of Data Collection

The method employed to gather data for this research project was that of survey research. The research instrument constructed for gathering data consists of an eight-page questionnaire (Appendix A). Other research questionnaires were reviewed, and several faculty members with expertise in various relevant areas of Sociology, as well as research consultants at each of the four colleges, and the Oklahoma State Board

of Regents for Higher Education, were consulted before the final research instrument was constructed. Likewise, a fairly extensive review of literature was made to ascertain the most relevant items to be included in this type of research. The survey instrument includes most standard demographic questions pertaining to the subjects' age, sex, race, marital status, number of children, size of hometown, number of siblings, religious preference, and political preference, as well as demographic data on their parents. Also, questions regarding birth order, going steady, college major, necessity to work while in college, access to automobile, place of residence while in school, and projected occupational, marriage, and family plans were included. In addition to this type of data, questions dealing with reasons for attending college, and attitudes about religion and politics were also asked. Incorporated within the framework of the questionnaire is the standardized "Purpose of Life Scale", a semantic differential scale developed by Crumbaugh and Maholick (1968), consisting of 20 items utilizing bi-polar adjectives. This scale is the only known scale which purports to measure "meaning" and "purpose in life" (Crumbaugh and Maholick, 1968). Additional questions deal with attitudes toward marriage, child-bearing, sexual permissiveness, homogamy, autonomy, and other sociological phenomena.

In order to assess the idealized occupational status, students were asked to specify what occupation, trade, job, or profession they ultimately hope to enter. A modified version of the North-Hatt Occupational Prestige Scale (1964) was used to rank-order occupations according to relative status (Appendix B). Students were also asked to list the occupation of each parent. Parents' occupations were subsequently ranked



according to the same scale allowing comparison between the rank of occupation chosen by the student and those already held by the student's parents.

One of the major disadvantages of survey research is that of sampling error (Kerlinger, 1973), so rather than attempt independent probability samples, it was decided that a more accurate baseline could be developed for the freshman class at each of the four schools through the method of cohort analysis. Cohort refers to persons born or entering a system at the same time (Riley, 1972). As indicated by Elder (1969), studying a single cohort over time makes it difficult to distinguish affective change from historical effects. However, he points out that historical events do not act uniformly on all cohort members, thus, if analyzed carefully, change in a particular variable can be distinguished from the differential impact of historical events over time (Elder, 1975). Cohort analysis has been cited as one of the most effective methods of measuring change over time (Babbie, 1975; Simon, 1978).

In order to collect data, meetings were arranged with the Presidents of the four colleges (or their designated representatives), and with the Institutional Research Director of each school. Arrangements were made to distribute the questionnaires to the entire freshman classes at their freshman orientation meetings. The great majority of data collected was obtained at the initial meeting with each school's freshman class. The objective was to obtain a completed questionnaire from every beginning freshman at each college. A computerized list of all freshmen enrolled was furnished by each college with the exception of one which furnished a typed list of enrollees. Completed questionnaires were compared to these lists, and those identified as not having completed a

questionnaire were isolated. Follow-up trips were begun and questionnaires were distributed to small groups in classroom situations. When necessary, students were contacted by telephone, and meetings were arranged where questionnaires were administered on a one-to-one basis. A final attempt was made through a mail-out procedure to reach those few remaining students who had not completed a questionnaire. The mail-out tactic netted a return rate of approximately 60% of all those sent. It proved virtually impossible to collect data from 100% of the freshmen, but an established goal of at least 95% of each group was met and exceeded at each school. Collected data ranged from a minimum of 95% at one school, to a remarkable 98% of the freshmen at another, with the other two colleges falling somewhere in between. Of the 2% to 5% from which data were not collected, some were purposely excluded by school officials because they were international students who faced a language barrier in completing such a survey instrument. It was also felt by the school administrators that those few individuals were not representative of the overall freshman class. Any students who enrolled after the first two weeks, as well as transfer students or re-enrollees who had previously attended college, were systematically excluded.

In an attempt to equalize conditions under which the questionnaires were completed as much as possible, standardized instructions were developed and read to each group. Attached to each questionnaire was a cover letter (Appendix A) explaining the nature of the study, and urging complete cooperation, while assuring the students of the confidentiality of their personal data.

### Methods of Analyses

Immediately upon collection, all questionnaires were systematically coded and all data were keypunched onto computer data cards. All statistical analyses and tests were done on the Oklahoma State University Computer utilizing programs from SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) and/or SAS (Statistical Analysis System). In order to summarize data, various statistical techniques have been employed. For comparison of demographic data and many variables of nominal level, crosstabulations have been made with frequencies and percentages presented in contingency tables where appropriate. To facilitate interpretation and comparison of variables, several tables have been constructed. Because this study is exploratory and descriptive in nature, crosstabulation is the most frequently used procedure for data analysis, as description not explanation, is the primary focus of this project.

Certain variables required more in-depth analysis than is provided through the crosstabulation procedure. In order to compare idealized occupational status with the status of the occupations held by the students' parents, the data were converted into ordinal level as indicated earlier, and then subjected to the Spearman Rank-Order Correlation procedure. The rank of the student's idealized occupation was first correlated with the rank of the father's occupation and then with the rank of the mother's occupation. This correlation procedure allowed the relationship between these variables to be assessed, with a  $p < .05$  set as the cut-off point for statistical significance.

The variable requiring the most sophisticated statistical procedures

for analysis was that of purpose in life. Since the Purpose in Life Scale is a semantic differential scale, it assumes interval level data, and may be subjected to parametric statistical procedures. In order to check the Purpose in Life Scale for unidimensionality, a Principle Components factor analysis was performed. Although Crumbaugh and Maholick (1968) ran extensive tests for reliability and validity, a factor analysis of these data show the Purpose in Life Scale not to be purely unidimensional (Appendix C). Three items within the scale did not have their highest loading on the first unrotated factor. Principle components procedure indicated that four factors were being measured within the scale. The items not loading highest on the first factor deal with freedom of choice, suicide, and control over one's own life. Thus, out of 20 items within the scale, 17 items loaded highest on the first factor. It is not certain why the three items did not also load highest on the first factor, as they appear to deal with purpose or meaning in life. Probably, these items should be considered as sub-dimensions within the Purpose of Life Scale as described by Bourdette and Dodder (1976). Based on the data in this study, the scale can be considered unidimensional, however, since all 20 items did load on the first unrotated factor (loading of .30 or higher), and that first factor explained 31% of the total variation among the 20 items (Appendix C). A Purpose in Life Scale was computed for each individual by adding the individual's scores on the 20 items. Possible scores on the PIL range from 20 to 140, with the higher the score the more purpose in life exhibited. A crosstabulation was run by college for each of the categories of purpose in life: Lacking (20 to 91), Indecisive (92 to 112), and Definite (113 and above) as outlined by Crumbaugh and Maholick

(1969). Further analysis of PIL scores was achieved through two one-way analyses of variance. First, all four colleges were separated, and a mean PIL score for each school calculated. One-way analysis of variance was used to see if the means differed significantly among the four schools. Finally, the schools were divided into categories of private, church-affiliated and public, state-supported. The means for these two categories were established, and subjected to one-way analysis of variance to determine if a significant difference in mean purpose in life existed between the two types of colleges compared. In each case a  $p < .05$  was set as the statistical level of significance.

In all cases of demographic data, divisions or classifications used conformed as nearly as possible to those used by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. Although many of the variables included within the demographic profiles may be considered ordinal and even interval level, the cross-tabulation procedure only assumes nominal level data; and therefore while some generalizability may be lost, no assumptions of data level are violated.

Analysis and interpretation of statistical data in this study includes both a statistical interpretation and a substantive interpretation as to significance. For statistical significance, the  $p < .05$  level was used throughout the study. However, in order to provide more beneficial insight into the description of findings, substantive interpretation was also employed in order to consider possible intervening variables such as conditions under which the data were collected, nature of the questionnaire, size of the cohorts (a large N makes statistical significance much easier to attain), wording of particular questions, verbal instructions given, and subjective impressions related to data

collection, preparation, and analysis. There has been much debate over the need to quantify in order to study higher education. As pointed out by Solmon and Taubman (1973:408-09): "There is nothing inherently evil in quantification or in statistical analysis . . . on the other hand, there is no need to exclude those items that are not quantifiable . . . a humanistic attitude is also necessary." This blend of quantifiable, objective data and non-quantifiable, subjective interpretation has been incorporated throughout this study as a methodological approach.

## CHAPTER IV

### CULTURAL CONTEXTS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE FOUR COLLEGES

#### Introduction

Before analyzing the collected data from the four colleges involved in this research project, a brief overview of the cultural contexts and institutional objectives should provide some insight into the educational environment existing at each of the four schools. Visitations and personal contacts have been made at each of the four colleges. The information contained in this chapter is not a result of quantifying and analyzing empirical data, but a subjective impression based upon personal observation and discussions with students, faculty, and administration at each of the institutions.

In order to preserve the anonymity of the colleges and individuals involved in this study as guaranteed by the researcher, it is impossible to footnote information in this chapter in the typical fashion. Direct quotes concerning educational philosophy or educational objectives at the four colleges, in every case, have been extracted verbatim from the 1977-78 college catalog or undergraduate bulletin for that school. Admittedly, observations other than those directly quoted are open to interpretation, and can be supported only subjectively from the author's point of view. The brief information about each school in this chapter

is in no way considered complete, but should provide a useful background before turning to the quantifiable data.

### Sanctuary Hill College

Founded in 1896, Sanctuary Hill College is a four-year liberal arts college, owned and operated by a protestant denomination. Geographically, the college is located in the southwest region of the United States fairly near two large metropolitan areas. Total enrollment is approximately 850 students. Despite being near large cities, the particular denomination represented at Sanctuary Hill tends to place great value on rural living, and officials at the college believe that most of their students come from rural areas. Officials at Sanctuary Hill contend that their denomination is fundamentalist in nature, and its members tend to be politically, culturally, and socially conservative, as well as conservative in religious views.

Insight provided by those acquainted with Sanctuary Hill College and the church with which it is affiliated, indicate that while students at the college tend to come from lower-class origins and families with relatively modest incomes, there seems to exist a rather strong medical subculture at the school. In other words, many young members of this religious denomination who attend college become involved in degree programs designed to prepare one for entrance into occupations in the field of medicine. Despite modest incomes and the conservative bent of members of this denomination, there seems to be strong motivation for parents to send their children to Sanctuary Hill even though its tuition and fees are extremely high as compared to other colleges and universities in the



area. Of the four schools studied in this research project, Sanctuary Hill has the highest tuition rate, at approximately \$90 per semester hour.

The college is operated through the philosophy that ". . . true education consists of the harmonious development of the mental, physical, social, and spiritual nature of man." In response to that philosophy, the college educational program has these objectives:

1. Spiritual--To enable its students to make an intelligent dedication of their lives to spiritual leadership and selfless service to God and mankind.
2. Intellectual--To broaden man's knowledge of life, of nature, and of the arts and sciences; to develop the student's ability in critical thinking; and to offer systematic preparation for the professions.
3. Social--To guide in the formation of character marked by integrity, selfdiscipline, responsibility, tolerance, and loyalty to God, government, and mankind.
4. Aesthetic--To cultivate the highest level of refinement and aesthetic tastes.
5. Civic--To provide leadership for the community, for the church, and for world society.
6. Health--To foster attitudes and practices of healthful living.
7. Vocational--To encourage wholesome respect for the dignity of labor and to offer systematic preparation for vocations.

Recruitment of students does not seem to be much of a problem for Sanctuary Hill College. Admittedly, officials there would like to see enrollment increase, but they are satisfied for the most part, that those members of the denomination served by Sanctuary Hill who send their children to college, make every attempt to send them there. In other words, due to its close church affiliation Sanctuary Hill College is somewhat limited to its recruitment. However, officials there seem

confident that they are attracting a great portion of their potential students. Administrators, faculty, and students at Sanctuary Hill College demonstrate a great deal of pride in their educational institution and its goals.

#### Eden University

Founded in 1906, and accredited since 1917, Eden University is a small, private institution in the southwest affiliated with a protestant denomination. The university consists of a Liberal Arts College, Graduate College, and a Graduate Seminary. Officials at Eden University take great pride in the fact that their student enrollment of approximately 1,400 represents more than 40 states and between 10 to 15 foreign countries. Great pride is taken in the world-wide recruitment effort existing at Eden. This pride carries over into the academic preparation of entering freshmen. Officials at Eden University contend that their entering freshman students have a mean ACT score some three points above the national average, ranking them the highest in the southwestern state in which they are located. This emphasis upon educational excellence is predominant throughout the administration, faculty, and student body at Eden University.

Unlike some church-related schools, Eden attracts many students from outside the religious denomination with which it is affiliated. In fact, while school officials take great pride in the "Christian atmosphere" existing at Eden, they tend to play down its affiliation with a particular denomination. Chapel attendance is no longer required at Eden, but according to virtually all sources there, it is strongly encouraged.

Eden University has a proud heritage of "commitment to quality education in a Christian atmosphere." The university exists for its students and "respects the integrity, individuality and contribution each student brings to the total educational environment." The university does not have a long list of educational objectives, but has as its major aim, "to provide an atmosphere in which each student can grow and mature mentally and spiritually." Administrators indicate that the guiding influence at Eden University has always been its Christian tradition. While there is no written honor code, the students are expected to exemplify the highest degree of personal honor and integrity.

Although fairly isolated from any large cities, officials at Eden University believe that most of their students come from upper-middle to lower-upper class backgrounds. Tuition at Eden University is approximately \$50 per semester hour, which although not the highest in the region, is considered very high compared to most schools in the area. Officials have no qualms about the high tuition rate, indicating that their students' families can afford it, and feel the type of education being provided at Eden is well worth the cost. Eden University has established a very good reputation in the fine arts and attracts a lot of students on that basis.

The campus of Eden University is quite small, facilitating a very friendly and personal atmosphere. Class sections tend to be small providing excellent opportunity for individualized instruction often lacking at larger universities. Officials at Eden characterize their student body as being fairly conservative with high aspirations and strong educational motivation.

## University of Soul

The University of Soul is a predominantly black state-supported university in the southwest. From its founding in 1897 up until the mid-1950's, it served its state as the only institution of higher learning open to blacks. At the time of its establishment, the legislature stated the objective of the school to be:

The exclusive purpose shall be the instruction of both male and female Colored persons in the art of teaching various branches which pertain to a common school education and in such higher education as may be deemed advisable, and in the fundamental laws of the United States in the rights and duties of citizens in the agricultural, mechanical and industrial arts.

Steeped in history and tradition, the University of Soul is held in high esteem by the black constituency it has so long served. In 1954, the University of Soul was opened to students of all races, yet even today, its student population, faculty, and administration are predominantly black.

The University of Soul is located approximately half way between two large metropolitan areas, and draws a substantial number of its students from those two cities. A very small school (enrollment less than 1,000), the students tend to come from upper-lower and mlower-middle class backgrounds. Tuition is approximately \$12 per semester hour, and officials indicate that many of their students must obtain some type of financial aid to help meet those costs.

Officials at the University of Soul are extremely reluctant to attempt to categorize their students in terms of liberal or conservative. They simply point out that their students are fairly representative of the black communities in the urban areas from which they come. According

to the administration, students at Soul are highly educationally motivated, most of them overcoming many hardships in order to attend college. Officials there would greatly like to see an increase in enrollment, but also feel they are adequately meeting the educational needs of the communities they serve at the present time.

The atmosphere at the University of Soul is extremely relaxed and unstructured. Students, faculty, and administration seem genuinely friendly, and exhibit great pride in their educational institution. Classes are small, and there appears to be a great deal of personal interaction among faculty and students.

The general objective at the University of Soul is stated as being, "To enable every student to fulfill his potentialities for growth so that he may find the fullest satisfaction in efficient participation in a complex society." The educational experiences provided for the student, the degree of involvement with the community of learning, and the period of time spent at the University of Soul should make each student a better and significantly different individual. The university is committed to the mission of equipping students--many whose achievement and development have been limited by factors exterior to the individual--with the critical qualities of mind and the durable qualities of character which will serve them in the future.

The University of Soul has the 10 following institutional objectives for its students:

1. Develop intellectual curiosity and eagerness for scholarly growth.
2. Develop the habit of thinking logically and critically and making sound judgments.
3. Provide a common core of experiences that will prepare

him for a career and for the responsibilities of citizenship.

4. Develop and strengthen the ability to use communication skills effectively and appropriately.
5. Develop an appreciation for the value of moral and ethical standards in his personal and professional life.
6. Develop understanding and appreciation of his cultural activities.
7. Develop objectivity about self and beliefs and recognize the value of examining these beliefs periodically.
8. Develop research capacity.
9. Render community service through extension and cultural activities.
10. Develop appreciation for the maintenance of physical health and vigor and comprehend the importance of the appropriate leisure time activities.

In addition to the 10 institutional objectives for students, the University of Soul lists its major functions as instruction, research, and community service. More specifically the following functions are described:

1. To provide curricula in general and specialized education, culminating in the awarding of a baccalaureate degree in three divisions: Arts and Sciences, Applied Sciences, and Education.
2. To provide programs of instruction to fit persons for gainful employment, culminating in the awarding of an associate degree.
3. To provide a program of research directed toward solving problems of people of the state.
4. To provide a program of extension education to assist in the alleviation of social, economic, and cultural problems confronting low-income people of the state.
5. To provide experimental education programs at both the lower and upper divisions to meet the particular needs of the University's clientele.

6. To provide out-of-class experiences for the total development of the individual.
7. To provide a program of service designed to enhance the college community.
8. To relate as a public institution with identifiable characteristic to a state system of higher education.
9. To relate as a unique public college to the state as a geographic area of service.

Administrators indicate a strong commitment to fulfilling these educational objectives and carrying out the stated functions.

#### State University of Middle America

The State University of Middle America (SUMA) founded in 1909, is a four-year liberal arts institution with four major academic divisions: Arts and Sciences, Education, Environmental Sciences and Health Sciences, and Graduate Studies with emphasis on teacher training. Principle support for the university is derived from public taxation, and the administration acknowledges responsibility to its constituency. Enrollment for the 1977-78 academic year was approximately 3,800.

Administrators at SUMA believe their student body is comprised of individuals from lower-middle and middle-class socioeconomic backgrounds. Located a substantial distance from any large urban areas, SUMA officials feel the school's greatest appeal is to students in the surrounding rural area. SUMA has experienced declining enrollments and has conscientiously instituted a new recruitment program to attract more students. This new recruitment involves the offering of many vocationally oriented courses in the evenings. Because of this, officials feel they are beginning to attract older students to their campus, many of whom would not have

attended college under other circumstances. While not a vocational-technical program, it is felt that the new curriculum offers pragmatic training useful for seeking gainful employment. It is hoped that the new program will make the general course offerings at SUMA and the degree programs more attractive, helping to increase future enrollments. Tuition at SUMA is \$15 per semester hour.

Administrators, faculty, and students all tend to classify themselves as somewhat conservative. In fact, the colloquial term "Red neck" was used by faculty and students on more than one occasion to describe the cultural setting existing at SUMA. There appears to be a great deal of value placed on the rural lifestyle with which many of the students are acquainted. The atmosphere seems friendly, and although a fairly good size state university, class sizes are fairly small allowing for personal interaction and individual help when needed.

Historically, SUMA ". . . has sought to serve the needs of the people of the state in a democratically responsive manner." The university administration lists as the institution's major objectives:

1. To provide with chief emphasis during the first two years of college work, a program of general education designed to extend and enrich the common basic educational experiences for all students in the areas of social sciences, natural sciences, and the humanities.
2. To provide varied baccalaureate programs in Arts and Sciences designed to furnish opportunity for scholarly accomplishments in the various academic areas with continual attention being paid by the institution to the relevance and structure of such programs.
3. To provide a baccalaureate program of teacher education and training for related professional services which will develop teachers who have the requisite theoretical knowledge and who are competent in methods and techniques of instruction, use of media, human relation skills, and analysis of behavior and to provide for development of



individuals who are capable of providing a variety of human services.

4. To provide pre-professional educational opportunities emphasizing basic studies leading to specialized work in professional fields such as dentistry, engineering, law, medicine, pharmacy, and veterinary medicine.
5. To develop, maintain, and expand programs in environmental and health sciences at the baccalaureate and other levels to meet the needs of the Southwest; to train, educate, and motivate students interested in environmental and health sciences to pursue post-baccalaureate academic and in-service training in the area; and to cooperate with clinics, hospitals, and institutions of higher learning in the Southwest in programs of education and internship.
6. To develop and provide a broad, continuing, and appropriate program in adult education designed to meet the personal and societal needs of adults in the district.
7. To maintain, develop, and expand its graduate program to better serve the needs of the region.
8. To develop a limited program of research as impetus is furnished by participation in various federal projects, development contracts with local, state, and federal agencies, proximity and close affiliation with the various research and development centers and regional medical and service centers, and the developing graduate program.
9. To provide leadership and expertise in the development of programs directed toward community research and urban development in the region.

#### Summary of Cultural Contexts and Objectives

While all four of the colleges in this study are located in the same southwestern geographical region, each seems to have its own unique cultural context and educational atmosphere. All four institutions offer similar degree programs, yet one or two of the institutions have developed what might be considered "specialties" in certain academic areas. The two church-related colleges emphasize the development of the spiritual self as well as academics, yet Sanctuary Hill appears to have a

much closer tie to the protestant denomination supporting it than does Eden University. Eden very straightforwardly touts academic excellence as its mainstay. Obvious differences in cultural settings emerge when looking at the two state-supported universities. Size and racial composition are the most obvious, but more subtle differences may emerge as the collected data are explored. Common at all four of the schools involved appears to be a genuine commitment to the process of higher education on the part of administrators, faculty, and students.

## CHAPTER V

### FINDINGS

#### Demographic Profiles of Students

As indicated in the review of literature (Chapter II), there is evidence to suggest that selected demographic variables are related to academic performance and success in remaining in college to attain a degree. One of the specific research objectives of this study has been to develop and analyze a demographic profile of the freshman class of 1977-78 at each of the four colleges involved in this project. Standard demographic variables are included in this profile to facilitate comparison among the four freshman cohorts. Thus, Table I includes the variables of age, sex, race, marital status, number of children, and size of hometown, as well as additional variables which may be related to college performance, success, and socialization. These additional variables include number of siblings, birth order, religious and political preferences, most common grade in high school, residence while in college, and hours worked per week during college attendance.

#### Age

As indicated in Table I, there appear to be some differences when comparing the age categories of the entering freshmen at the four institutions. Sanctuary Hill College had the lowest mean age (18.7),

TABLE I  
 DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILES OF THE FRESHMAN  
 CLASSES OF 1977-78 BY COLLEGE

Variable	College			SUMA
	Sanct.	Eden	Soul	
<u>Age</u>				
Under 18	22 10.6%	25 13.6%	12 9.3%	64 10.9%
18-19 yrs.	166 80.1%	132 72.2%	90 69.7%	417 70.5%
20-21 yrs.	10 4.8%	7 3.8%	14 10.8%	30 5.1%
22-23 yrs.	3 1.5%	5 2.8%	6 4.7%	13 2.2%
24-25 yrs.	0 0.0%	7 3.8%	3 2.3%	12 2.0%
Over 25	6 3.0%	7 3.8%	4 3.2%	55 9.3%
TOTAL	207 100.0%	183 100.0%	129 100.0%	591 100.0%
MEAN AGE	18.7	18.8	19.2	20.0
<u>Sex</u>				
Male	99 47.6%	68 37.0%	72 55.8%	267 44.6%
Female	109 52.4%	116 63.0%	57 44.2%	331 55.4%
TOTAL	208 100.0%	184 100.0%	129 100.0%	598 100.0%
SEX RATIO	91	59	126	81
<u>Race</u>				
White	161 77.4%	168 91.3%	8 3.9%	524 87.8%

TABLE I (Continued)

Variable	College			SUMA
	Sanct.	Eden	Soul	
Black	15 7.2%	6 3.3%	112 87.5%	22 3.7%
American Indian	0 0.0%	3 1.6%	0 0.0%	42 7.0%
Oriental	9 4.3%	2 1.1%	0 0.0%	3 0.5%
Chicano	9 4.3%	1 0.5%	1 0.8%	2 0.3%
Puerto Rican	1 0.5%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Other	13 6.3%	4 2.2%	10 7.8%	4 0.7%
TOTAL	208 100.0%	184 100.0%	128 100.0%	597 100.0%
<u>Marital Status</u>				
Married	4 1.9%	12 6.5%	7 5.4%	68 11.4%
Divorced	1 0.5%	5 2.8%	2 1.6%	23 3.9%
Separated	3 1.4%	1 0.5%	2 1.6%	6 1.0%
Single	193 92.8%	157 85.3%	110 85.3%	473 79.2%
Engaged	7 3.4%	8 4.4%	6 4.6%	24 4.0%
Widowed	0 0.0%	1 0.5%	2 1.5%	3 0.5%
TOTAL	208 100.0%	184 100.0%	129 100.0%	597 100.0%

TABLE I (Continued)

Variable	College			SUMA
	Sanct.	Eden	Soul	
<u>Number of Children</u>				
None	198 99.0%	173 94.0%	111 88.8%	519 87.1%
1 or 2	1 0.5%	6 3.2%	14 11.2%	52 8.8%
3 or 4	1 0.5%	5 2.8%	0 0.0%	22 3.6%
5 or more	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 0.5%
TOTAL	200 100.0%	184 100.0%	125 100.0%	596 100.0%
<u>Size of Hometown</u>				
Farm or open country	15 7.2%	13 7.1%	14 10.8%	11 1.8%
Town of less than 2,500	28 13.5%	12 6.5%	1 0.8%	109 18.2%
2,501-50,000	120 57.7%	46 25.0%	42 32.4%	415 69.5%
50,000-500,000	20 9.6%	68 36.9%	41 31.5%	50 8.4%
Over 500,000	25 12.0%	45 24.5%	32 24.5%	13 2.1%
TOTAL	208 100.0%	184 100.0%	130 100.0%	598 100.0%
<u>Number of Siblings</u>				
None	10 4.8%	6 3.3%	6 4.6%	26 4.3%
One	43 20.7%	35 19.0%	13 10.0%	137 22.9%

TABLE I (Continued)

Variable	College			SUMA
	Sanct.	Eden	Soul	
Two	52 25.0%	58 31.5%	22 16.9%	168 28.1%
Three	52 25.0%	46 25.0%	20 15.4%	117 19.6%
Four	21 10.0%	25 13.6%	11 8.5%	53 8.9%
Five	18 8.7%	6 3.3%	21 16.2%	32 5.4%
Six	4 1.9%	1 0.5%	14 10.7%	22 3.7%
Seven	2 1.0%	4 2.2%	3 2.3%	17 2.8%
Eight	2 1.0%	0 0.0%	11 8.5%	12 2.0%
Nine or more	4 1.9%	3 1.6%	9 6.9%	14 2.3%
TOTAL	208 100.0%	184 100.0%	130 100.0%	598 100.0%
MEAN	2.7	2.6	4.2	2.8
<u>Birth Order</u>				
First	70 33.8%	68 37.0%	40 32.3%	180 30.3%
Second	70 33.8%	54 29.4%	27 21.8%	194 32.7%
Third	36 17.4%	36 19.6%	18 14.5%	106 17.8%
Fourth	14 6.8%	14 7.6%	15 12.1%	46 7.7%
Fifth	10 4.8%	8 4.3%	9 7.3%	28 4.7%

TABLE I (Continued)

Variable	College			SUMA
	Sanct.	Eden	Soul	
Sixth	6 2.9%	0 0.0%	9 7.3%	11 1.9%
Seventh	1 0.5%	2 1.1%	3 2.4%	12 2.0%
Eighth	0 0.0%	1 0.5%	2 1.6%	6 1.0%
Ninth or higher	0 0.0%	1 0.5%	1 0.7%	11 1.9%
TOTAL	207 100.0%	184 100.0%	124 100.0%	594 100.0%
<u>Religious Preference</u>				
Catholic	3 1.5%	8 4.4%	10 8.0%	38 6.5%
Jewish	1 0.5%	1 0.5%	1 0.8%	2 0.3%
Protestant	129 62.3%	148 80.4%	25 20.0%	356 60.6%
Other	74 35.7%	27 14.7%	89 71.2%	191 32.6%
TOTAL	207 100.0%	184 100.0%	125 100.0%	587 100.0%
<u>Political Preference</u>				
Democrat	37 17.9%	51 27.9%	89 70.1%	362 60.9%
Republican	77 37.2%	80 43.7%	5 3.9%	98 16.5%
Other	18 8.7%	13 7.1%	11 8.7%	14 2.4%
Uncertain	75 36.2%	39 21.3%	22 17.3%	120 20.2%



TABLE I (Continued)

Variable	College			SUMA
	Sanct.	Eden	Soul	
TOTAL	207 100.0%	183 100.0%	127 100.0%	594 100.0%
<u>Most Common High School Grade</u>				
A	60 29.4%	73 39.9%	15 11.9%	167 28.1%
B	94 46.1%	90 49.2%	56 44.4%	311 52.4%
C	49 24.0%	19 10.4%	53 42.1%	110 18.5%
D	1 0.5%	1 0.5%	2 1.6%	6 1.0%
TOTAL	204 100.0%	183 100.0%	126 100.0%	594 100.0%
<u>Participation in Extracurricular Activities While in High School</u>				
0-5	139 66.8%	97 52.7%	105 80.8%	399 66.8%
6-10	65 31.3%	81 44.0%	24 18.5%	182 30.4%
More than 10	4 1.9%	6 3.3%	1 0.7%	17 2.8%
TOTAL	208 100.0%	184 100.0%	130 100.0%	598 100.0%
<u>Residence While in College</u>				
Dormitory	161 78.2%	139 75.6%	103 80.3%	311 52.3%
Fraternity or sorority house	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Own apartment or house	8 3.9%	19 10.3%	14 10.9%	100 16.8%

TABLE I (Continued)

Variable	College			SUMA
	Sanct.	Eden	Soul	
With parents	28 13.6%	23 12.5%	8 6.3%	163 27.4%
With relatives	9 4.3%	3 1.6%	1 0.8%	10 1.7%
With non-relatives	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	5 0.8%
Other	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 1.5%	6 1.0%
TOTAL	206 100.0%	184 100.0%	128 100.0%	595 100.0%
<u>Hours Worked per Week</u>				
None	31 15.5%	88 48.4%	48 38.7%	258 44.3%
1-10 hours	27 13.4%	35 19.2%	25 20.2%	77 13.2%
11-20 hours	74 36.8%	36 19.8%	27 21.7%	115 19.7%
21-30 hours	48 23.9%	17 9.3%	12 9.7%	75 12.9%
Full time	21 10.4%	6 3.3%	12 9.7%	58 9.9%
TOTAL	201 100.0%	182 100.0%	124 100.0%	583 100.0%

with the largest percentage (80.1%) of its freshmen in what is generally considered the typical age for entering college (18 to 19 years). Only 3.0% of entering freshmen at Sanctuary were included in the over 25 years

of age category, indicating that this college does not attract a large number of older people who decide to go to college after several years of absence from the academic scene. With a total of 90.7% of its entering freshmen being 19 years old or younger, it can be assumed that for the most part, the typical entering freshman at Sanctuary has come directly from high school graduation.

Eden University appears very similar to Sanctuary. Altogether, 85.8% of Eden's entering freshmen are under the age of 20, with 72.2% within the 18 to 19 year old range. Only 3.8% of Eden's entering freshmen were over 25 years old, and the mean age was only slightly higher than that of Sanctuary, being 18.8 years.

The data on age of entering freshmen at the University of Soul indicate a somewhat different break-down by age categories. While the largest single category is still 18 to 19 years (69.7%), this is the smallest percentage of freshmen in that age category among the four schools. The University of Soul has a total of 79% of its entering freshmen under 20 years of age. Of the four schools, Soul has the largest percentage of freshmen in the 20 to 21 year old age category (10.8%). This would indicate a large number of its entering freshman cohort waited three to four years after high school graduation to enter college. Transfers from other colleges would not account for this difference as all data gathered from each of the four schools included only those who were entering a college or university for the first time in the Fall of 1977. This trend of older students does not continue throughout the age categories, however, as only 3.2% of Soul's entering freshmen were over 25 years of age.

The age data from State University of Middle America indicate the oldest mean age (20.0 years) among the four schools. While 81.4% of SUMA's entering freshmen were under 20 years of age, the percentage of entering freshmen at SUMA who were over 25 years old is nearly triple that of the other three schools (9.3%). These data on age indicate that SUMA has the broadest appeal of the four schools to high school graduates who have been out of school for five years or more before deciding to go to college. Continuing education and special vocational programs developed at SUMA in order to attract older working students to college appear to have been effective to a certain extent. Although the range in mean ages is not great (18.7 to 20.0), there is over a year's difference between the youngest and oldest (Sanctuary and SUMA).

#### Sex

The demographic profiles in Table I indicate a great deal of difference in the breakdown by sex among the four freshman cohorts. Sanctuary, Eden, and SUMA all have more females than males, while the freshman cohort at Soul is the only one in which the males outnumber the females. The sex ratio (number of males per 100 females) is 91 at Sanctuary, 59 at Eden, 126 at Soul, and 81 at SUMA. Interestingly, Eden reports in its 1977-78 catalog that its ratio of males to females is approximately one to one, while these data indicate that as entering freshmen, the ratio is nearly two females for every male. It is possible that either the officials at Eden are using outdated statistics which are no longer accurate, or this cohort is unusual in terms of sex ratio. It may be possible that the drop-out rate from freshman to senior years is so differentiated by sex that the sex ratio begins to average out and approach

100 when looking at the entire student enrollment. Follow-up studies should provide more insight into this phenomenon at Eden. Of particular interest is the fact that Soul is the only college of the four which has a higher proportion of males as entering freshmen. Further, if females are more likely to drop-out, Soul's sex ratio would be even higher for the entire student body than it is for its freshman class. Sanctuary is the only college of the four which approximates a one to one relationship between males and females in its 1977-78 freshman cohort.

### Race

The racial composition of the four freshman cohorts is varied. Both private, church-related colleges are predominantly white (77.4% at Sanctuary and 91.3% at Eden). SUMA also had a predominantly white freshman cohort (87.8%), while the University of Soul was predominantly black with only 3.9% of its entering freshmen being white, as compared to 87.5% black. Sanctuary, Eden, and SUMA had blacks comprising 7.2%, 3.3%, and 3.7% of their 1977-78 freshman classes respectively. There were no American Indians in the freshman classes at either Sanctuary or Soul, and only 1.6% at Eden University. On the other hand, SUMA's freshman class had 7.0% of its racial composition made up by American Indians. Sanctuary led the other schools in both the categories of Oriental and Chicano with 4.3% of their entering freshmen in each of these classifications. As can be seen in Table I, very small percentages were registered in each of the remaining racial categories at the four schools.

### Marital Status

It was assumed that most entering freshmen in 1977-78 would not be

married, and these data support this assumption. However, there was a noticeable difference in the percent married or ever having been married among the four schools. Sanctuary had the fewest freshmen presently married (1.9%), and when adding those who were divorced or separated, had a total of only 3.8% of their entering freshman class who had ever been married. Comparatively, Eden had 6.5% married freshmen, 2.8% divorced, and 0.5% separated. Soul had 5.4% married, 1.6% divorced, and 1.6% separated. Leading the three other colleges in these categories was SUMA with 11.4% of its entering freshmen married, and another 4.9% who had previously been married. As can be seen in Table I, there were very few widowed freshmen at any of the four schools.

The statistics for marital status, when viewed together with the age data, indicate that the schools with the youngest entering freshmen have the fewest students who are married, divorced, or separated. The fact that SUMA's entering freshmen were older and out of high school longer probably explains the higher percentage of married students entering as freshmen there. Sanctuary leads all schools in the "single" category with 92.8%. Eden and Soul each had 85.3% of their entering freshmen who were single, and SUMA had 79.2%. Very little difference is seen when comparing the percentage of those who are engaged to be married.

#### Number of Children

The number of children in the family of procreation naturally corresponds closely to the marital status data at each school. Only 1.0% of the freshmen at Sanctuary were parents and 6.0% of Eden's freshman

class had children. A total of 11.2% of Soul's freshmen were parents, as was 12.9% of SUMA's.

#### Size of Hometown

The data on size of hometown reflects the approximate population range of the town where the freshmen lived during their senior year in high school. When categories are collapsed, it is found that the largest groups of rural students (town of 2,500 or less) are found at Sanctuary (20.7%) and SUMA (20.0%). Only 13.6% of Eden's freshmen came from rural areas, and Soul had the smallest rural percentage (11.6%). SUMA derived 69.5% of its freshmen from cities ranging in population from 2,501 to 50,000 as compared to 57.7% at Sanctuary, 32.4% at Soul, and only 25.0% at Eden. Eden led in percentage of students from cities of 50,000 to 500,000 population with 36.9%, while Soul had 31.5%, Sanctuary 9.6%, and SUMA 8.4%. Finally, coming from cities over 500,000 in population, both Eden and Soul had 24.5% of their freshmen, while Sanctuary had 12.0%, and only 2.1% of SUMA's entering freshmen came from cities that large. If the freshman cohorts were to be described according to a simple dichotomous breakdown, it would be concluded that Eden and Soul are primarily comprised of urban students whereas Sanctuary and SUMA are largely rural.

#### Number of Siblings

Number of siblings provides information regarding the size of the family of origin in which the student was first socialized. When looking at data in Table I, it can be seen that the percentage of only-children entering as freshmen at the four schools is quite similar, ranging from

3.3% at Eden to 4.8% at Sanctuary. The largest percentages for Sanctuary, Eden, and SUMA are found in the categories of one, two, or three siblings. The most noticeable differences appear in the table when comparing the percentage of entering freshmen at each college who have more than four brothers or sisters. In these categories, Soul clearly differs from the other three colleges. The smallest percentage having more than four siblings was found at Eden University (7.6%), followed by Sanctuary (14.5%), and SUMA (16.2%). University of Soul had 44.6% of its entering freshmen coming from families having at least five children. In fact, 6.9% of Soul's entering freshmen had nine or more siblings in their family of orientation, which is a larger percentage than the other three freshman cohorts had combined. These data indicate that the two private schools' freshmen came from smaller families on the average than those at the two state-supported schools, and most notably, that the students from the predominantly black state institution came from the largest families on the average. This is in harmony with national census data on fertility rates (Bureau of the Census, 1971). The mean number of brothers and sisters reflects these differences vividly with Soul having the highest mean (4.2), followed by SUMA (2.8), Sanctuary (2.7), and Eden (2.6).

#### Birth Order

The order of birth is a statistic that was added to this demographic profile in order to determine in later follow-up studies of drop-outs if birth order is related in anyway to success in college. It is conceivable that position in the birth sequence differentially affects the



socialization process to which a child is exposed. Eden University had the largest percentage of first-borns enter as freshmen in the Fall of 1977 (37.0%). Sanctuary had 33.8% first-borns in its freshman cohort, followed by Soul with 32.0%, and SUMA with 30.3%. While Soul had a larger percentage of its freshmen from families with nine or more children, SUMA had the largest percentage of freshmen among the four schools who were born ninth or later in the birth sequence (1.9%) as compared to 0.7% at Soul, 0.5% at Eden, and none at Sanctuary. As indicated earlier, the relevance of this variable is unknown at this time, but it is hoped that it will provide some useful information in future studies regarding drop-outs.

#### Religious Preference

Members of the four freshman cohorts were instructed to indicate their religious preference by marking Catholic, Jewish, Protestant, or Other. As Table I indicates, Sanctuary, Eden, and SUMA were predominantly Protestant (62.3%, 80.4%, and 60.6% respectively), while only 20.0% of the freshmen at Soul indicated Protestant as their preference. The Jewish category represented the smallest percentage at each school ranging from 0.3% at SUMA to 0.8% at Soul. Indicating a preference of "Other" were 35.7% at Sanctuary (a Protestant affiliated college with very strong church ties), 14.7% at Eden (also Protestant affiliated), 71.2% at Soul, and 32.6% at SUMA. These data on religious preference are believed to be quite misleading. While the categories used are those on most standardized forms inquiring about religious preference, it is felt that many of the freshmen who belong to specific Protestant denominations are not familiar with the general classification of

Protestant for these denominations. When questionnaires were reviewed on this item, it was found that in a few instances, that respondents had marked "Other" and then written beside the question the name of a specific religious denomination typically classified as Protestant such as Methodist, Baptist, or Lutheran, for example.

It is possible that part of the unusually high figure for "Other" religious preference at the University of Soul can be attributed to the interest there in black heritage and some of the African religions. However, a figure of 71.2% is probably not accurate even based upon that explanation. In discussing this with members of the faculty at Soul, it was estimated that less than half of the students there are involved in African religions, and that probably the largest percentage of students at Soul are affiliated with Protestant denominations.

Unquestionably, the figure of 62.3% Protestant at Sanctuary is too low. Due to the close affiliation of Sanctuary with the Protestant denomination which helps support it, it would probably be safe to estimate that over 90% of its entering freshmen are affiliated with that denomination.

#### Political Preference

The political preferences of entering freshmen at the four colleges indicate an interesting difference between the two types of institutions. Both private, church-affiliated schools had the largest percentage of their freshmen indicate Republican as their political preference (37.2% at Sanctuary and 43.7% at Eden). On the other hand, both state-supported institutions had freshman classes comprised predominantly of students whose political preference was Democrat (70.1% at Soul and 60.9% at

SUMA). Small percentages were found among the other political preferences and these parties were all collapsed under the category of "Other" (see questionnaire item 37 in Appendix A for specific categories offered). Only 8.7% at Sanctuary, 7.1% at Eden, 8.7% at Soul, and 2.4% at SUMA indicated party preference other than Democrat or Republican. The largest percentage of students who were uncertain about their political preference were at Sanctuary (36.2%), followed by Eden (21.3%), SUMA (20.2%), and Soul with 17.3%. The differences in mean ages could possibly account for this somewhat, in that the larger number of students over 18 years of age, the more likely they are to have registered to vote and declared political party affiliation. It was not surprising to find the political affiliation of freshmen at the predominantly black school to be overwhelmingly Democratic.

#### Most Common High School Grade

Since one of the overall objectives of the research project for which this study is establishing the data baseline is to attempt to determine possible variables relating to success and persistence in college, the most common grade in high school was included in this demographic profile. Later studies may indicate a significant relationship between success and persistence in college and secondary school performance.

The most common grade in high school for each of the four freshman cohorts was a letter grade of "B". Sanctuary had 46.1% of its entering freshmen in this category; Eden, 49.2%; Soul, 44.4%; and SUMA, 52.4%. Some differences appear, however, when comparing the "A" and "C" categories. Eden had the highest percentage among the four schools in the "A"

category with 39.9% as compared to 29.4% at Sanctuary, 28.1% at SUMA, and only 11.9% at Soul. University of Soul led all schools in percentage of "C" students entering in the Fall of 1977 with 42.1% as compared to 24.0% at Sanctuary, 18.5% at SUMA, and only 10.4% at Eden. Less than 2.0% of each freshman cohort indicated "D" as their most common grade while in high school. Overall, it appears that the highest high school grades were held, on the average, by the freshmen at Eden. As indicated in Chapter IV, Eden officials take great pride in the academic excellence at their school. Although Eden had the largest percentage of students with high school grades of "B" or higher, it was followed by one of the state-supported schools (SUMA), and thus, no clearcut trend in terms of type of college appears.

#### Participation in Extracurricular

##### Activities in High School

Academic performance is only one aspect of the high school experience which may be related to later performance at the college level. Another variable which may be useful in comparing the four cohorts is the extent to which the students participated in extracurricular activities, won awards, held offices in organizations, and so forth while attending high school. Item nine on the questionnaire (Appendix A), asked students to indicate this type of extracurricular participation while in high school. Items checked were simply added for each individual student, and crosstabulated by college to facilitate comparison. Possibilities ranged from none (0) to 17. In order to categorize for easier comparison, categories were trichotomized into groups of 0 to 5, 6 to 10, and more than 10 activities. The predominant category

for all four schools was zero to five extracurricular activities with Sanctuary registering 66.8%; Eden, 52.7%; Soul, 80.8%; and SUMA, 66.8%. Eden led the other three colleges in each of the other two categories with 44.0% indicating 6 to 10, and 3.3% more than 10. Thus, it appears that Eden University's freshman cohort not only had the highest grades while in high school, on the average, but also tended to participate in more extracurricular activities.

#### Residence While in College

Place of residence while in college along with other variables, such as the use of an automobile, help reflect the extent of autonomy experienced by the freshmen during their freshman year. The norm at all four colleges is for beginning freshmen to live in a dormitory on the college campus. This is the case for 78.2% of the freshmen at Sanctuary, 75.6% at Eden, 80.5% at Soul, and 52.3% at SUMA. The category receiving the next higher percentage at each school was that of living with parents, with 13.6% at Sanctuary, 12.5% at Eden, 6.3% at Soul, and 27.4% at SUMA fitting this classification. Both Sanctuary and Eden require beginning freshmen to live in the dormitories, and this is reflected in their housing data. Since SUMA had the largest percentage of married students, it follows that it would also have the largest percentage of students living off-campus in private homes and apartments (16.8%). The higher mean age at SUMA may also account for this, as many of the students there work and live in other communities and commute to school.

#### Hours Worked per Week

The number of hours worked per week while attending college would

be expected to relate inversely with parents' income (which will be discussed later in this chapter), and may also later prove to be related to success and persistence in college. When comparing the number of hours a student must work while attending college, it is found that Eden freshmen work fewer hours per week on the average, with 48.4% of its freshmen working none, as compared to 44.3% at SUMA, 38.7% at Soul, and only 15.5% at Sanctuary. The largest percentage of freshmen at Sanctuary (36.8%) must work between 11 to 20 hours per week, and it has the highest percentage of students who must work full-time (10.4%). Since the two private schools have higher tuition rates, it appears that most of that financial burden falls upon the parents at Eden, while the students at Sanctuary evidently must share part of that burden. A later look at the income of parents may provide some insight into this phenomenon. Both state-supported universities' freshmen appear to be working about the same amount of hours per week, as all categories are quite similar for Soul and SUMA.

### Summary

In briefly summarizing the demographic profiles of the four freshman cohorts, while quite similar in many respects on some demographic variables, patterns can be seen which distinguish each of the individual classes. Likewise, on certain variables such as age, marital status, size of family of orientation, and political preference, a distinction can be seen between the two different types of colleges (private versus public). When comparing demographic data on the freshmen at the predominantly black school with those at the predominantly white schools, the most noticeable differences appear on the variables of number of

siblings, religious preference, and high school grades. The most clear-cut distinction of the predominantly black freshman cohort is found in its sex ratio, as it is the only one of the four schools with a freshman class comprised of more males than females.

In brief summation of the student demographic profiles, the following trends and patterns tend to emerge:

1. The mean age of the freshman cohorts at the two state-supported schools were slightly higher than those at the two private colleges. The youngest mean age for freshmen was at Sanctuary (18.7) and the oldest was at SUMA (20.0).
2. Sanctuary, Eden, and SUMA all had more females than males in their freshman cohorts of 1977-78, whereas Soul had more males.
3. Racially, the freshman cohorts at Sanctuary, Eden, and SUMA are predominantly white, while that of Soul is predominantly black.
4. Most students at each of the four schools are single. More of the freshmen at the state schools were married than were those at the private schools, with SUMA having the largest percentage of married freshmen.
5. The two state-supported institutions also had more entering freshmen who were parents than did the two private schools. SUMA had the largest percentage of freshmen with children.
6. If dichotomized in terms of rural and urban, Eden and Soul primarily attract students from urban areas, whereas Sanctuary and SUMA primarily draw students from rural areas.
7. The number of siblings was quite similar among the freshman cohorts with the notable exception of Soul whose freshmen tended to have more brothers and sisters than those at the other three schools.
8. In terms of birth order, approximately one-third of each freshman cohort was comprised of first-born children.
9. With the exception of Soul, where "Other" was indicated, all the freshman cohorts are predominantly Protestant in religious preference.
10. Both of the private colleges had more students who were Republican in political preference, while both of the state-supported university freshman cohorts were predominantly Democratic. Over 70% of Soul's freshmen indicated preference for the Democratic party.

11. The highest typical high school grades were found among the freshmen at Eden, but no clearcut pattern was established indicating higher grades for freshmen at the private schools as compared to freshmen at state schools. Freshmen at Soul tended to have the lowest grades while in high school.
12. Extent of participation in extracurricular activities in high school was quite similar among the four schools with the noticeable exception of more participation among Eden's freshman cohort.
13. There are no notable distinctions among the four cohorts in residence while at college, as the majority of freshmen at each of the four schools tend to live in college dormitories.
14. Freshmen at Sanctuary must work more hours per week on the average than their counterparts at each of the three other schools. The amount of hours worked by Soul and SUMA freshmen is quite similar, while the freshmen at Eden are clearly working the fewest hours per week while in college.

#### Demographic Profiles of Parents

Entering freshmen are generally recent high school graduates and, in most cases, still living at home and receiving a substantial amount of physical, financial, and emotional support from their parents. Therefore, any effort to accurately describe and compare groups of college freshmen would be remiss to exclude data on their parents. Furthermore, as outlined in the theoretical perspective underpinning this study, the social learning approach assumes that a great deal of the variables to be measured regarding attitudes, values, and behavior, are a result of the socialization process experienced by the individual. Thus, demographic information about the parents can provide a valuable tool for comparison among the freshman cohorts of the four institutions participating in this study.

It should be kept in mind that the demographic data on the parents were collected from the students, and thus, there may be some discrepancy



between the response given by the student and what might have been given by the parents themselves. Yet, since all the data on parents of the members of the four freshman cohorts were gathered identically, it is assumed that all four groups were subject to the same discrepancies, and thus, comparisons may still be made and justified.

Demographic variables measured for the parents of the freshmen of 1977-78 at these four institutions include: fathers' marital status, mothers' marital status, fathers' religious preferences, mothers' religious preferences, fathers' political preferences, mothers' political preferences, fathers' educational level, mothers' educational level, parents' annual income, and the relative occupational status of both the fathers' and mothers' jobs (Table II).

#### Marital Status

Although displayed separately in Table II for more accurate presentation of data, the two variables of fathers' marital status and mothers' marital status can be more readily discussed simultaneously.

As indicated in Table II, the highest percentage of freshmen at each of the four schools have fathers and mothers who are married and living together. However, there is a significant difference between the freshmen at Soul and those at the other three schools. Soul had only 58.2% of its freshmen indicating their fathers were married and living with their mothers, whereas Sanctuary had 87.2%, Eden had 87.5%, and SUMA had 83.1%. Logically, these percentages should match identically with mothers who are married and living with the students' fathers, but but due to some students responding to one item and not the other, there is a slight discrepancy in these figures. For example, Sanctuary has

TABLE II  
 DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILES OF THE PARENTS OF THE FRESHMAN  
 CLASSES OF 1977-78 BY COLLEGE

Variable	College			SUMA
	Sanct.	Eden	Soul	
<u>Fathers' Marital Status</u>				
Married, living with mother	171 87.2%	154 87.5%	68 58.2%	460 83.1%
Divorced	20 10.2%	17 9.7%	26 22.2%	75 13.6%
Separated	5 2.6%	2 1.1%	19 16.2%	12 2.2%
Widowed	0 0.0%	3 1.7%	4 3.4%	6 1.1%
TOTAL	196 100.0%	176 100.0%	117 100.0%	553 100.0%
<u>Mothers' Marital Status</u>				
Married, living with father	169 82.8%	154 85.6%	67 54.9%	459 78.2%
Divorced	20 9.8%	17 9.4%	27 22.1%	78 13.3%
Separated	4 2.0%	2 1.1%	19 15.6%	11 1.9%
Widowed	11 5.4%	7 3.9%	9 7.4%	39 6.6%
TOTAL	204 100.0%	180 100.0%	122 100.0%	587 100.0%
<u>Father's Religious Preference</u>				
Catholic	9 4.5%	5 2.8%	10 8.2%	32 5.7%
Jewish	0 0.0%	2 1.1%	1 0.8%	1 0.2%

TABLE II (Continued)

Variable	College			SUMA
	Sanct.	Eden	Soul	
Protestant	112 56.3%	133 75.6%	31 25.4%	333 58.9%
Other	78 39.2%	36 20.5%	80 65.6%	199 35.2%
TOTAL	199 100.0%	176 100.0%	122 100.0%	565 100.0%
<u>Mothers' Religious Preference</u>				
Catholic	6 2.9%	7 3.9%	5 4.2%	37 6.3%
Jewish	0 0.0%	2 1.1%	1 0.8%	1 0.2%
Protestant	129 62.3%	143 79.0%	28 23.3%	362 61.7%
Other	72 34.8%	29 16.0%	86 71.7%	187 31.8%
TOTAL	207 100.0%	181 100.0%	120 100.0%	587 100.0%
<u>Fathers' Political Preference</u>				
Democrat	41 20.8%	72 40.9%	82 70.1%	371 65.2%
Republican	87 43.9%	79 44.9%	4 3.4%	90 15.8%
Other	9 4.5%	7 4.0%	11 9.5%	8 1.5%
Uncertain	61 30.8%	18 10.2%	20 17.0%	100 17.5%
TOTAL	198 100.0%	176 100.0%	117 100.0%	569 100.0%

TABLE II (Continued)

Variable	College			SUMA
	Sanct.	Eden	Soul	
<u>Mothers' Political Preference</u>				
Democrat	46 22.4%	62 34.3%	89 73.6%	386 65.6%
Republican	89 43.4%	93 51.4%	5 4.1%	91 15.5%
Other	9 4.4%	7 10.5%	7 5.8%	5 0.9%
Uncertain	61 29.8%	19 10.5%	20 16.5%	106 18.0%
TOTAL	205 100.0%	181 100.0%	121 100.0%	588 100.0%
<u>Fathers' Educational Level</u>				
Less than elementary	9 4.3%	2 1.1%	7 5.4%	45 7.5%
Completed elementary	7 3.4%	3 1.6%	3 2.3%	22 3.7%
Less than high school	29 13.9%	18 9.8%	24 18.5%	121 20.3%
Completed high school	34 16.4%	38 20.7%	28 21.5%	161 26.9%
Some college	35 16.8%	30 16.3%	17 13.1%	97 16.2%
Two-year college graduate	8 3.8%	4 2.2%	9 6.9%	17 2.8%
Four-year college graduate	36 17.3%	26 14.1%	17 13.1%	57 9.5%
Some graduate work	7 3.4%	13 7.1%	2 1.5%	19 3.2%
Master's degree	11 5.3%	21 11.4%	9 6.9%	29 4.9%

TABLE II (Continued)

Variable	College			SUMA
	Sanct.	Eden	Soul	
Ph.D. or M.D.	32 15.4%	29 15.7%	14 10.8%	30 5.0%
TOTAL	208 100.0%	184 100.0%	130 100.0%	598 100.0%
<u>Mothers' Educational Level</u>				
Less than elementary	5 2.4%	2 1.1%	5 3.8%	28 4.7%
Completed elementary	6 2.9%	1 0.5%	1 0.8%	16 2.7%
Less than high school	19 9.1%	11 6.0%	25 19.2%	119 19.9%
Completed high school	48 23.1%	49 26.6%	34 26.2%	240 40.1%
Some college	47 22.6%	44 23.9%	17 13.1%	85 14.2%
Two-year college graduate	13 6.3%	16 8.7%	13 10.0%	14 2.3%
Four-year college graduate	42 20.2%	27 14.7%	16 12.3%	33 5.5%
Some graduate work	5 2.4%	15 8.2%	3 2.3%	16 2.7%
Master's degree	15 7.2%	16 8.7%	6 4.6%	38 6.4%
Ph.D. or M.D.	8 3.8%	3 1.6%	10 7.7%	9 1.5%
TOTAL	208 100.0%	184 100.0%	130 100.0%	598 100.0%
<u>Annual Income</u>				
Less than \$5,000	19 9.4%	9 5.1%	25 21.4%	77 14.6%

TABLE II (Continued)

Variable	College			SUMA
	Sanct.	Eden	Soul	
\$5,001-\$10,000	51 25.1%	20 11.4%	41 35.0%	114 21.6%
\$10,001-\$15,000	59 29.1%	44 25.1%	20 17.1%	157 29.8%
\$15,001-\$20,000	20 9.9%	45 25.7%	20 17.1%	90 17.1%
Over \$20,000	54 26.5%	57 32.7%	11 9.4%	89 16.9%
TOTAL	203 100.0%	175 100.0%	117 100.0%	527 100.0%
<u>Fathers' Occupational Status*</u>				
Upper	40 19.5%	47 25.8%	11 8.7%	40 6.8%
Middle	83 40.5%	89 48.9%	32 25.2%	272 46.0%
Lower	82 40.0%	46 25.3%	84 66.1%	279 47.2%
TOTAL	205 100.0%	182 100.0%	127 100.0%	591 100.0%
<u>Mothers' Occupational Status*</u>				
Upper	3 1.4%	7 3.8%	0 0.0%	5 0.8%
Middle	111 53.6%	103 56.3%	41 31.8%	258 43.4%
Lower	93 44.9%	73 39.9%	88 68.2%	332 55.8%
TOTAL	207 100.0%	183 100.0%	129 100.0%	595 100.0%

\*Based on Revised North-Hatt Occupational Prestige Scale (Appendix B).

171 fathers married and living with mothers, but only 169 mothers married and living with fathers. However, these discrepancies are not serious enough to distort the patterns of marital status evidenced by Table II. Clearly, the highest percentage of divorced parents is at Soul (over 20.0%), as is the highest percentage of parents who are separated (approximately 16.0%). When these two categories are combined, it can be seen that over one-third of the entering freshmen at Soul experienced a broken family situation. The second highest percentage of divorced and separated parents was at SUMA. The two lowest rates of divorces and separations were at the two private colleges, as might be expected due to the religious connotations associated with marriage and divorce. Both private schools had approximately 10.0% of their freshmen with divorced parents, and an additional 1.0% to 2.5% separated. When preliminary reports of these findings were submitted, officials at Sanctuary openly admitted surprise at the number of freshmen entering their school with divorced and/or separated parents. Officials at the other three schools showed no surprise, and indicated the figures were about what was expected. All four schools had more widowed mothers than fathers with Soul leading in both categories (3.4% had widowed fathers, and 7.4% had widowed mothers). The other three schools had similar data on widowed parents as can be seen in Table II.

#### Religious Preferences

The variables of fathers' and mothers' religious preferences are subject to the same misconceptions discussed earlier when discussing students' religious preferences, in that apparently many students whose

parents are associated with Protestant denominations indicated "Other" on the questionnaire. However, as with the data on the students' religious preferences, general trends in religious preference can be viewed.

According to these data, the majority of both fathers and mothers are Protestant at Sanctuary, Eden, and SUMA. However, "Other" leads all categories at Soul with 65.6% of the fathers and 71.7% of the mothers classified as such. There appear to be some "mixed" marriages in terms of religion among Catholic and non-Catholic parents at each school (though these percentages are quite small at the two private schools), but the figures for Jewish parents match at each school indicating that interfaith marriage among Jewish parents is virtually non-existent for the four freshman cohorts.

#### Political Preferences

Data on parents' political preferences look very similar to those for the political preferences of the students. Parents of the freshmen at the two private schools tend more to be affiliated with the Republican party, while those of the students at the state schools are predominantly democratic. As with the students, over 70.0% of both the mothers and fathers of Soul freshmen prefer the Democratic party. A substantial percentage of the freshmen at each school are uncertain of their parents' political preference. Sanctuary led all schools with percentage of freshmen unsure of their parents' political preferences (approximately 30.0%).

Overall, the general trends for political preference of parents look quite similar to those for the students. It seems apparent that



the entering freshmen, most of whom are just reaching an age of political awareness and participation, are greatly influenced by their parents in terms of preference for a political party. This phenomenon will be further explored in later studies to see if during the college experience the political preference of students undergo any change.

### Educational Level

In order to examine the educational attainment level of the parents of the freshmen at the four institutions under study, data were collected on the educational level of both the parents. Categories for responses ranged from not having completed elementary school to having received a Ph.D. or M.D. degree. In order to provide the most accurate profile of parents' educational attainment, each category is given in Table II. However, in order to facilitate discussion and comparison in this section, categories have been collapsed to those of "Did not complete high school", and "High school graduates" (this category includes those with some college and graduates of two-year college programs), "College graduates" (which includes those with some graduate work), "Master's degree", and the category of "Doctoral degrees" including Ph.D., Ed.D., and M.D. degrees.

When categories are collapsed, the fathers of freshmen at the two private colleges clearly have higher educational levels than those at the two state-supported universities. Fathers of Eden freshmen have the highest overall educational attainment level among the four schools, and SUMA fathers have the lowest. The freshmen at Sanctuary indicated 21.6% to have fathers with less than a high school diploma and Eden had only 12.5%, while Soul had 26.2%, and SUMA had 31.5% in this category. There

were 37.0% at Sanctuary who indicated their fathers' highest educational attainment level to be high school graduates, as did 39.2% at Eden, 41.5% at Soul, and 45.9% at SUMA. These two categories account for 67.7% of the fathers of freshmen at Soul and 77.4% of those at SUMA as compared to 58.6% at Sanctuary and 51.7% at Eden. Thus, while a majority of fathers of freshmen at all four schools are high school graduates or less in educational attainment, a substantially larger percentage of fathers at the two private schools have gone beyond that level than have fathers of freshmen at the two state schools. Sanctuary had 20.7% of its freshmen indicate their fathers were college graduates, while Eden slightly bettered that percentage with 21.2%. Soul and SUMA lagged considerably behind these figures with 14.6% and 12.7% respectively. Eden led all schools in percentage of freshmen whose fathers had attained Master's degrees and in the category of Doctoral degrees with 11.4% at the Master's level and 15.7% with Doctorates. Sanctuary followed with 5.3% and 15.4% in these two categories, Soul registered 6.9% with Master's and 10.8% with Doctor's, and SUMA had only 4.9% and 5.0% in these categories.

Similar trends are found when comparing the educational level of the mothers of freshman students from the four institutions. Overall, the two private schools had the highest level and the two state-supported schools the lowest. Sanctuary had 14.4% who had not completed high school and Eden had only 7.6%, while Soul had 23.8%, and SUMA had 27.3%. The largest category for three of the schools was that of high school graduates with Sanctuary registering 52.9%, Eden at 59.2%, and Soul at 49.3%. SUMA had 20.6% high school graduates which was fewer than those who had not completed high school. Both Sanctuary and Eden were very

close in percentage of freshmen whose mothers had attained college degrees (22.6% and 22.9%). Soul had 14.6% of the mothers with college degrees and SUMA only 8.2%. Sanctuary and Eden were also similar in percentage of mothers with advanced degrees. Sanctuary had 7.2% with Master's degrees and 3.8% who had earned Doctorates, while Eden had 8.7% Master's and 1.6% Doctor's. Soul indicated 4.6% of the freshmen to have mothers with Master's degrees, and 7.7% with Doctorates (which seems inordinately high and raises some doubt in the mind of the researcher considering the socioeconomic status of the students and parents at Soul). SUMA registered 6.4% in the Master's category and 1.5% with Doctoral degrees.

#### Annual Income

When comparing annual incomes of parents of the freshmen entering these four institutions in the Fall of 1977, it appears that on the average, the parents of the students entering the two private colleges had slightly higher annual incomes than those entering the state-supported universities. The most notable difference occurs when comparing the incomes of parents of freshmen at Eden University with the parents of those at the University of Soul. Soul had 21.4% of its freshmen indicate their parents had incomes of less than \$5,000 per year, whereas Eden only had 5.1% in that category (SUMA had 14.6% and Sanctuary had 9.4%). The same type of difference is noted in the \$5,001 to \$10,000 category where Soul's largest percentage was located (35.0%) as compared to only 11.4% at Eden (Sanctuary and SUMA were very close in this category with 25.1% and 21.6% respectively). Sanctuary and SUMA

were also quite similar in the next category (\$10,001 to \$15,000) with Sanctuary having 29.1% of its freshmen and SUMA having 29.8%. Soul registered 17.1% in this category whereas Eden had over one-fourth of its freshmen (25.7%) indicating parent incomes within that range. The category of annual incomes over \$20,000 shows a clearcut division between types of college with the private schools much higher than the two public colleges. Eden led all schools in the over \$20,000 range with close to one-third of its freshman students (32.7%). Sanctuary followed closely with 26.5% indicating incomes over \$20,000, while SUMA had 16.9% and Soul only 9.4%. Overall, these data indicate the highest income level of parents to be among the freshman class at Eden while the lowest income level is found at Soul. The parental income level at SUMA appears the most diverse across categories. As interesting note in the distribution of income at Sanctuary is a steady increase in percentages of students in each category as income increases until the \$15,001 to \$20,000 category is reached, and then only 9.9% of the freshmen are included within that classification. Yet, the percentage jumps back up to 26.5% in the over \$20,000 range. At Eden, as the income range increases, so does the percentage of students whose parents are included in that category. The income patterns depicted in Table II and described in this section seem to fit quite appropriately with information received about parents' incomes from administrators and faculty at the four schools involved in this study.

#### Occupational Status

As can be seen in Table II, when the occupations of the freshman students' fathers are ranked on the North-Hatt Occupational Prestige

Scale revised by Cooper (1975), Eden leads all schools with the percentage of fathers who hold upper status jobs with 25.8% in that category. Eden is followed by Sanctuary with 19.5% of their fathers in the upper status category. The two state-supported universities fall far behind the two private schools with 8.7% of the fathers of Soul freshmen and 6.8% of those at SUMA having upper status occupations. At Sanctuary, 40.5% of the fathers had middle status occupations as compared to 48.9% at Eden, 25.2% at Soul, and 46.0% at SUMA. The largest percentage of fathers having lower status jobs is found at Soul (66.1%), followed by SUMA (47.2%), Sanctuary (40.0%), and Eden with 25.3%. While the percentages are different for mothers' occupational status, the same trends can be seen among the four schools. Occupational status of parents will be further discussed later in this chapter when the idealized occupations selected by the freshmen are discussed and compared.

#### Socioeconomic Status of Parents

By combining the variables of income, educational level, and occupational status, a general assessment of the socioeconomic status of the parents of the freshmen at the four schools can be made. Based on the combination of these three variables, the freshmen at Eden University are clearly coming from higher socioeconomic backgrounds than are their counterparts at the three other schools. The parents of Eden freshmen were highest on each of the three variables of income, educational level, and occupational status. The other private school (Sanctuary) would be ranked second in terms of parents' socioeconomic status. The parents of freshmen at the two state-supported schools appear lower

in socioeconomic status, with a general trend of the SUMA parents being slightly higher than those of Soul freshmen.

### Summary

A number of variables were included in the demographic profile of the parents of the members of the freshman classes of 1977-78 at the four colleges under study as depicted in Table II. In briefly summarizing the demographic profiles of these parents, the following assessments can be made:

1. The majority of the freshmen's parents were married and living together at each of the four schools. However, Soul had a significantly smaller percentage of parents married and living together (some 25.0% less than the other three schools). The percentage of divorced or separated parents was higher at the two state schools than at the two private schools, with Soul having the highest in both categories.
2. The majority of the parents at Sanctuary, Eden, and SUMA are Protestant, while the majority is classified as "Other" at Soul. These data are quite consistent with data on religious preferences of the students.
3. The political preferences of the parents are quite similar to those expressed by the students. Both private schools have more parents preferring the Republican party, while both state schools are predominantly Democratic. Over 70.0% of Soul's parents are associated with the Democratic party.
4. The parents of the freshmen at the two private colleges have higher educational attainment levels overall than do the parents of the freshmen at the two state-supported institutions. The highest educational level for parents is at Eden and the lowest is at SUMA.
5. On the average, the annual incomes of parents of freshmen at the two private schools are higher than the annual incomes of parents of freshmen at the two state universities. The highest annual incomes are at Eden and the lowest at Soul.
6. When comparing the relative statuses of the occupations held by parents of the freshmen at the four schools, it is found that parents of the freshmen at the private schools tend to have higher status occupations than their counterparts at the state

schools. Overall, Eden parents tend to occupy jobs with the highest prestige, while parents of Soul freshmen tend to have the lowest prestige jobs on the average.

7. When comparing the overall socioeconomic status of the parents of members of the four freshman cohorts based on the variables of educational attainment level, annual income, and occupational prestige, a clear distinction can be seen between the two types of colleges. The freshmen at the two private colleges come from relatively higher socioeconomic backgrounds with Eden being the highest. The socioeconomic backgrounds of the freshmen at the two state-supported universities are comparatively lower, with Soul being the lowest.

### Comparison of Selected Attitudes and Values

#### Among the Freshman Cohorts

In order to fulfill the fourth research objective of this study (see Chapter I), the research instrument contained a wide range of items designed to identify selected attitudes and values held by members of each freshman cohort in regard to variables such as: racial integration, homogamy, legalization of marijuana, religion, sexual permissiveness, traditional sex roles for women, academic honesty, the most influential persons in their lives, and purpose in life. Similarly, items were included regarding going steady and use of an automobile, as were variables relating to future plans of the students about marriage, having children, choice of major field, and occupational selections.

#### Racial Integration

In order to gain some insight into existing attitudes among the entering freshmen at the four colleges in this study toward racial integration, respondents were asked to indicate the number of friends they had of a racial group other than their own while in high school.

Responses ranged from "None" to "More than of their own race" (Table III).

The data on number of friends of another race are quite similar for Sanctuary, Eden, and SUMA, but markedly different for the freshmen at the University of Soul. The two largest categories for the two private schools and SUMA are "None" and "Three to five". When categories are collapsed, it can be seen that a majority of these three cohorts had five or fewer friends of another race (Sanctuary, 65.2%; Eden, 62.3%; and SUMA, 62.8%). The freshmen with the largest number of friends of another race were found at Soul. The largest category for Soul freshmen was that of having as many friends of another race as one's own (35.7%). There were an additional 6.2% who indicated more friends of a different race than of their own. A  $X^2$  of 35.15 with 15 degrees of freedom indicates a  $p < .05$  indicating a significant difference on this variable. When comparing the cells, it can readily be seen that most of this difference is between Soul and the other three schools. This difference could be assessed as meaning that entering freshmen at the University of Soul are more liberal and more predisposed toward racial integration. Another possible explanation for the significant difference could be related to the fact that the black students entering Soul probably comprised a minority in the high schools which they attended, and, therefore, had a much greater opportunity to make as many or more friends from another race as from their own. On the other hand, the predominantly white cohorts at each of the three other schools were probably part of the majority race in their high schools. It will be interesting in future studies to see if the data on number of friends of a different race change for the cohort at Soul as they are now,



TABLE III  
NUMBER OF FRIENDS FROM OTHER RACIAL GROUPS  
WHILE IN HIGH SCHOOL BY COLLEGE

College	Number of Friends						As Many as Own Race	More Than Own Race	Total
	0	1	2	3-5	6-10				
Sanctuary	45 22.1%	18 8.8%	19 9.3%	51 25.0%	37 18.1%	22 10.8%	12 5.9%	204 100.0%	
Eden	51 27.9%	10 5.5%	16 8.7%	37 20.2%	36 19.7%	26 14.2%	7 3.8%	183 100.0%	
Soul	12 9.3%	9 7.0%	11 8.5%	20 15.5%	23 17.8%	46 35.7%	8 6.2%	129 100.0%	
SUMA	123 21.0%	53 9.0%	49 8.4%	143 24.4%	101 17.2%	93 15.9%	24 4.1%	586 100.0%	
	231 21.0%	90 8.2%	95 8.6%	251 22.8%	197 17.9%	187 17.0%	51 4.6%	1102* 100.0%	

$\chi^2 = 35.15, 15 \text{ d.f.}, p < .05.$

\*A total of 18 students did not respond to this item.

perhaps for the first time in their educational careers, attending a predominantly black school. Thus, interaction with members of another race will be somewhat limited during the college experience. If four years of college socialization proves to be a liberalizing experience as indicated by Feldman and Newcomb (1969), Astin (1977), and others, the number of friends of a different race than their own may increase for members of each of the four freshman cohorts by the time they are seniors in college.

#### Homogamy

Students' attitudes toward homogamy were measured by Items 39 and 42 on the questionnaire (Appendix A). These items refer to two typical homogamy norms which exist to varying degrees in our culture. Both items were stated in affirmation of the homogamy norm--one dealing with religion and the other with race--indicating the belief that it is important to marry someone of the same religion and the same race. A typical five-point continuum of responses were provided ranging from "Strongly Agree" through "Mixed Feelings" to "Strongly Disagree". These data have been compiled and are reflected in Tables IV and V.

As indicated in Table IV, the strongest support for homogamy based on religion exists at one of the private, church-affiliated colleges (Sanctuary), with 73.9% of its freshmen indicating they strongly agree that it is important to marry someone of the same religious faith. An additional 14.0% responded that they agreed, making 87.9% altogether responding in agreement with religious homogamy. Only 8.8% of Sanctuary's freshmen had "Mixed Feelings" about the necessity of marrying

TABLE IV  
 ATTITUDES TOWARD HOMOGAMY BASED ON RELIGION BY COLLEGE

Response	College			SUMA
	Sanct.	Eden	Soul	
Strongly Agree	153 73.9%	28 15.3%	20 15.5%	119 20.0%
Agree	29 14.0%	58 31.7%	23 17.8%	148 24.9%
Mixed Feelings	18 8.8%	39 21.3%	17 13.2%	163 27.4%
Disagree	3 1.4%	25 13.7%	29 22.5%	93 15.6%
Strongly Disagree	4 1.9%	33 18.0%	40 31.0%	72 12.1%
TOTAL	207 100.0%	183 100.0%	129 100.0%	595 100.0%

$\chi^2 = 313.67, 12 \text{ d.f.}, p < .05.$

TABLE V  
 ATTITUDES TOWARD HOMOGAMY BASED ON RACE BY COLLEGE

---

Statement: It is important to marry someone of your own race.

---

Response	College			SUMA
	Sanct.	Eden	Soul	
Strongly Agree	101 48.8%	51 27.7%	18 14.0%	321 53.9%
Agree	39 18.8%	49 26.6%	26 20.2%	113 19.0%
Mixed Feelings	34 16.4%	43 23.4%	21 16.3%	94 15.8%
Disagree	17 8.2%	17 9.2%	25 19.3%	32 5.4%
Strongly Disagree	16 7.8%	24 13.1%	39 30.2%	35 5.9%
TOTAL	207 100.0%	184 100.0%	129 100.0%	595 100.0%

---

$\chi^2 = 151.17$ , 12 d.f.,  $p < .05$ .

someone of the same religious faith, and a total of 3.3% disagreed. The other private, church-affiliated institution (Eden) had the lowest percentage of freshmen who strongly agreed with the statement, but there were an additional 31.7% who agreed, making a total of 47.0% in agreement with this homogamy norm. There was also a substantial percentage of Eden's freshmen who had mixed feelings about this item, and a total of 31.7% were in disagreement. Thus, when comparing the two church-affiliated colleges, it can be seen that Sanctuary freshmen appear to feel much stronger about marrying someone of the same religious faith than do their counterparts at Eden. When discussing this item with officials at these two schools, it was indicated that the two denominations represented by them are rather dissimilar on attitudes toward religious homogamy. The denomination predominantly represented at Sanctuary emphasizes the importance of marrying within the religious faith. While the denomination at Eden suggests marriage within one's faith, it is not as strongly encouraged as it is in many denominations. Therefore, these data on religious homogamy seem consistent with the basic philosophies on inter-faith marriages held by the different denominations affiliated with the two schools.

Upon examination of the data on this variable from Soul and SUMA, a substantial difference in attitudes can be detected. Soul is the only one of the four colleges where the largest percentage of students are in disagreement with the statement on religious homogamy. At Soul, 22.5% disagree with the statement that it is important to marry someone of the same religious faith and 31.0% strongly disagree (53.5% altogether in disagreement). Approximately one-third of Soul's freshmen agreed with the statement (33.3%) and 13.2% had mixed feelings. The majority

of freshmen at SUMA were spread over the three categories of "Strongly Agree" (20.0%), "Agree" (24.9%), and "Mixed Feelings" (27.4%). A total of 27.7% were in disagreement with the necessity of marrying within one's own religious faith.

A  $X^2$  of 313.67 with 12 degrees of freedom indicated statistical significance with  $p < .05$ . Most of the difference among these cohorts can be identified when looking at the two extreme cases of Sanctuary and Soul. Clearly, the strongest support for religious homogamy is among the freshmen at Sanctuary. In contrast, the least emphasis upon marrying someone of the same religious faith is indicated at Soul. Both Eden and SUMA reflect attitudes favoring religious homogamy, but appear less adamant about it than the freshmen at Sanctuary. The freshman cohorts at Eden and SUMA had substantial percentages of students with mixed feelings about this item.

The variable of racial homogamy was measured by the item "It is important to marry someone of your own race." Subjects were given the same five alternatives for response, and findings are summarized in Table V.

Although less compelling than the data on religious homogamy, Sanctuary once again scored very highly in the "Strongly Agree" column (48.8%), and an additional 18.8% indicated "Agree", thus making 67.6% altogether expressing agreement with the notion that it is important to marry someone of your own race. There were 16.4% of the Sanctuary freshmen who were unsure about interracial marriage, and a total of 16.0% who disagreed with the importance of marrying within one's own race. The prevailing attitude at Sanctuary appears to clearly be in favor of racial homogamy. The strongest support for homogamy based on

race was found among the freshman students at SUMA (53.9% strongly agree, and 19.0% agree). There were 15.8% with mixed feelings on the subject at SUMA, and 11.3% who indicated disagreement with the importance of marrying a member of the same race. Eden had a majority of its freshmen respond in agreement with this item (54.3%) indicating the prevalence of attitudes favoring racial homogamy within that cohort, but also had a substantial percentage who were unsure of its importance (23.4%). There were 22.3% who disagreed with the importance of marrying a person of the same race among the Eden freshmen. Once again, the Soul freshmen indicated the least emphasis upon homogamy. Almost one-half of Soul's freshman class indicated disagreement with the importance of racial homogamy (49.5%). Another 16.3% had mixed feelings, and 34.2% were in agreement with the statement. A  $X^2$  of 151.17 with 12 degrees of freedom indicated statistical significance well beyond the  $p < .05$  level.

When looking at both items as measures of homogamy, these data suggest a prevalence of attitudes favoring homogamy at Sanctuary in regard to both religion and race. While homogamy norms are also supported at Eden, adherence seems more varied with a substantial percentage of the freshmen experiencing mixed feelings about these items. SUMA freshmen have a tendency to favor marriage within religious faith, but indicate much more tolerance for inter-faith marriage than for interracial marriage. The weakest support for homogamy on both variables seems to exist at Soul. The largest percentage on both items indicated strong disagreement with the importance of homogamy. These data indicate more tolerant attitudes toward both inter-faith and interracial marriages to exist among the freshmen at Soul as compared to those at the other three educational institutions participating in this study.

These findings are in line with the data compiled on attitudes toward racial integration as measured by the number of friends from a different race. It follows that those who have more friends of different races (Soul) are more favorably predisposed to interracial marriage than those who have few friends of a different race. Since Soul freshmen will experience a more racially segregated environment over the next four years than they have probably experienced through their previous educational experience, this will be an interesting variable to re-measure when this cohort is ready to graduate from college. Likewise, the other three cohorts may show some indication of change in attitudes on these variables, although it is quite likely that the attitudes strongly favoring religious homogamy at Sanctuary will continue to exist. Constant exposure to members of the same religious denomination may very well strengthen these attitudes throughout the college socialization experience.

#### Legalization of Marijuana

For at least the past decade, a great deal of controversy has been generated in regard to the possible legalization of marijuana in this country. In order to assess attitudes toward the legalization of marijuana, students at the four schools were asked to respond to the statement, "Marijuana should be legalized" on a Likert-type continuum ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The results are shown in Table VI.

As indicated in Table VI, the largest percentage of freshmen students at each of the four schools strongly disagree with the legalization of marijuana. Sanctuary had 68.5% of its freshman class strongly



TABLE VI  
ATTITUDES TOWARD LEGALIZATION OF MARIJUANA BY COLLEGE

Statement: Marijuana should be legalized.					
Response	College				Total
	Sanct.	Eden	Soul	SUMA	
Strongly Agree	13 6.3%	21 11.4%	23 18.3%	63 10.6%	120 10.8%
Agree	11 5.3%	23 12.6%	14 11.1%	62 10.4%	110 9.9%
Undecided	23 11.2%	36 19.7%	38 30.2%	114 19.2%	211 19.0%
Disagree	18 8.7%	30 16.4%	10 7.9%	77 12.9%	135 12.2%
Strongly Disagree	141 68.5%	73 39.9%	41 32.5%	279 46.9%	534 48.1%
TOTAL	206 100.0%	183 100.0%	126 100.0%	595 100.0%	1110* 100.0%

$\chi^2 = 65.00$ , 12 d.f.,  $p < .05$ .

\*A total of 10 students did not respond to this item.

disagreeing with the statement, and an additional 8.7% in disagreement. The smallest percentage of students favoring legalization of marijuana were at Sanctuary (11.6%). The other church-affiliated school, Eden, was a bit more diversified, with a total of 56.3% opposed to legalization, 24.0% in favor of legalization, and 19.7% undecided. Soul had 40.4% opposed to legalization, 29.4% in favor, and 30.2% undecided (the largest percentage within this category among the four schools). SUMA had a majority of its freshmen in opposition to legalization of marijuana (59.8%), 21.0% in favor of legalization, and 19.2% were undecided.

When looking at categorical totals, 48.1% of the entering freshmen at the four schools combined were in strong disagreement with the statement that marijuana should be legalized. Another 12.2% disagreed, making a majority of the freshmen (60.3%) in opposition to the legalization of marijuana. A total of 19.0% of the freshmen were undecided on the issue, and only 20.7% indicated approval of the legalization of marijuana. These findings are quite consistent with those found by Astin (1977:61) who found 20.1% of his national sample of college freshmen in favor of legalization of marijuana. A  $X^2$  of 65.00 with 12 degrees of freedom is statistically significant, with  $p < .05$ .

When comparing the two church-affiliated schools with the two state-supported institutions, there is no large noticeable difference. While Sanctuary had the fewest in support of legalization of marijuana, SUMA had the second largest percentage in that category. Overall, the freshmen cohorts at each of the four schools show a similar trend of attitudes against the legalization of marijuana.

## Religion

The religious preferences of the members of the four freshman cohorts were recorded and discussed earlier in this chapter (Table I). Four other questions dealing with religion were incorporated into the measuring instrument, and can be utilized for comparative purposes among the four groups. These items involve church attendance, Bible reading, the belief in life after death, and the relative importance of religion in their lives at the time of college entrance as compared to its importance at the age of 12.

As indicated in Table VII, Sanctuary scored highest on three out of the four religion variables. Sanctuary's freshman class had 91.2% of its members who attend church every week, 28.5% who regularly read the Bible, 60.1% who believe in life after death, and 72.5% who feel religion is more important in their lives today than it was at age 12. Belief in life after death was the only variable on which they did not have the highest percentage. In fact, 32.0% of Sanctuary's freshman class strongly disagreed that there is a future life after death. This is quite surprising as the religious denomination affiliated with Sanctuary expresses a strong belief in life after death. This puzzled officials at Sanctuary when they were shown these data, and they could only guess that the statement was somehow misconstrued by the students to indicate a belief in reincarnation, which would be out of line with their beliefs. However, data from the other church-affiliated school does not indicate a similar misunderstanding by the students there. In rounding out the categories for Sanctuary freshmen, only 1.0% indicated they never attend church and never read the Bible, and 12.1% view religion as less

TABLE VII  
COMPARISON OF RELIGION VARIABLES BY COLLEGE

Variable	College			SUMA
	Sanct.	Eden	Soul	
<u>Church Attendance*</u>				
Every week	186 91.2%	95 52.2%	53 41.7%	250 42.3%
1-2 times per month	14 6.8%	44 24.2%	32 25.2%	147 24.8%
3-4 times per year	1 0.5%	16 8.8%	11 8.7%	85 14.4%
Rarely	1 0.5%	22 12.1%	25 19.7%	95 16.0%
Never	2 1.0%	5 2.7%	6 4.7%	15 2.5%
TOTAL	204 100.0%	182 100.0%	127 100.0%	592 100.0%
<u>Bible Reading**</u>				
Regularly	59 28.5%	34 18.5%	17 13.4%	92 15.4%
Often	46 22.2%	28 15.2%	27 21.3%	93 15.6%
Occasionally	74 35.7%	69 37.5%	40 31.5%	209 35.2%
Rarely	26 12.6%	37 20.1%	33 26.0%	160 26.8%
Never	2 1.0%	16 8.7%	10 7.8%	42 7.0%
TOTAL	207 100.0%	184 100.0%	127 100.0%	596 100.0%

TABLE VII (Continued)

Variable	College			SUMA
	Sanct.	Eden	Soul	
<u>Belief in Life After Death***</u>				
Strongly agree	116 57.1%	107 58.9%	52 42.3%	344 57.8%
Agree	6 3.0%	29 15.9%	16 13.0%	69 11.6%
Undecided	14 6.9%	31 17.0%	39 31.7%	117 19.7%
Disagree	2 1.0%	2 1.1%	5 4.1%	28 4.7%
Strongly disagree	65 32.0%	13 7.1%	11 8.9%	37 6.2%
TOTAL	203 100.0%	182 100.0%	123 100.0%	595 100.0%
<u>Importance of Religion Compared to Age 12****</u>				
More important	150 72.5%	123 66.8%	92 71.9%	342 57.6%
Less important	25 12.1%	27 14.7%	8 6.2%	84 14.1%
About the same	32 15.4%	34 18.5%	28 21.9%	168 28.3%
TOTAL	207 100.0%	184 100.0%	128 100.0%	594 100.0%

\* $X^2 = 164.44$ , 12 d.f.,  $p < .05$ .

\*\* $X^2 = 49.40$ , 12 d.f.,  $p < .05$ .

\*\*\* $X^2 = 151.60$ , 12 d.f.,  $p < .05$ .

\*\*\*\* $X^2 = 26.85$ , 6 d.f.,  $p < .05$ .

important in their lives than it was at age 12. Another 15.4% indicated the importance of religion to be about the same upon entering college as it was when they were 12 years old.

With the exception of church attendance (Sanctuary was by far the highest on regular attendance), Eden freshmen appear quite similar to those at Sanctuary on the variables related to religion. Over one-half of Eden's freshmen (52.2%) attend church every week, and only 2.7% indicated they never attend. Data indicate that 18.5% of Eden's freshmen read the Bible regularly, and only 8.7% never read the Bible (this is a larger percentage of non-readers of the Bible than both the state schools as Soul had 7.8% and SUMA had 7.0%). There were 58.9% of Eden's freshmen who strongly agreed with the belief in life after death. When comparing the importance of religion to what it was at age 12, 66.8% of the Eden freshmen indicated religion has become more important, and 14.7% indicated less important, while 18.5% indicated it remained about the same.

The largest percentage of freshmen at Soul (41.7%) indicated they attend church every week. This was the smallest of the four schools, but SUMA was very close with 42.3% of its freshmen in that category. Soul had the largest percentage who never attend church (4.7%). Soul recorded the lowest percentage of regular Bible readers (13.4%), and had 7.8% who said they never read the Bible. A majority of Soul's freshmen indicated a belief in life after death (55.3%), and there were only 13.0% who disagreed with this concept. Soul registered the second largest percentage of students who indicated religion to be more important at the time of college entrance than it was at the age of 12

(71.9%), and only 6.2% indicated it was less important. As can be seen in Table VII, SUMA was quite similar to Eden and Soul on most of the religion variables.

When comparing the four schools on these religion variables, some marked similarities as discussed above, can be seen. Eden was slightly higher on church attendance and Bible reading than the two state-supported universities, but Sanctuary was substantially higher than all three of the other schools. A significant  $X^2$  was found for each item. Overall, each of the four freshman cohorts is fairly high in religiosity as measured by these four variables, which is fairly indicative of the geographic region of the schools.

#### Sexual Permissiveness

Sexual permissiveness was measured by two items on the questionnaire. The items were worded, "Sexual relations before marriage are morally wrong for men", and "Sexual relations before marriage are morally wrong for women". Students were asked to respond in Likert fashion with responses ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

The data in Table VIII clearly indicate the entering freshmen at Sanctuary to be the least permissive in regard to premarital sexual relations for both males and females. Over two-thirds of the freshmen at Sanctuary agreed that premarital sexual relations were morally wrong for males (67.9%), and slightly more viewed it as wrong for females (69.9%). There were 20.8% who disagreed with the statement for men, and only 18.0% who disagreed that it was morally wrong for women to have sexual relations before marriage. A small percentage were undecided for males (11.6%), and slightly more for females (12.1%). There appears to be a

TABLE VIII

## SEXUAL PERMISSIVENESS FOR MALES AND FEMALES BY COLLEGE

---

Statement: Sexual relations before marriage are morally wrong for males.

---

Response	College				Total
	Sanct.	Eden	Soul	SUMA	
Strongly Agree	125 60.4%	49 26.6%	19 14.8%	156 26.3%	349 31.3%
Agree	15 7.2%	20 10.9%	12 9.4%	55 9.2%	102 9.2%
Undecided	24 11.6%	40 21.7%	20 15.6%	12 25.5%	236 21.2%
Disagree	15 7.2%	32 17.4%	29 22.7%	93 15.6%	169 15.2%
Strongly Disagree	28 13.6%	43 23.4%	48 37.5%	139 23.4%	258 23.1%
TOTAL	207 100.0%	184 100.0%	128 100.0%	595 100.0%	1114* 100.0%

---

Statement: Sexual relations before marriage are morally wrong for females.

---

Response	College				Total
	Sanct.	Eden	Soul	SUMA	
Strongly Agree	132 64.1%	51 27.7%	19 15.0%	185 31.1%	387 34.8%
Agree	12 5.8%	24 13.0%	18 14.2%	70 11.8%	124 11.2%
Undecided	25 12.1%	39 21.3%	26 20.5%	143 24.0%	233 21.0%
Disagree	14 6.8%	30 16.3%	22 17.3%	89 15.0%	155 13.9%
Strongly Disagree	23 11.2%	40 21.7%	42 33.1%	108 18.1%	213 19.1%

---



TABLE VIII (Continued)

Response	College			SUMA	Total
	Sanct.	Eden	Soul		
TOTAL	206 100.0%	184 100.0%	127 100.0%	595 100.0%	1112** 100.0%

Note: For the first statement,  $X^2 = 124.45$ , 12 d.f.,  $p < .05$ ; for the second statement,  $X^2 = 117.96$ , 12 d.f.,  $p < .05$ .

\*Six students did not respond to this item.

\*\*Eight students did not respond to this item.

slight double-standard existing among the freshmen at Sanctuary, as their attitudes are slightly more permissive for males than for females, but the percentages are quite similar, and generally, the majority of Sanctuary freshmen view premarital sexual activity as morally wrong for both males and females. Of the four schools studied, Sanctuary was the only one with a majority of its freshmen in agreement with the two statements. The other church-affiliated college (Eden) had 37.5% of its freshmen in agreement with the statement in regard to men, and 40.7% in regard to women. About the same percentage were undecided (21.7% for males and 21.3% for females), and 40.8% disagreed that premarital sex was morally wrong for males and 38.0% felt that way for females. Thus, a double-standard is also evident at Eden, but the figures are relatively close when comparing attitudes toward sexual permissiveness for males and females.

Of the two state-supported schools, freshmen at SUMA appear much less permissive than those at Soul. In fact, the figures for SUMA

freshmen are quite similar to those for the freshmen at Eden. In regard to sexual permissiveness for males, 35.5% agreed that premarital sex was morally wrong. For females, 42.9% felt premarital sexual relations to be morally wrong, while approximately one-fourth were undecided in regard to both males and females. There were 39.0% who disagreed in regard to males, and 33.1% disagreed in regard to females. When comparing the figures for SUMA with Sanctuary and Eden, there appears to be a more noticeable double-standard at SUMA, as they are more permissive toward men than women. The Soul freshmen expressed the most liberal attitudes toward premarital sexual relations for both men and women. Only 24.2% agreed that sexual relations were morally wrong for men, while 60.2% expressed disagreement (of those, 37.5% strongly disagreed). An additional 5.0% viewed premarital sex as morally wrong for women (29.2%), and 50.4% disagreed with that idea. These data indicate a much more permissive attitude toward sexual relations before marriage than any of the three other schools. Soul freshmen exhibit, however, the same extent of double-standard toward premarital sex as the other three cohorts, but overall are more permissive toward both sexes. A significant  $X^2$  ( $p < .05$ ) was found for each item.

#### Traditional Sex Role for Women

In order to assess and compare attitudes regarding the traditional sex role for women, the subjects were asked to respond to the statement, "The activities of married women are best confined to the home and family", by indicating either strong agreement, agreement, mixed feelings, disagreement, or strong disagreement. Table IX indicates the responses of the four freshman cohorts in regard to this statement.

TABLE IX

## ATTITUDES TOWARD TRADITIONAL SEX ROLE FOR WOMEN BY COLLEGE

---

Statement: The activities of married women are best confined to the home and family.

---

Response	College				Total
	Sanct.	Eden	Soul	SUMA	
Strongly Agree	32 15.5%	13 7.1%	28 21.7%	54 9.1%	127 11.4%
Agree	39 18.8%	22 12.0%	18 14.0%	111 18.6%	190 17.0%
Mixed Feelings	53 25.6%	29 15.8%	22 17.0%	138 23.2%	242 21.7%
Disagree	37 17.9%	37 20.1%	30 23.3%	135 22.7%	239 21.4%
Strongly Disagree	46 22.2%	83 45.0%	31 24.0%	157 26.4%	317 28.5%
TOTAL	207 100.0%	184 100.0%	129 100.0%	595 100.0%	1115* 100.0%

---

$\chi^2 = 56.61, 12 \text{ d.f.}, p < .05.$

\*A total of five students did not respond to this item.

Approximately 34.3% of Sanctuary's entering freshmen agreed that married women's activities are best confined to home and family, while 40.1% disagreed, and over one-fourth (25.6%) had mixed feelings. The freshmen at Eden expressed the most disagreement with the notion of the traditional sex role for married women (65.1%). Another 15.8% of Eden's freshmen had mixed feelings, and only 19.1% agreed with the statement. Thus, Eden freshmen expressed the most liberal attitude toward changing sex roles for married women of the four groups. Soul freshmen, on the other hand, while seemingly more liberal on sexual permissiveness, expressed the most agreement with the traditional sex role for married women. Over one-fifth (21.7%) strongly agreed, and an additional 14.0% were in the "Agree" category. There were 17.0% of the Soul freshmen who indicated they had mixed feelings on this issue, and 47.3% who disagreed. Freshmen at SUMA were more diversified on this variable than either those at Eden or Soul, with 27.7% in agreement, 23.2% undecided, and 49.1% in disagreement with the traditional sex role for married women. In looking at the totals among all categories for all the subjects, almost one-half (49.9%) disagreed with the statement, 21.7% had mixed feelings, and 28.4% agreed. A  $X^2$  value of 56.61 with 12 degrees of freedom, is significant with  $p < .05$ .

#### Academic Honesty

Academic honesty was measured by the inclusion of a questionnaire item which asked the students to indicate how they would react if they saw a classmate cheating during an exam. Responses ranged from publicly rebuking the cheater to the idea that cheating is normal and sometimes necessary. The data are summarized in Table X.

TABLE X  
REACTION TO SEEING A CLASSMATE CHEAT ON AN EXAM BY COLLEGE

Reaction	College				Total
	Sanct.	Eden	Soul	SUMA	
Publicly rebuke him/her	1 0.5%	2 1.1%	2 1.6%	1 0.2%	6 0.5%
Privately report him/her	15 7.5%	11 6.0%	5 3.9%	17 2.9%	48 4.5%
Privately rebuke him/her	36 17.9%	37 20.2%	14 11.0%	76 13.0%	163 14.9%
Indigation, but do nothing	81 40.3%	90 49.1%	46 36.3%	241 41.3%	458 41.8%
No feeling or reaction	34 16.9%	25 13.7%	40 31.5%	174 29.8%	273 24.9%
Tolerant and understanding	26 12.9%	14 7.7%	5 3.9%	59 10.1%	104 9.5%
Cheating is normal and sometimes necessary	8 4.0%	4 2.2%	15 11.8%	16 2.7%	43 3.9%
TOTAL	201 100.0%	183 100.0%	127 100.0%	584 100.0%	1095* 100.0%

$\chi^2 = 77.58$ , 18 d.f.,  $p < .05$ .

\*A total of 25 students did not respond to this item.

As can be seen from the data in Table X, responses were similar among the four freshman cohorts under study. The response indicated by the largest percentage of freshmen at each of the four colleges was that they would feel indignation, but do nothing about it, and when all four schools are combined, 41.8% of the total N responded in this way. The least indicated response was that of publicly rebuking the cheater (0.5%). The only clear distinction in these data emerges when comparing the two state-supported schools with the two private colleges on the response of "No feeling or reaction". Soul had the highest percentage in this category (31.5%) followed closely by the other state school (SUMA) with 29.8%. The next highest in this response category was Sanctuary which drops down to 16.9%, and finally Eden had 13.7%. There appears to be a significant difference between the two types of colleges, with a larger portion of the entering freshmen at the state schools who would have no feeling or reaction to seeing a student cheat on an exam. However, the distinction is somewhat obfuscated by the fact that while 12.9% of the Sanctuary freshmen indicated they would be tolerant and understanding, and 4.0% indicated they felt cheating was normal and sometimes necessary. The next largest group indicating tolerance was at SUMA (10.1%), and they were followed by Eden (7.7%), and Soul (3.9%). Soul had the largest percentage of freshmen who indicated that cheating is normal and sometimes necessary, with 11.8% responding in that manner. The two private schools also had the largest percentages who would privately rebuke the person they saw cheating (17.9% at Sanctuary and 20.2% at Eden). A  $X^2$  of 77.78 with 18 degrees of freedom was significant with  $p < .05$ .

### Most Influential Person

Parents are generally considered to be the most influential people in the lives of their children while they are undergoing primary socialization (Elkin and Handel, 1978). However, after children grow older, attend school, date, and form other primary relationships, it is not known if the influence of the parents remains strong or dwindles. These data indicate that the most influential person in the lives of the entering freshmen under study tends to be one of the parents.

As can be seen in Table XI, the leading category at each of the four schools in terms of influence on personal life, was one of the parents. At Soul, 61.5% of the freshmen indicated one of their parents as most influential, while 51.7% indicated similarly at Eden, 48.7% at Sanctuary, and 46.2% at SUMA. Very few at each school indicated a brother or sister was the most influential (6.7% at Sanctuary, 4.9% at Eden, 5.4% at Soul, and 7.7% at SUMA). Soul was markedly different from the other three cohorts in terms of boyfriend or girlfriend being most influential, with some 10.0% fewer responding in that fashion than at the other three schools. Anywhere from 16.9% (Eden) to 25.1% (SUMA) indicated someone other than a parent, sibling, boyfriend, girlfriend, teacher, or minister was the most influential person in their lives. While a great deal of emphasis is placed upon the influence teachers have on their students' lives, only 4.3% of the Eden freshmen indicated a teacher as most influential, followed by 3.8% at both Sanctuary and Soul, and only 3.5% at SUMA. Ministers were cited as most influential even less than teachers. A larger percentage of the freshmen at the private, church-affiliated colleges indicated ministers as most

TABLE XI  
 MOST INFLUENTIAL PERSON IN LIFE BY COLLEGE

Person	College				Total
	Sanct.	Eden	Soul	SUMA	
Parent	101 48.7%	95 51.7%	80 61.5%	276 46.2%	552 49.3%
Sibling	14 6.7%	9 4.9%	7 5.4%	46 7.7%	76 6.8%
Boyfriend/Girlfriend	35 16.8%	33 17.9%	8 6.2%	97 16.2%	173 15.4%
Teacher	8 3.8%	8 4.3%	5 3.8%	21 3.5%	42 3.8%
Minister	5 2.4%	8 4.3%	1 0.8%	8 1.3%	22 2.0%
Other	45 21.6%	31 16.9%	29 22.3%	150 25.1%	255 22.7%
TOTAL	208 100.0%	184 100.0%	130 100.0%	598 100.0%	1120 100.0%

$\chi^2 = 38.70$ , 15 d.f.,  $p < .05$ .



influential than their counterparts at the state universities, but the percentages were quite small (2.4% at Sanctuary and 4.3% at Eden).

Clearly, the parents appear most influential on these students with 49.3% of the total N indicating such. A  $X^2$  value of 38.70 with 15 degrees of freedom was significant with  $p < .05$ .

#### Use of Automobile and Its Importance

Two questions related to the use of an automobile were included in the measuring instrument. Students were asked if they would have the use of an automobile while at college, and were asked to respond to the statement, "An automobile is essential to social success in college" in Likert fashion on a scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. As can be seen in Table XII, there are noticeable differences in these two variables when comparing the four cohorts.

As can be seen in Table XII, the percentage of students who will have the use of a car during college is quite varied when comparing the four cohorts. Only 35.4% of the freshmen at Soul have access to an automobile, followed by 47.1% at Sanctuary (where freshmen are not allowed to keep cars on campus), 57.9% at Eden, and 85.1% at SUMA. While fewer of the freshmen at Soul have the use of an automobile, Soul does not have the largest percentage of students who disagree with the statement, "An automobile is essential to social success in college". In fact, 44.9% of Soul's freshmen agreed that the car is essential to success in college, while 41.0% disagreed, and 14.1% expressed mixed feelings. Thus, while the smallest percentage among all four cohorts to have the use of a car is at Soul, the largest percentage of those who view the car as essential to social success in college is also there. While

TABLE XII  
USE OF AUTOMOBILE AND ITS IMPORTANCE BY COLLEGE

Response	College				Total
	Sanct.	Eden	Soul	SUMA	
Strongly Agree	20 9.7%	4 2.2%	22 17.3%	75 12.6%	121 10.9%
Agree	54 26.2%	21 11.5%	35 27.6%	167 28.1%	277 25.0%
Mixed Feelings	41 19.9%	24 13.1%	18 14.1%	115 19.4%	198 17.8%
Disagree	57 27.7%	61 33.3%	26 20.5%	156 26.3%	300 27.0%
Strongly Disagree	34 16.5%	73 39.9%	26 20.5%	81 13.6%	214 19.3%
TOTAL	206 100.0%	183 100.0%	127 100.0%	594 100.0%	1110* 100.0%
Percent with use of automobile	47.1%	57.9%	35.4%	85.1%	N/A

$X^2 = 96.06$ , 12 d.f.,  $p < .05$ .

\*A total of 10 students did not respond to this item.

57.9% of Eden's freshmen have access to an automobile, only 13.7% view it as essential to social success, and 73.2% disagree with that idea. While Sanctuary and SUMA differ greatly in the percentage who have access to a car, they are fairly similar in regard to attitudes about the essentialness of a car to social success in college. A  $\chi^2$  value of 96.06 with 12 degrees of freedom is statistically significant with  $p < .05$ .

### Purpose in Life

Meaning and purpose in life are unquestionably multifaceted variables; but for this study, purpose in life is operationally defined as an individual's total score on the Purpose in Life Scale, a 20 item scale devised by Crumbaugh and Maholick (1968), which purports to measure the degree to which an individual experiences "meaning" or "purpose" in life.

In order to measure the variable of purpose in life, the standardized Purpose in Life Scale (developed by Crumbaugh and Maholick) was administered. Both construct and criterion validity have been tested extremely favorably, as have internal and external reliability (Crumbaugh and Maholick, 1968). The scale consists of 20 items designed to determine the degree of definiteness in purpose in life. A previous factor analysis of the Purpose in Life Scale has shown that while unidimensional, the scale also measures religiosity and adherence to middle class values, which may be considered sub-dimensions of purpose in life (Bourdette and Dodder, 1976). A factor analysis of these data produced similar findings (Appendix C).

Crosstabulation was used to determine the frequency and percentages who scored in each of the three categories of purpose in life (lacking, indefinite, and definite) as outlined by Crumbaugh and Maholick (1969), at each of the four schools. One-Way Analysis of Variance was used to determine the differences in means by type of college (private vs. public), and also to determine if the means of each of the four colleges were significantly different.

A crosstabulation of scores on the Purpose in Life Scale by type of college (Table XIII) indicates that for both private, church-affiliated colleges and state-supported universities, the largest percentage of their entering freshmen fall into the category of "lacking" any definite purpose in life. This would constitute a raw score of 92 or less (highest possible score is 140). Interestingly enough, the two private schools had a slightly larger percentage of their freshmen in the "lacking" category (48.5%) than did the public colleges (44.7%). Subjects that scored between 92 and 112 on the Purpose in Life Scale are categorized as "indecisive", and 40.6% of the entering freshmen at the two church-related colleges were in this category, while 43.0% of those at the two state colleges fall into that grouping. Scores above 112 are considered to reflect "definite" purpose in life. In this category, the state college freshmen scored slightly higher than their counterparts in the private schools (12.3% as compared to 10.9%). A chi square of 1.61 was calculated with a critical value of 5.99 needed at the alpha .05 level. Therefore, the above-mentioned differences are not statistically significant. While there is no statistically significant difference in scores on the Purpose in Life Scale between the two types

of colleges, it is interesting that entering freshmen at Soul and SUMA (the two state-supported schools) tended to score slightly higher than those at Sanctuary and Eden (the two private schools).

TABLE XIII

## A CROSSTABULATION OF PURPOSE IN LIFE BY TYPE OF COLLEGE

Extent of Purpose in Life	Type of College		Total
	Private	State	
Definite	42 10.9%	88 12.3%	130 12.9%
Indecisive	157 40.6%	309 43.0%	466 41.6%
Lacking	188 48.5%	321 44.7%	509 45.5%
TOTAL	387 100.0%	718 100.0%	1105* 100.0%

$X^2 = 1.61$  (with 2 d.f., critical value = 5.99); not significant at the .05 level.

\*Fifteen students did not complete the PIL scale.

Two One-Way Analysis of Variance tests were run to determine if the mean scores differed significantly on purpose in life. First, the four colleges were grouped as before by type of institution, to see if the mean purpose in life score for church-affiliated colleges differed significantly from the mean for state-supported universities (Table XIV). As can be seen, the two means were not statistically different at the

.05 level of significance. The overall mean for Sanctuary and Eden (private colleges) was 110.4, while Soul and SUMA (public colleges) had a composite mean of 109.2. The mean for the private colleges was only slightly higher than the mean for public colleges. This difference was not statistically significant at the .05 level, and can be attributed to chance variation.

TABLE XIV  
ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR PURPOSE IN LIFE  
BY TYPE OF COLLEGE

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio
Between Groups	356.92	1	356.92	1.73
Within Groups	227748.06	1103	206.48	
Total	228104.98	1104		

F of 1.73 has a  $p < 0.18$  (not significant at .05 level).

A second Analysis of Variance was used to examine the difference between means on purpose in life for each of the four schools (Table XV). The results show that the highest mean score was at Eden (111.2), the second highest was at Soul (110.8), next came Sanctuary (109.7), and the lowest mean was at SUMA (108.9). Thus, no trend by type of college was established. The F test was insignificant at the .05 level,

indicating no significant differences among the four schools on purpose in life.

TABLE XV

## ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR PURPOSE IN LIFE BY COLLEGE\*

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio
Between Groups	977.79	3	325.93	1.58
Within Groups	227132.46	1101	206.30	
Total	228110.25	1104		

F of 1.58 has a  $p < 0.19$  (not significant at .05 level).

\*PIL mean scores: Sanctuary, 109.7; Eden, 111.2; Soul, 110.8; SUMA, 108.9.

While Crumbaugh and Maholick (1969) found a national mean of 112 on the Purpose in Life Scale, their sample of college undergraduates had a mean of 108.5. The mean scores for the colleges in this study range from 108.9 to 111.2, which appear to be very consistent with the national means reported by Crumbaugh and Maholick (1969). Thus, these entering freshmen appear fairly typical of entering freshmen in general on the variable of purpose in life.

#### Going Steady

When students at the four schools were asked if they were going

steady at the time of entering college, very similar results were found among three of the schools with Soul being the noticeable exception. A  $X^2$  of 8.03 was found statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ) with three degrees of freedom. As can be seen in Table XVI, among all the entering freshmen at the four schools combined, 30.1% are going steady and 69.9% are not. Sanctuary, Eden, and SUMA are all very close to those total figures. The freshmen at Soul differ somewhat, with 40.6% of their freshmen indicating they are going steady, and 59.4% who are not. There does not appear to be any pattern based on type of college on the going steady data. At each of the four institutions, the majority of entering freshmen were not going steady at the beginning of their college career.

TABLE XVI  
GOING STEADY BY COLLEGE

Statement: Are you going steady at the present time?					
Response	College				Total
	Sanct.	Eden	Soul	SUMA	
Yes	59 28.8%	56 30.6%	52 40.6%	163 28.1%	330 30.1%
No	146 71.2%	127 69.4%	76 59.4%	417 71.9%	766 69.9%
TOTAL	205 100.0%	183 100.0%	128 100.0%	580 100.0%	1096* 100.0%

$X^2 = 8.03$ , 3 d.f.,  $p < .05$ .

\*A total of 24 students did not respond to this item.



Plans for Marriage

Most freshmen at the four schools were unmarried at the time of college entrance (see Demographic Profiles), and they were asked about future marriage plans. As indicated in Table XVII, the majority of the unmarried freshmen at each of the four schools intend to marry in the future. Sanctuary, Eden, and SUMA are quite similar on this variable, while the freshmen at Soul once again show a noticeable difference. While between 94.7% and 97.1% of the freshmen at the other three schools intend to marry someday, that percentage drops to 85.6% for the freshmen at Soul. Statistical significance ( $p < .05$ ) was found with  $X^2 = 20.46$  with three degrees of freedom.

TABLE XVII  
PLANS FOR MARRIAGE BY COLLEGE

Response	College				Total
	Sanct.	Eden	Soul	SUMA	
Plan to marry	195 95.6%	166 97.1%	107 85.6%	504 94.7%	972 94.2%
Do not plan to marry	9 4.4%	5 2.9%	18 14.4%	28 5.3%	60 5.8%
TOTAL	204 100.0%	171 100.0%	125 100.0%	532 100.0%	1032* 100.0%

$X^2 = 20.46$ , 3 d.f.,  $p < .05$ .

\*Ninety-one out of a total 1,120 subjects indicated they were married, thus three married students responded to this item. (This would not affect the above percentages noticeably, however.)

These data on future marriage plans will provide a data baseline with which to compare four years from now. It is probable that some of these freshmen will marry within that four-year period. In fact, marriage may prove to be one of the variables involved in dropping out of college.

### Plans for Children

Closely associated with future plans for marriage is the variable of idealized number of children in the future. Respondents were asked how many children they would like to have in the future, with response categories ranging from none to five or more.

As shown in Table XVIII, the largest percentage of students at each of the four schools indicated they would like to have two children, with 51.8% of the total subjects responding in that manner. Eden had the largest percentage who would like to have no children (11.3%), and Soul had the largest who would like to have five or more (10.4%). Statistical significance was found with  $X^2 = 20.40$ , 15 degrees of freedom,  $p < .05$ . However, the mean number of children desired for each of the four cohorts are quite similar, ranging from 2.24 at Eden, to 2.57 at Soul, with a grand mean of 2.33.

### Major Field of Study

Members of the four freshman cohorts were asked if they had decided on a major field of study. Over three-fourths of the students at Sanctuary, Eden, and Soul had decided on academic majors (Table XIX). SUMA had 65.7% who had decided upon a major field of study. A follow-up question was in open-ended format asking the question if the freshmen

TABLE XVIII  
PLANS FOR CHILDREN BY COLLEGE

Number of Children	College			SUMA	Total
	Sanct.	Eden	Soul		
None	16 7.8%	20 11.3%	11 8.8%	46 8.3%	93 8.8%
One	3 1.5%	10 5.6%	9 7.2%	31 5.6%	53 5.0%
Two	110 53.9%	90 50.9%	50 40.0%	299 54.0%	549 51.8%
Three	41 20.1%	30 16.9%	21 16.8%	105 19.0%	197 18.6%
Four	21 10.3%	18 10.2%	21 16.8%	55 9.9%	115 10.8%
Five or more	13 6.4%	9 5.1%	13 10.4%	18 3.2%	53 5.0%
TOTAL	204 100.0%	177 100.0%	125 100.0%	554 100.0%	1060* 100.0%
Mean Number of Children	2.43	2.24	2.57	2.26	2.33

$\chi^2 = 29.40$ , 15 d.f.,  $p < .05$ .

\*A total of 60 students did not respond to this item.

TABLE XIX  
CHOICE OF MAJOR FIELDS OF STUDY BY COLLEGE

Major Field	College				Total
	Sanct.	Eden	Soul	SUMA	
Social Science	16 8.0%	14 7.6%	13 10.3%	64 11.2%	107 9.9%
Natural Science	33 16.5%	10 5.4%	6 4.8%	23 4.0%	72 6.7%
Engineering	8 4.0%	3 1.6%	3 2.4%	32 5.6%	46 4.3%
Pre-professional	17 8.5%	14 7.6%	7 5.6%	36 6.3%	74 6.8%
Fine Arts	1 0.5%	35 19.0%	10 7.9%	25 4.4%	71 6.6%
Business	31 15.5%	32 17.4%	32 25.4%	174 30.4%	267 24.7%
Education	15 7.5%	10 5.4%	9 7.1%	73 12.8%	107 9.9%
Language Arts	4 2.0%	11 6.0%	14 11.1%	20 3.5%	49 4.5%
Nursing	27 13.5%	5 2.7%	5 4.0%	21 3.7%	58 5.4%
Physical Education	13 6.5%	3 1.6%	12 9.5%	35 6.1%	63 5.8%
Home Economics	7 3.5%	1 0.5%	4 3.2%	19 3.3%	31 2.9%
Mathematics	2 1.0%	5 2.7%	2 1.6%	19 3.3%	28 2.6%
Religion	11 5.5%	13 7.2%	1 0.7%	1 0.2%	26 2.4%
Industrial Arts	5 2.5%	2 1.1%	2 1.6%	8 1.4%	17 1.6%

TABLE XIX (Continued)

Major Field	College				Total
	Sanct.	Eden	Soul	SUMA	
Vocational	10 5.0%	26 14.2%	6 4.8%	22 3.8%	64 5.9%
TOTAL	200 100.0%	184 100.0%	126 100.0%	572 100.0%	1082* 100.0%
Percent who have selected	81.8%	80.4%	85.9%	65.7%	73.4%

\*Thirty-eight students did not indicate a major field of study.

had to make a choice today, what they would choose for an academic major, and a total of 15 different categories were indicated (Table XIX).

When looking at all four cohorts together, the largest percentage of students is found majoring in Business (24.7%), with no other single discipline anywhere near that category. The least popular major field appears to be that of Industrial Arts, which was selected by only 1.6% of the total number of students responding to this item. At Sanctuary, Natural Science was selected as a major by 16.5% of the entering freshmen. As indicated in Chapter IV, a medical subculture seems to exist at Sanctuary, and many of those majoring in Natural Science aspire to later enter medical school. Another 8.5% of Sanctuary's freshmen were classified as pre-professional majors, most of which indicated they were pre-med majors. The next highest percentage of freshmen at Sanctuary are majoring in Nursing. Percentages then drop off sharply. More Eden

freshman students selected Fine Arts as a major field of study (19.0%) than any other discipline. As indicated in Chapter IV, Eden has what is considered an excellent music program which probably accounts for the large number of Fine Arts majors. The second most popular field at Eden was Business (17.4%). Business was the most frequently chosen major field at both the two state-supported schools with 25.4% at Soul and 30.4% at SUMA. Language Arts attracted the second largest group of students at Soul (11.1%), while Education was second at SUMA claiming 12.8% of the students. One of the least chosen majors was Religion, with only 2.4% of all the entering freshmen choosing it. However, there is a noticeable difference when the two private schools are compared with the two state universities. Eden led all schools in Religion majors with 7.2%, followed by Sanctuary with 5.5%. Both these schools train young people for the ministry in the denomination which helps support them. The two state schools had only 0.7% (Soul), and 0.2% (SUMA) who were majoring in Religion. While differences can be noted in percentages, other categories are fairly similar for each of the four schools. Whether these major fields are actually pursued throughout the course of college attendance can be assessed in future studies.

#### Occupational Selections

Students were asked to indicate the occupation they intend to enter after leaving college. These idealized occupations were ranked according to relative social status according to a modified version of the North-Hatt Occupational Prestige Scale (Appendix B), which ranks occupations from U.S. President (96) to Housewife (01). For classification purposes, occupational ranks were trichotomized into lower, middle, and

upper status jobs. The dividing line between lower and middle status occupations was arbitrarily designated as between scores of 65 and 66 (occupations of Carpenter and Mail Carrier). Similarly, the dividing line between middle and upper status occupations was established between the occupations of Army Officer and Talented Pianist (ranks of 80 and 81). Students were also asked to list the occupations of their parents, and these were ranked according to the same scale. Table XX shows the percentage of students whose occupations fall into each of the three categories, as well as the percentages for their parents in each category.

As indicated in Table XX, when the status of the idealized occupations of students is compared with the statuses of the occupations actually held by their parents, some interesting patterns emerge. A college degree is often considered a part of the process of upward social mobility in our society, and these data support that idea. This can be seen at each of the four schools, but is most noticeable when looking at the data from Soul. Whereas 66.1% of the fathers and 68.2% of the mothers of Soul freshmen hold jobs ranked as lower status, only 6.8% of the students have indicated a selection of occupations ranked of similar status. Further, 71.8% of the freshmen at Soul have selected occupations ranked as middle status, while only 25.2% of their fathers and 31.8% of their mothers have occupations within that category. Finally, 21.4% of the Soul freshmen have idealized occupations of upper status, while only 8.7% of their fathers and none of their mothers have occupations which rank that high. As indicated in Chapter II, a major function of college often perceived by Blacks is that of upward mobility

TABLE XX  
 OCCUPATIONAL STATUSES FOR STUDENTS AND PARENTS  
 BY COLLEGE

Status	College					
	Sanctuary			Eden		
	Student	Father	Mother	Student	Father	Mother
Upper	61 30.4%	40 19.5%	3 1.4%	31 19.0%	47 25.8%	7 3.8%
Middle	118 58.7%	83 40.5%	111 53.6%	122 74.9%	89 48.9%	103 56.3%
Lower	22 10.9%	82 40.0%	93 44.9%	10 6.1%	46 25.3%	73 39.9%
TOTAL*	201 100.0%	205 100.0%	207 100.0%	163 100.0%	182 100.0%	183 100.0%

  

Status	College					
	Soul			SUMA		
	Student	Father	Mother	Student	Father	Mother
Upper	25 21.4%	11 8.7%	0 0.0%	87 15.9%	40 6.8%	5 0.8%
Middle	84 71.8%	32 25.2%	41 31.8%	395 72.2%	272 46.0%	258 43.4%
Lower	8 6.8%	84 66.1%	88 68.2%	65 11.9%	279 47.2%	332 55.8%
TOTAL*	117 100.0%	127 100.0%	129 100.0%	547 100.0%	591 100.0%	595 100.0%

\*Total N's do not coincide at each school because some students left one or two of the items blank.



(Watts and Gaier, 1969), and since Soul is a predominantly Black school, some credence is added to that assertion. However, as indicated in Table XX, all four cohorts tend to indicate a selection of higher status occupations than their parents. Only 10.9% of Sanctuary's freshman class chose occupations categorized as lower status, while 40.0% of their fathers and 44.9% of their mothers were in that classification. Approximately 58.7% of the Sanctuary cohort indicated middle prestige jobs, and 30.4% selected upper status occupations, although only 19.5% of their fathers and 1.4% of their mothers have attained occupations that rank that high. Similar findings can be seen with the data from SUMA, as 15.9% of the students selected upper status jobs and 72.2% middle status, both figures much higher than for their parents in the same categories. An interesting trend can be seen in the data from Eden. When looking at the lower status category, a pattern of upward mobility can be seen. While 25.3% of the Eden fathers and 39.9% of the mothers hold lower status occupations, only 6.1% of the freshmen have chosen to pursue occupations that rank that low. Approximately one-half of the parents of Eden freshmen hold occupations ranked as middle status, but almost three-fourths (74.9%) of the entering freshmen students have idealized occupations which may be categorized as middle status. An interesting exception to this pattern of idealized upward social mobility in terms of occupational prestige can be seen among the Eden freshmen in the category of upper status jobs. While 25.8% of their fathers hold jobs categorized as upper status, only 19.0% of the freshmen chose occupations which ranked that high. If carried out, fewer Eden graduates will enter upper status occupations than are currently held by their fathers.

For further comparison, Spearman's rank-order correlations were used to measure the association between each student's idealized occupational rank, and the rank of his/her father's and mother's occupations. At Sanctuary, a correlation of .19 was found between the student's occupational rank and the rank of the father's occupation. While this is statistically significant at the  $p < .05$  level, it explains less than 4.0% of the variation, and thus, substantively, the association appears quite weak. The correlation between students' and mothers' occupations was .11 which is not significant at the  $p < .05$  level. Neither of the correlations were significant for the data from Eden. When the students' chosen occupational prestige was associated with the fathers' achieved occupational ranking, a correlation of .12 was found with  $p > .05$ . When associated with mothers' occupational ranking, a slight inverse relationship was found (-.05), but was not statistically significant at the .05 level, and should therefore be attributed to chance. At Soul, both correlations showed an inverse relationship between students' occupational status and that of their parents, indicating that the lower the statuses of the occupations of the father and mother, the higher the occupational rank, on the average, of the student. With fathers, the correlation was  $-.18$ ,  $p < .05$ , and with mothers it was  $-.15$ ,  $p < .05$ . While both correlations are statistically significant at the .05 level, and the trend of an inverse relationship can be established, due to the large N, the value needed for significance is quite low. Both correlations indicate that either parents' occupational status explains less than 4.0% of the variation in occupational statuses of the students. Both correlations for the data from SUMA are low (.08 between student and father,  $p < .05$ , and .06 between student and mother,

$p > .05$ ). Although the correlation between student and father's occupational status is statistically significant at the .05 level, the explained variation is less than 1.0%, which subjectively viewed, certainly seems insignificant.

#### Dominant Motives for Attending College

Another research objective specified at the outset of this study was to determine dominant motives within each cohort for attending college. Ranges of possible motives explored include going on to college out of sheer boredom, through pragmatic reasons involving better jobs and higher income, and more idealistic motives such as serving God or mankind. In order to assess and compare dominant motives for attending college, the freshmen were asked to indicate their first, second, and third most important reasons for attending college.

As shown in Table XXI, the largest percentage of Sanctuary freshmen indicated their most important reason for attending college to be that of serving God and/or humanity (30.4%). The response of not being able to find a job or having nothing better to do, was indicated by the fewest freshmen at Sanctuary (0.5%) as the primary reason for attending college. The most frequently listed response as the second most important reason was also to serve God and/or humanity (19.3%). Another 9.6% at Sanctuary cite this as the third most important reason. Thus, altruistic motives appear fairly important as reasons for college attendance among the Sanctuary freshman cohort. The freshmen at Eden (the other church-affiliated college) appear to have had less altruistic motives for college attendance than those at Sanctuary, as 26.7% of them indicated that their primary reason for going to college was to get a

TABLE XXI

## DOMINANT MOTIVES FOR ATTENDING COLLEGE IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE BY COLLEGE

Reason	College											
	Sanct.			Eden			Soul			SUMA		
	1st	2nd	3rd	1st	2nd	3rd	1st	2nd	3rd	1st	2nd	3rd
Make more money	26 12.5%	34 16.4%	39 18.8%	17 9.2%	27 14.7%	29 15.8%	36 27.7%	39 30.0%	52 40.0%	84 14.0%	138 23.1%	143 23.9%
Parents' wishes	14 6.7%	14 6.7%	10 4.8%	11 6.0%	4 2.2%	19 10.3%	11 8.5%	8 6.2%	8 6.2%	38 6.4%	34 5.7%	61 10.2%
No job/nothing better	1 0.5%	5 2.4%	13 6.3%	0 0.0%	1 0.5%	2 1.1%	4 3.1%	1 0.8%	3 2.3%	11 1.8%	11 1.8%	15 2.5%
Learn more culture	14 6.7%	24 11.5%	36 17.3%	30 16.4%	41 22.4%	31 16.8%	10 7.7%	22 16.9%	21 16.2%	46 7.7%	81 13.5%	85 14.2%
Better job	24 11.5%	27 13.0%	21 10.1%	49 26.7%	26 14.1%	16 8.7%	26 20.0%	22 16.9%	5 3.8%	214 35.8%	105 17.6%	60 10.0%
Serve God/humanity	63 30.4%	40 19.3%	20 9.6%	19 10.3%	12 6.5%	13 7.1%	4 3.1%	4 3.1%	0 0.0%	39 6.5%	23 3.8%	18 3.0%
General education	25 12.0%	17 8.2%	15 7.2%	31 16.8%	33 17.9%	11 6.0%	23 17.7%	23 17.7%	14 10.8%	98 16.4%	107 17.9%	75 12.5%
Get away from home	7 3.4%	3 1.4%	6 2.9%	1 0.5%	7 3.8%	18 9.8%	1 0.7%	2 1.5%	5 3.8%	6 1.0%	18 3.0%	19 3.3%

TABLE XXI (Continued)

Reason	College											
	Sanct.			Eden			Soul			SUMA		
	1st	2nd	3rd	1st	2nd	3rd	1st	2nd	3rd	1st	2nd	3rd
Prepare for graduate school	29 13.9%	25 12.0%	6 2.9%	19 10.3%	14 7.6%	12 6.5%	14 10.8%	5 3.8%	6 4.6%	49 8.2%	28 4.7%	18 3.0%
Meet new people	5 2.4%	19 9.1%	42 20.1%	7 3.8%	19 10.3%	33 17.9%	1 0.7%	4 3.1%	16 12.3%	13 2.2%	53 8.9%	104 17.4%
TOTAL	208	208 100.0%	208	184	184 100.0%	184	130	130 100.0%	130	598	598 100.0%	598

First reason:  $\chi^2 = 183.90$ , 27 d.f.,  $p < .05$ .

Second reason:  $\chi^2 = 119.38$ , 27 d.f.,  $p < .05$ .

Third reason:  $\chi^2 = 100.45$ , 27 d.f.,  $p < .05$ .

better job (49.5% cited this as one of their three most important reasons for college attendance). A total of 23.9% of Eden's freshmen indicated the service of God/humanity as one of their three most important reasons for attending college (only 10.3% indicated this was the most important reason).

Making more money is clearly an important reason for the entering Soul freshmen to attend college. Approximately 27.7% indicated it as the most important reason, and a total of 97.7% cited it as one of the three most important (as compared to 61.0% at SUMA, 47.7% at Sanctuary, and 39.7% at Eden). Serving God and humanity was cited far less by the freshmen at Soul (only 6.2% indicated it was one of the three most important reasons). The largest percentage of freshmen at the other state-supported university (SUMA) cited getting a better job as their most important reason for going to college (35.8%), with 63.4% including this as one of their three most important motives. This was followed very closely by the desire to make more money, with 60.2% of SUMA's freshmen indicating that as being one of their most important reasons for going to college.

When comparing the two types of schools, freshmen at the church-affiliated schools appear to have more altruistic motives for college attendance, especially among the entering freshmen at Sanctuary. The entering freshmen at the two state-supported universities cite more pragmatic reasons such as getting a better job and making more money, as their most important motives for attending college. The most mixed responses were found among the entering freshmen at Eden. Significant  $X^2$  values were found for each of the three reasons for attending college ( $p < .05$ ).

One of the primary reasons for including this variable in this study is so that when Phase II examines drop-outs from each of the four cohorts it will be possible to determine if any noticeable differences in motives for going to college exist between those who drop out and those who persist, and remain in college to ultimately graduate.

## CHAPTER VI

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

#### Summary

This research was designed as the first phase of a longitudinal cohort analysis dealing with the impact of college socialization. The major purpose of this study has been to establish a descriptive data baseline to serve as a reference point for future studies. The research questions addressed in this study were: What demographic, attitudinal, value, and behavioral characteristics were brought to college by the members of each freshman cohort at the four colleges under study? Do entering freshmen at state-supported universities differ significantly from entering freshmen at church-related colleges on these characteristics? Do entering freshmen at a predominantly black state university differ on these characteristics from entering freshmen at a predominantly white state university?

The study was undertaken with six specific research objectives to be accomplished. These objectives included: ascertaining the cultural context and educational objectives at each of the four schools under study; development of a demographic profile of each freshman cohort; development of a demographic profile for the parents of members of each freshman class; determination, measurement, and comparison of selected attitudes and values held by each cohort; determination of dominant



motives within each cohort for attending college; and, comparative descriptive analyses of the four freshman cohorts based on a multitude of selected variables, being sensitive to any patterns that may emerge.

An extensive review of literature provided a theoretical underpinning for this study based on social learning theory as outlined by Bandura (1977), and the concept of the college as an ecological niche (Stern, 1970) and social milieu providing for secondary socialization. Literature reviewed emphasized the differential recruitment and attraction of different types of colleges, and some of the processes involved in the phenomenon of college selection. Previous studies dealing with attitudes, values, and behavior of college freshmen were discussed, as were studies dealing with demographic and other sociological variables and how they relate to success in college. Finally, some of the major studies attempting to assess the impact of college experience were reviewed.

Data were gathered from freshman cohorts at four colleges and universities in the southwest. Questionnaires were distributed at freshman orientation meetings, in classroom situations, and through personal contacts. Eventually, a total of 1,120 freshman students were surveyed from the four schools. Data were coded, keypunched, and subjected to computer analysis utilizing crosstabulation, analysis of variance, correlation, and factor analysis. Tables were compiled, and selected variables were subjected to descriptive analysis in regard to both statistical and substantive significance.

In keeping with the research objectives established for this study, the cultural contexts and educational objectives at each of the four schools under study were assessed and discussed (Chapter IV). A

demographic profile was established for each freshman class containing a variety of demographic variables. Similarly, a demographic profile of the parents of the students comprising the four freshman cohorts was also established. These profiles were subjected to descriptive analyses, and comparisons among the four schools studied. A variety of selected attitudes, values, behavior, and future plans of members of each cohort were measured, compared, and discussed. The dominant motives within each cohort for attending college were identified, described, compared, and discussed. The variables of purpose in life and idealized future occupational status were subjected to more extensive analyses, and the findings assessed. These findings are thoroughly discussed and summarized in Chapter V. Thus, each of the six research objectives proposed for this study were systematically approached, explored, and fulfilled.

### Conclusions

Based on the findings of this study, as presented and discussed in Chapter V, it can be concluded that while noted similarities exist among the four freshman cohorts studied, some clearcut patterns of distinction have emerged on several variables. Thus, the answer to the first research question would appear to be that on many of the demographic, attitudinal, and value variables included in this study, significant differences can be noted between entering freshmen at church-related colleges and those at state universities. Similarly, when a predominantly black freshman cohort is compared to a predominantly white one at two state-supported universities, some noticeable differences in demographic, attitudinal, and value characteristics emerge.

On demographic variables such as age, marital status, number of children, and political preferences, there is a noticeable difference between the entering freshmen at the two private, church-affiliated colleges and those at the two state-supported universities. Those entering the state schools were more likely to be slightly older, married with children, and favor the Democratic party, than their counterparts at the private schools.

When comparing the demographic profiles of the parents of entering freshmen at the two types of colleges, it can be seen that distinctions emerge in terms of political preferences, educational attainment levels, annual incomes, and occupational statuses. The parents of the freshmen at private schools tended to be Republican, and overall, be higher on all the socioeconomic variables than those of freshmen at the two state schools.

When variables related to selected values and attitudes were compared, distinctions between the two types of colleges also emerged. On church attendance, Bible reading, and belief in life after death, the cohorts from the private schools responded in a pattern which would be considered more involved with religion than those from the two state institutions. When dominant motives for attending college were assessed, the freshmen at the private colleges tended to cite more altruistic reasons such as serving God and/or humanity, while those at the state-supported schools indicated the desire for better jobs and the desire to make more money.

The two freshman cohorts from state universities, one predominantly black, and the other predominantly white, were also noticeably different on several variables. The sex ratio at the predominantly black school

indicated more males than females, whereas the predominantly white cohort was the opposite. Freshmen at the black school tended to come from urban areas, while the white state school's freshmen were primarily drawn from rural areas. The entering freshmen at the predominantly black school tended to have lower grades when in high school than those at the predominantly white school, and they tended to come from larger families than did those at the predominantly white state university.

When comparing the parents' demographic profiles of the two state schools, the predominantly black school had a larger percentage of divorced and separated parents, and their parents had lower annual incomes, educational levels, and occupational statuses, than their counterparts at the predominantly white state school.

In terms of attitudes and values, the predominantly black cohort indicated less support for religious and racial homogeneity, were more sexually permissive toward both males and females, had more friends of a different race, and plan to have slightly larger families in the future, than their counterparts at the predominantly white state university. Overall, the freshmen at the predominantly black state school appeared more liberal on most issues than their white counterparts.

There were, of course, other variables included in this study in which no noticeable differences emerged between the two types of college (private vs. public), nor between the predominantly black and predominantly white state schools. The most notable of these variables was that of purpose in life, in which mean scores on the Purpose in Life Scale were quite similar among each of the four cohorts.

On many of the variables in this study, however, differences appeared among each of the freshman cohorts. Thus, while distinctions

can be seen between entering freshmen at private, church-affiliated colleges and those at state-supported universities, and between entering freshmen at predominantly black and predominantly white state schools, each freshman cohort appears to be somewhat distinct from each of the other three. The phenomena of differential recruitment, attraction, and selection (as discussed in Chapter II), appear to exist with each school's freshman cohort emerging as somewhat unique and distinct in many ways from the others. When these findings (Chapter V) are viewed in conjunction with the seemingly distinct and different cultural contexts of the four schools (as discussed in Chapter IV), the concept of the college as an ecological niche as asserted by Stern (1970), appears supported. Similarly, as other studies have indicated, support is shown for the idea that each educational institution gathers students of certain ranges of ability, certain aspirations and intentions, and certain personality attributes, attitudes, and values (Clark et al., 1972).

Based upon the social learning theoretical perspective underpinning this study, which views socialization as the social learning process based upon continuous reciprocal interdependence among behavior, personality, and environment (Bandura, 1977), it is conceivable and probable, that the four cohorts under study will undergo differential socialization processes throughout the college experience. Thus, when future studies compare the members of these cohorts who persist in college to ultimately graduate, on these same variables as seniors, it may be that even more noticeable distinctions will appear. Similarly, a study of drop-outs may indicate that those individuals who differ most from the overall pattern of their freshman cohort, may be most likely to

drop out, or transfer to a different institution with a different ecological environment with which they feel more comfortable. Thus, as indicated in Chapter II, the decision to go to college is only one aspect of college socialization. Perhaps of equal importance, is the decision about where to go to college.

#### Limitations of the Study

From the outset, this study was designed as an exploratory, descriptive analysis. As such, emphasis has been placed on description, and not explanation. In most cases of data analyses, simple univariate techniques were utilized, rather than more sophisticated multivariate statistical methods which possibly could have been employed. For every table constructed and discussed in this study, a multitude of other tables could have been created utilizing controls for variables such as age, race, sex, socioeconomic status, and a variety of others. While analyses utilizing such controls would have been both interesting and informative, they also would have well beyond the scope and purposes of this study. It should be kept in mind that the major purpose of this project is to provide a data baseline designed to function as a solid foundation and reference point from which extent of change in these variables can be assessed four years later.

This study suffers from many of the inherent weaknesses associated with survey research. Despite careful planning and preparations, a few questions contained in the measuring instrument were worded in such a way that through differences in interpretation, it was felt data collected might be misleading. One such example was item number 32 (Appendix A), designed to ascertain if the student was old enough to

vote in the 1976 Presidential election, but misconstrued by many to ask if they were exactly 18 years old on that date. Thus, many who were obviously over 18 responded "No". This item was eliminated from analysis, as was the item on favorite Presidential candidate in 1976. Item number 38 asked the respondents to characterize the "hippie movement". An inordinate number of students left the item blank, and several wrote on the questionnaire that they did not have the faintest idea of what the "hippie movement" was. There were some items purposely excluded from the analysis, though included in the questionnaire. These items include height, weight, and number of meals of snacks per day. These variables were not intended to be used in this particular study, but since the opportunity to collect data from complete college cohorts totalling over a thousand students is so rare, it was decided to include these items for possible sociobiological studies in the future. For example, in the future, these variables might be related to grades, attrition, and other things. Thus, while not utilized in this study, these data have been retained and may be explored in the future.

Another limitation reflected in this study might be labeled as "institutional defense". While quite cooperative, representatives at each school were understandably concerned about what types of data were collected from their students. While questions related to attitudes about items such as marijuana use and sexual permissiveness, these could have perhaps been enhanced by inclusion of items directly asking about behavior (i.e., "Have you ever smoked marijuana?"), but officials at one or two of the schools objected to questions being worded that directly. Although pseudonyms were assigned to each school, and both personal and institutional anonymity guaranteed, there was some reluctance for any

information to be gathered which might later reflect negatively upon any of the institutions involved.

Despite acknowledged weaknesses, it is felt that this study remains strong. The overall design of longitudinal cohort analysis is methodologically sound. While certain weaknesses inherent in survey research are acknowledged, a major weakness associated with sampling error was corrected through the utilization of cohort analysis. While generalizability to colleges and universities across the nation may be severely limited, findings for these four freshman classes must be considered representative, as virtually all of the freshmen at the four schools were involved in the study. The questionnaire has provided a wealth of demographic and sociological data for description and analysis, proving more than adequate for addressing and fulfilling each of the explicit research objectives established at the outset of this project.

#### Suggestions for Further Study

At the time of this writing, Phase II of "Project Future" is already well underway. Data have been collected from many of those who dropped out after their freshman year and attrition rates, as well as reasons for leaving school, are already being assessed. Near the end of the senior year for most members of these four cohorts, Phase III will be implemented. The third phase will mark the culmination stage in which data on the variables in this study will be collected and analyzed, and compared to these data presented in this study. In this way, the impact of college socialization can hopefully be assessed. It is hoped, and further, it is believed, that this study has established a thorough data



baseline to serve as a solid foundation and reference point for those future studies.

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acuff, Gene and Donald Allen  
1970 "Hiatus in Meaning: Disengagement for Retired Professors."  
Journal of Gerontology 25:126-28.
- Akers, Ronald L.  
1977 Deviant Behavior: A Social Learning Approach (2nd ed.).  
Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Allen, Vernon L. and Barry W. Bragg  
1969 Ordinal Position and Conformity. Technical Report conducted  
at Wisconsin University at Madison by Research and Develop-  
ment Center for Cognitive Learning. Sponsored by Office of  
Education (Dept. of HEW), Washington, D. C., Bureau of  
Research (Sept.).
- Astin, Alexander W.  
1977 Four Critical Years. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Babbie, Earl R.  
1975 The Practice of Social Research. Belmont, California:  
Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Bandura, Albert  
1977 Social Learning Theory. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey:  
Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Bayer, Alan E.  
1975 "Sexist Students in American Colleges: A Descriptive Note."  
Journal of Marriage and the Family 37:391-97.
- Bayer, Alan E. and Jeffrey E. Dutton  
1975 "Trends in Attitudes on Political, Social and Collegiate  
Issues Among College Students: The Mid-1960's to Mid-1970."  
A paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American  
College Personnel Association in Atlanta, Georgia, March 5-8,  
1975.
- Berger, Peter L. and Thomas Luckmann  
1967 The Social Construction of Reality. Garden City, New York:  
Anchor Books.
- Blalock, Hubert M. Jr.  
1972 Social Statistics (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Book  
Company.

- Borland, Melvin and Donald E. Yett  
1967 "The Cash Value of College." Transaction Nov.:44-149.
- Bourdette, John and Richard A. Dodder  
1976 "The Purpose in Life Test: What Does it Measure?" Free Inquiry 4:1-9.
- Bowen, Howard R.  
1977 Investment in Learning: The Individual and Social Value of American Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.  
1978 "The Liberalizing Role of College." WSU Hilltopics Feb:12-13.
- Bowers, William J.  
1971 "Confronting College Cheating." Pp. 72-87 in Charles W. Havice (ed.), Campus Values. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Boyer, Ernest L. and Martin Kaplan  
1977 Educating for Survival. New Rochelle, New York: Change Magazine Press.
- Bureau of the Census, U.S. Census of Population: 1970  
1971 General Social and Economic Characteristics: Oklahoma. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.  
1972 Projections of School and College Enrollment: 1971 to 2000, Series P-25, No. 473, January, 1972.
- Centra, John A.  
1970 "Black Students at Predominantly White Colleges: A Research Description." Sociology of Education 43:325-39.
- Chambers, M. M.  
1974 "Panic in Higher Education." Educational Forum 38:7-12.
- Clark, Burton R., P. Heist, T. R. McConnell, M. A. Trow, and G. Yonge  
1972 Students and Colleges: Interaction and Change. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.
- Clouse, Bonnidell  
1973 "Attitudes of College Students as a Function of Sex, Politics, and Religion." Journal of College Student Personnel 13:260-64.
- Coffelt, John J. and Dan S. Hobbs  
1964 In and Out of College: A Longitudinal Study of the 1962 Freshman Class in Oklahoma Colleges. (Prepared for the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.) State Capital, Oklahoma City.

Conger, Rand

- 1976 "Social Control and Social Learning Models of Delinquency: A Synthesis." *Criminology* 14:17-40.

Cooper, Billy Lewis

- 1975 *Senior Adult Education: Participative Motivational Factors at an Oklahoma Community College*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Stillwater: Oklahoma State University.

Crumbaugh, J. C. and L. T. Maholick

- 1963 "The Case for Frankl's Will to Meaning." *Journal of Existential Psychiatry* 4:43-48.
- 1964 "An Experimental Study in Existentialism: The Psychometric Approach to Frankl's Concept of Noogenic Neurosis." *Journal of Clinical Psychology* 20:200-07.
- 1968 "Cross-Validation of Purpose-in-Life Test Based on Frankl's Concepts." *Journal of Individual Psychology* 24:74-81.
- 1969 *Manual of Instructions for the PIL Test*. Manual Number 168. Psychometric Affiliates, Box 3167, Munster, Indiana.

Davis, Samuel C., Jane W. Loeb and Lehmann F. Robinson

- 1970 "A Comparison of Characteristics of Negro and White College Freshman Classmates." *The Journal of Negro Education* 20: 359-66.

DeJong, Gordon F., Joseph E. Faulkner and Rex H. Warland

- 1976 "Dimensions of Religiosity Reconsidered: Evidence from a Cross-Cultural Study." *Social Forces* 54:866-89.

Dewey, John

- 1915 *School and Society*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Dreitzel, Hans Peter (ed.)

- 1973 *Childhood and Socialization*. Chicago: MacMillan Publishing Company.

Durkheim, Emile

- 1954 *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life* (translated by Joseph W. Swain). Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.
- 1956 *Education and Sociology* (translated by Sherwood D. Fox). Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.

Elder, Glen

- 1974 *Children of the Great Depression*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 1975 "Age Differentiation and the Life Course." *Annual Review of Sociology* 1:165-90.

- Elkin, Frederick and Gerald Handel  
1978 *The Child and Society: The Process of Socialization.* New York: Random House.
- Feather, N. T.  
1973 "Value Change Among University Students." *Australian Journal of Psychology* 25:57-70.
- Feldman, Kenneth A. and Theodore Newcomb  
1969 *The Impact of College on Students (Vols. I and II).* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Fink, Jerome S.  
1973 "College Degree Equals Good Job (Maybe)." *NASPA Journal* 11:61-65.
- Freedman, Marvin B.  
1967 *The College Experience.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Friedenberg, Edgar Z.  
1959 *The Vanishing Adolescent.* New York: Dell.
- Fritze, David  
1978 "Where Oklahoma's Higher Education is Headed." *Oklahoma Monthly* 4:55-62.
- Haug, Marie R. and Marvin B. Sussman  
1971 "Working Class Students and Images of Social Change." A paper presented at the American Sociological Association Convention in Denver, Colorado, August 10-September 2, 1971.
- Havice, Charles W. (ed.)  
1971 *Campus Values.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Henry, Jules  
1963 *Culture Against Man.* New York: Random House.
- Hetlinger, Richard F.  
1971 "Portrait of the Freshman as a Sexual Being." Pp. 37-54 in Charles W. Havice (ed.), *Campus Values.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Hurn, Christopher J.  
1978 *The Limits and Possibilities of Schooling.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Iffert, Robert E.  
1957 *Retention and Withdrawal of College Students.* Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office. (Office of Education Bulletin: 1958, No. 1.)

- Inkeles, Alex  
1969 "Social Structure and Socialization." Pp. 615-32 in David A. Goslin (ed.), Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co.
- Jencks, Christopher and David Riesman  
1969 The Academic Revolution. New York: Anchor Books.
- Jencks, Christopher  
1972 Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America. New York: Basic Books.
- Jones, John D.  
1971 "A Study of the Relationship Between the Student's Socio-economic Background and His Freshman Year in College." NASPA Journal 9:234-36.
- Kerlinger, Fred N.  
1973 Foundations of Behavioral Research (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.
- Kraemer, Hazel V. (ed.)  
1974 Youth and Culture: A Human Development Approach. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.
- Magarrell, Jack  
1977 "Colleges Seen Threatening Capitalism." The Chronicle of Higher Education 7:5.
- Mayhew, Lewis B.  
1972 "Higher Education, Work, and the Professions: An Introduction." Journal of Higher Education 48:169-78.
- McLaughlin, Barry  
1971 Learning and Social Behavior. New York: Free Press.
- McNeil, Elton B.  
1969 Human Socialization. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.
- Miller, Delbert C.  
1970 Handbook fo Research Design and Social Measurement (2nd ed.). New York: David McKay Company, Inc.
- Newcomb, Theodore  
1943 Personality and Social Change. New York: Dryden Press.
- Nosow, Sigmund and Stephen R. Robertson  
1973 "Changing Socio-Political Attitudes of College Students." College Student Journal 7:7-14.

- O'Dea, Thomas F.  
1966 *The Sociology of Religion*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Parelius, Ann P.  
1975 "Emerging Sex-Role Attitudes, Expectations, and Strains Among College Women." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 34:146-52.
- Parelius, Ann P. and Robert J. Parelius  
1978 *The Sociology of Education*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Parsons, Talcott  
1959 "The School Class as a Social System." *Harvard Educational Review* 29:285-97.
- Parsons, Talcott and Gerald M. Platt  
1970 "Age, Social Structure, and Socialization in Higher Education." *Sociology of Education* 43:1-37.
- Patterson, Michelle  
1973 "Some Limitations of Traditional Research on the Benefits of Higher Education." Pp. 225-30 in Lewis C. Solmon and Paul J. Taubman (eds.), *Does College Matter?: Some Evidence on the Impacts of Higher Education*. New York: Academic Press.
- Pifer, Alan  
1976 "Higher Education Today and Tomorrow." *Today's Education* 65:26-29.
- Rich, Harvey E.  
1976 "The Effect of College on Political Awareness and Knowledge." *Youth and Society* 8:67-80.
- Riley, M. W., M. Johnson and A. Foner  
1972 *Aging and Society, Vol. 3 of A Sociology of Age Stratification*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Roodin, Paul A.  
1971 "Birth Order and Cooperativeness: Peer Ratings." *Psychological Reports* 29:590.
- Ryder, Norman  
1965 "The Cohort as a Concept in the Study of Social Change." *American Sociological Review* 30:843-61.
- Salisbury, W. Seward  
1964 *Religion in American Culture*. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press.

- Schatzman, Leonard and Anselm L. Strauss  
1973 *Field Research: Strategies for a Natural Sociology*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Scully, Malcolm G.  
1978 "Harvard Study May Refute Claim that Colleges Have Only Modest Impact." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 9:5.
- Sebok, Richard F.  
1971 "The Effect of Selected Demographic Factors on Prediction of GPA by Male Freshman Students." *Journal of Educational Research* 64:411-16.
- Selakovich, Daniel  
1973 *The Schools and American Society* (2nd ed.). Lexington, Massachusetts: Xerox College Publishing.
- Sewell, William H. and Robert M. Hauser  
1975 *Education, Occupation, and Earnings: Achievement in the Early Career*. New York: Academic Press.
- Simon, Julian L.  
1978 *Basic Research Methods in Social Sciences: The Art of Empirical Investigation* (2nd ed.). New York: Random House.
- Solmon, Lewis C. and Paul J. Taubman (eds.)  
1973 *Does College Matter?: Some Evidence on the Impacts of Higher Education*. New York: Academic Press.
- Spindt, Herman A.  
1961 *Selection and Retention of Students in California's Institutions of Higher Education*. Sacramento: California State Department of Education.
- Stern, George G.  
1970 *People in Context: Measuring Person-Environment Congruence in Education and Industry*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Stub, Holger R. (ed.)  
1975 *The Sociology of Education: A Source Book* (3rd ed.). Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press.
- Sutherland, Edwin H. and Donald R. Cressey  
1974 *Criminology* (9th ed.). Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott.
- Swift, David W.  
1976 *American Education: A Sociological View*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company.
- Tylor, Edward B.  
1958 *The Origins of Culture*. New York: Harper. (First published in 1871.)



Watts, William A. and Eugene L. Gaier

- 1969 "Current Attitudes and Socialization Patterns of White and Negro Students Entering College." *Journal of Negro Education* 38:342-50.

Weeks, John R.

- 1978 *Population: An Introduction to Concepts and Issues*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Werts, Charles E.

- 1968 "A Comparison of Male vs. Female College Attendance Probabilities." *Sociology of Education* 41:103-10.

Willie, Charles V.

- 1973 *Perspectives on Black Education and the Education of Blacks.* Pp. 213-38 in Lewis C. Solmon and Paul J. Taubman (eds.), *Does College Matter?: Some Evidence on the Impacts of Higher Education*. New York: Academic Press.

Woehner, Carol

- 1976 "Macro and Micro Approaches to the Study of Generations and Cohorts." (Unpublished paper presented at a Seminar of the Midwest Council for Social Research on Aging, June 20-25, 1976.)

Yankelovich, Daniel

- 1974 *The New Morality: A Profile of American Youth in the Seventies*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- 1977 "Three Dominant Values of Modern College Youth." Pp. 231-34 in Henry Ehlers (ed.), *Crucial Issues in Education* (6th ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Yankelovich, Daniel and Ruth Clark

- 1977 "College and Noncollege Youth Values." Pp. 148-55 in Dorothy Rogers (ed.), *Issues in Adolescent Psychology* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

**APPENDIXES**

APPENDIX A

RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

## P R O J E C T F U T U R E

Dear Member of the Freshman Class of 1977-78:

The entire freshman classes at four colleges and universities have been chosen to be the focus of a large-scale research project that has important long-range implications for the schools and their students. For example, from the information that you will supply on this questionnaire, we expect to discover how institutions of higher learning can better anticipate student needs and thus improve their education and preparation for life.

The social scientists who will study the data collected from your class will assign code numbers to each completed questionnaire for computer analysis. Thus, your personal identity will become submerged as general patterns, and trends for the entire class emerge. However, we need your permission to include your responses and data in the over-all project. Therefore, please read and sign the following statement and then respond as completely, accurately, and quickly as possible to the short questionnaire that follows. Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Jack E. Bynum, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor  
Department of Sociology  
Oklahoma State University

---

I hereby authorize the research team assigned to PROJECT FUTURE to include my data and information, along with that collected from my classmates over the next few years, in their research study. I understand that this research focuses on patterns and trends within the entire group, and that my anonymity will be preserved at all times.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Student's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of College or University: \_\_\_\_\_

Your Permanent Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
(number, street, city, state)

Research Code Number: \_\_\_\_\_ (To be filled in by the Researchers)

---

INSTRUCTIONS: Begin the questionnaire on the back of this page.

PART I. YOUR PERSONAL BACKGROUND. (Instructions: Read each short question and indicate your answer with a check mark (✓) or a few words.)

1. Where were you born?\_\_\_\_\_. (Indicate city and state.) (If you were born in a country other than the United States, so indicate.)
2. What is the approximate size of the community in which you lived during your senior year of high school? (Check only one of the following.)
 

(1) Farm or open country:_____	(6) City between 20,001 and 50,000:_____
(2) Town of less than 2,500 population:_____	(7) City between 50,001 and 100,000:_____
(3) Town between 2,501 and 5,000:_____	(8) City between 100,001 and 500,000:_____
(4) Town between 5,001 and 10,000:_____	(9) City between 500,001 and one million:_____
(5) Town between 10,001 and 20,000:_____	(10) City over one million population:_____
3. What is your sex? (1) Male:\_\_\_\_\_ (2) Female:\_\_\_\_\_
4. How many brothers and sisters do you have?\_\_\_\_\_
5. Indicate your position in the birth sequence of children in the family with a check mark. Were you the:
 

(1) First born:_____	(3) Third born:_____	(5) Fifth born:_____
(2) Second born:_____	(4) Fourth born:_____	(6) Sixth born:_____
6. Now indicate the sex of your brothers and sisters by writing "male" or "female" in as many of the empty spaces as necessary in the birth sequence above.
7. What is your religious preference?
 

(1) Catholic:_____	(3) Protestant:_____
(2) Jewish:_____	(4) Other:_____
8. What was your most common grade in high school?
 

(1) "A":_____	(3) "C":_____	(5) "F":_____
(2) "B":_____	(4) "D":_____	
9. In which of the following activities did you participate while in high school? (Check as many as apply to you.)
 

(1) Senior class officer:_____
(2) Won "letter" in athletics:_____
(3) Placed in advanced class:_____
(4) Member of science or math club:_____
(5) Student Association officer:_____
(6) Member of musical group (band, choir, etc.):_____
(7) Worked on school newspaper:_____
(8) Officer or leader in church activities:_____

9. (Continued)
- (9) On Academic Honor Roll: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (10) In drama or talent program: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (11) In National Honor Society: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (12) Won award in Science Fair: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (13) Member of Pathfinder Club: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (14) Member of Pep Club: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (15) Member of FFA or FHA: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (16) Published paper, poem, story, or article: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (17) Other honors, awards, or positions of leadership: \_\_\_\_\_
10. What is your racial background? (Check one of the following.)
- (1) White/Caucasian: \_\_\_\_\_ (4) Oriental: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Black/Afro-American: \_\_\_\_\_ (5) Mexican American/Chicano: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (3) American Indian: \_\_\_\_\_ (6) Puerto Rican-American: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (7) Other: \_\_\_\_\_
11. When you were in high school, how many good friends did you have from racial groups other than your own? (Check one of the following.)
- (1) None: \_\_\_\_\_ (6) As many as I had from my own racial group: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) One: \_\_\_\_\_ (7) More than I had from my own racial group: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (3) Two: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (4) Three to five: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (5) Six to ten: \_\_\_\_\_
12. How old are you today: \_\_\_\_\_ years.
13. What is your present marital status?
- (1) Married: \_\_\_\_\_ (4) Single: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Divorced: \_\_\_\_\_ (5) Single but engaged: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (3) Separated: \_\_\_\_\_ (6) Widow or widower: \_\_\_\_\_
14. How many children do you have?
- (1) None: \_\_\_\_\_ (3) Two: \_\_\_\_\_ (5) Four: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) One: \_\_\_\_\_ (4) Three: \_\_\_\_\_ (6) More than four: \_\_\_\_\_
15. Indicate what meals and snacks you normally eat each day: (Check all of the following that apply to you.)
- (1) Breakfast: \_\_\_\_\_ (4) Afternoon snack: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Morning snack: \_\_\_\_\_ (5) Dinner: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (3) Lunch: \_\_\_\_\_ (6) Evening snack: \_\_\_\_\_
16. Please estimate the yearly income of your parents with a check mark:
- (1) Less than \$5,000 dollars: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Between \$5,000 and \$10,000 dollars: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (3) Between \$10,000 and \$15,000 dollars: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (4) Between \$15,000 and \$20,000 dollars: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (5) \$20,000 and over: \_\_\_\_\_

---

INSTRUCTIONS: CONTINUE THE QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE BACK OF THIS PAGE.

17. Write down your present height: \_\_\_\_\_ . (Example: 5 feet, 2 inches)
18. Write down your present weight: \_\_\_\_\_ . (Example: 200 lbs.)
19. Are you "going steady" at the present time?  
 (1) Yes: \_\_\_\_\_ (2) No: \_\_\_\_\_

PART II. YOUR COLLEGE LIFE.

20. Is this the first college that you have attended?  
 (1) Yes: \_\_\_\_\_ (2) No: \_\_\_\_\_
21. Where will you live while attending college?  
 (1) College dormitory: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) College fraternity or sorority house: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (3) Your own apartment or house: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (4) In private home with your parent(s): \_\_\_\_\_  
 (5) In private home with relatives: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (6) In private home with non-relatives: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (7) Other housing (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_
22. Will you have an automobile to use at college:  
 (1) Yes: \_\_\_\_\_ (2) No: \_\_\_\_\_
23. Have you decided on a major field of study while in college?  
 (1) Yes: \_\_\_\_\_ (2) No: \_\_\_\_\_
24. If you had to make a choice today, what would be your major field of study? (Please specify.) \_\_\_\_\_
25. What occupation, trade, job, or profession do you hope to ultimately enter? (Please specify.) \_\_\_\_\_
26. How many hours must you work each week in order to meet your college expenses?  
 (1) None: \_\_\_\_\_ (4) From twenty-one to thirty hours: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) From one to ten hours: \_\_\_\_\_ (5) I need a full-time job: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (3) From eleven to twenty hours: \_\_\_\_\_
27. Designate with numerals (1, 2, and 3) in the appropriate spaces below, your 1st, 2nd, and 3rd most important reasons for coming to college: (There are no right and wrong answers so express your feelings!)  
 (1) Parents' wishes: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Could not find a job: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (3) Learn more about life: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (4) Nothing better to do: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (5) To serve humanity: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (6) Able to get a better job: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (7) Gain general education: \_\_\_\_\_

27. (Continued)

- (8) Improve reading-study skills: \_\_\_\_\_
- (9) To serve God: \_\_\_\_\_
- (10) Become a more cultured person: \_\_\_\_\_
- (11) Wanted to get away from home: \_\_\_\_\_
- (12) Prepare for graduate, medical, or professional school: \_\_\_\_\_
- (13) Meet new and interesting people: \_\_\_\_\_
- (14) Able to make more money: \_\_\_\_\_

PART III. FRESHMAN VIEWPOINTS (Answer each question with a check mark (✓).)

28. If you are not married now, do you hope to get married someday?  
 (1) Yes: \_\_\_\_\_ (2) No: \_\_\_\_\_
29. How many children would you like to have?  
 (1) None: \_\_\_\_\_ (3) Two: \_\_\_\_\_ (5) Four: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) One: \_\_\_\_\_ (4) Three: \_\_\_\_\_ (6) Five or more: \_\_\_\_\_
30. Do you attend church or synagogue? (Check one of the following.)  
 (1) Regularly/every week: \_\_\_\_\_ (4) Rarely: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Often/once or twice a month: \_\_\_\_\_ (5) Never: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (3) Occasionally/three or four times a year: \_\_\_\_\_
31. Who is the most influential person in your life at the present time?  
 (1) Mother: \_\_\_\_\_ (6) Boy friend: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Father: \_\_\_\_\_ (7) Girl friend: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (3) Brother: \_\_\_\_\_ (8) High school teacher: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (4) Sister: \_\_\_\_\_ (9) College teacher: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (5) Minister: \_\_\_\_\_ (10) Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_
32. Were you 18 years old on September 1, 1976:  
 (1) Yes: \_\_\_\_\_ (2) No: \_\_\_\_\_
33. Did you vote in the 1976 Presidential election:  
 (1) Yes: \_\_\_\_\_ (2) No: \_\_\_\_\_
34. Do you read the Bible? (Check one.)  
 (1) Regularly: \_\_\_\_\_ (4) Rarely: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Often: \_\_\_\_\_ (5) Never: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (3) Occasionally: \_\_\_\_\_
35. What is your political preference? (Check only one.)  
 (1) Democratic Party: \_\_\_\_\_ (5) John Birch Society: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Republican Party: \_\_\_\_\_ (6) Ku Klux Klan: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (3) Socialist Party: \_\_\_\_\_ (7) Uncertain: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (4) Communist Party: \_\_\_\_\_ (8) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

---

INSTRUCTIONS: CONTINUE THE QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE BACK OF THIS PAGE.



36. Who was your favorite candidate during the 1976 Presidential Primaries?
- (1) Carter: \_\_\_\_\_ (5) Brown: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Ford: \_\_\_\_\_ (6) Wallace: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (3) Humphrey: \_\_\_\_\_ (7) Uncertain: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (4) Reagan: \_\_\_\_\_ (8) Other: \_\_\_\_\_
37. How would you react if you saw a classmate cheating during an exam? (Check one.)
- (1) Publicly rebuke him or her: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Privately report him or her to the instructor: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (3) Privately rebuke him or her: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (4) Indignation, but do nothing: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (5) No feeling or reaction: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (6) Tolerant and understanding: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (7) Cheating is normal and sometimes necessary: \_\_\_\_\_
38. How would you characterize the hippie movement and life style? (Check one.)
- (1) Attractive: \_\_\_\_\_ (5) Deviant: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Freedom: \_\_\_\_\_ (6) Antisocial: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (3) Independent: \_\_\_\_\_ (7) A sick society: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (4) Nonconforming: \_\_\_\_\_ (8) Criminal: \_\_\_\_\_

THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS HAVE BEEN TAKEN FROM OTHER SURVEYS WHICH HAVE BEEN USED IN ORDER TO GET A NATIONWIDE STUDENT PERSPECTIVE. PLEASE INDICATE HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS BY CIRCLING THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER TO INDICATE:

	Strongly agree	Agree somewhat	Mixed Feelings	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly
1. Strongly agree.					
2. Agree somewhat.					
3. Mixed feelings.					
4. Disagree somewhat.					
5. Strongly disagree.					
39. It is important to marry someone of your own religious faith.	1	2	3	4	5
40. An automobile is essential to social success in college.	1	2	3	4	5
41. There is a future life sometime after death.	1	2	3	4	5
42. It is important to marry someone of your own race.	1	2	3	4	5
43. Sexual relations before marriage are morally wrong for men.	1	2	3	4	5
44. Sexual relations before marriage are morally wrong for women.	1	2	3	4	5

- |  | Strongly<br>agree | Agree<br>somewhat | Mixed<br>feelings | Disagree<br>somewhat | Strongly<br>disagree |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| 45. Marijuana should be legalized.   | 1                 | 2                 | 3                 | 4                    | 5                    |
| 46. The activities of married women are best confined to the home and family.  | 1                 | 2                 | 3                 | 4                    | 5                    |
| 47. Is religion more important or less important to you now than when you were 12 years old? (Check one of the following.)<br>(1) More important: _____ (3) About the same: _____<br>(2) Less important: _____ |                   |                   |                   |                      |                      |

PART IV. THIS PART OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE CONTAINS A SERIES OF STATEMENTS DESIGNED TO ELICIT YOUR FEELINGS AS YOU LOOK AT YOUR LIFE. FOR EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS, CIRCLE THE NUMBER THAT WOULD BE MOST NEARLY TRUE FOR YOU. NOTE THAT THE NUMBERS ALWAYS EXTEND FROM ONE EXTREME FEELING TO ITS OPPOSITE KIND OF FEELING. "NEUTRAL" IMPLIES NO JUDGMENT EITHER WAY. TRY TO USE THIS RATING AS LITTLE AS POSSIBLE.

- |                                      |   |   |   |           |   |   |                                |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|-----------|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 48. I am ususally:                   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4         | 5 | 6 | 7                              |
| completely bored                     |   |   |   | (neutral) |   |   | exuberant, enthusiastic        |
| 49. Life to me seems:                | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4         | 3 | 2 | 1                              |
| always exciting                      |   |   |   | (neutral) |   |   | completely routine             |
| 50. In life I have:                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4         | 5 | 6 | 7                              |
| no goals or aims at all              |   |   |   | (neutral) |   |   | very clear goals and aims      |
| 51. My personal existence is:        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4         | 5 | 6 | 7                              |
| utterly meaningless, without purpose |   |   |   | (neutral) |   |   | very purposeful and meaningful |
| 52. Every day is:                    | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4         | 3 | 2 | 1                              |
| constantly new and different         |   |   |   | (neutral) |   |   | exactly the same               |

---

INSTRUCTIONS: CONTINUE THE QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE BACK OF THIS PAGE.

53. If I could choose, I would:  
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
 prefer never to (neutral) like nine more lives  
 have been born just like this one
54. After retiring from work, I would:  
 7 6 5 4 3 2 1  
 do some of the exciting (neutral) loaf completely the  
 things I have always rest of my life  
 wanted to do
55. In achieving life goals I have:  
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
 made no progress (neutral) progressed to  
 whatever complete fulfillment
56. My life is:  
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
 empty, filled (neutral) running over with  
 with despair exciting good things
57. If I should die today, I would feel that my life has been:  
 7 6 5 4 3 2 1  
 very worthwhile (neutral) completely worthless
58. In thinking of my life, I:  
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
 often wonder (neutral) always see a reason  
 why I exist for my being here
59. As I view the world in relation to my life, the world:  
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
 completely (neutral) fits meaningfully  
 confuses me with my life
60. I am a:  
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
 very irresponsible (neutral) very responsible  
 person person
61. Concerning man's freedom to make his own choices, I believe man is:  
 7 6 5 4 3 2 1  
 absolutely free (neutral) completely bound by  
 to make all life limitations of  
 choices heredity and envi-  
 ronment
62. With regard to death, I am:  
 7 6 5 4 3 2 1  
 prepared and (neutral) unprepared and  
 unafraid frightened

63. With regard to suicide, I have:  
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
 thought of it (neutral) never given it a  
 seriously as a second thought  
 way out
64. I regard my ability to find a meaning, purpose, or mission in  
 life as:  
 7 6 5 4 3 2 1  
 very great (neutral) practically none
65. My life is:  
 7 6 5 4 3 2 1  
 in my hands and I (neutral) out of my hands and  
 am in control of it controlled by ex-  
 ternal factors
66. Facing my daily tasks is:  
 7 6 5 4 3 2 1  
 a source of pleasure (neutral) a painful and boring  
 and satisfaction experience
67. I have discovered:  
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
 no mission or (neutral) clear-cut goals and  
 purpose in life a satisfying life  
 purpose

PART V. PARENTAL HISTORY (Instructions: Read each short question and indicate your answer with a check mark (✓) or a few words.)

68. What is your father's approximate age? \_\_\_\_\_ years.
69. What is your father's present marital status? (Check one.)  
 (1) Married and living with your mother: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Divorced: \_\_\_\_\_ (3) Separated: \_\_\_\_\_ (4) Widowed: \_\_\_\_\_
70. What is your father's religious preference?  
 (1) Catholic: \_\_\_\_\_ (3) Protestant: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Jewish: \_\_\_\_\_ (4) Other: \_\_\_\_\_
71. What is your father's political preference?  
 (1) Democratic Party: \_\_\_\_\_ (5) John Birch Society: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Republican Party: \_\_\_\_\_ (6) Ku Klux Klan: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (3) Socialist Party: \_\_\_\_\_ (7) Uncertain: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (4) Communist Party: \_\_\_\_\_ (8) Other: \_\_\_\_\_
72. My father: (Indicate his highest level of formal education.)  
 (1) Did not complete elementary school: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Graduated from elementary school: \_\_\_\_\_

---

INSTRUCTIONS: CONTINUE THE QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE BACK OF THIS PAGE.

72. (Continued)
- (3) Did not complete high school: \_\_\_\_\_
  - (4) Graduated from high school: \_\_\_\_\_
  - (5) Did some college work: \_\_\_\_\_
  - (6) Graduated from a two-year community or junior college: \_\_\_\_\_
  - (7) Graduated from a four-year college or university: \_\_\_\_\_
  - (8) Did some graduate work: \_\_\_\_\_
  - (9) Received a Master's degree: \_\_\_\_\_
  - (10) Received a doctorate (Ph.D., Ed.D.): \_\_\_\_\_
  - (11) Received a medical degree (M.D., D.D., etc.): \_\_\_\_\_
73. What is (or was) your father's main life's work? \_\_\_\_\_  
(Try to be as specific as possible. Examples: carpenter, medical doctor, high school teacher, salesman, owner of clothing store, manager of grocery, etc.)
74. What is your mother's approximate age? \_\_\_\_\_ years.
75. What is your mother's present marital status? (Check one.)
- (1) Married and living with your father: \_\_\_\_\_
  - (2) Divorced: \_\_\_\_\_ (3) Separated: \_\_\_\_\_ (4) Widowed: \_\_\_\_\_
76. What is your mother's religious preference?
- (1) Catholic: \_\_\_\_\_ (3) Protestant: \_\_\_\_\_
  - (2) Jewish: \_\_\_\_\_ (4) Other: \_\_\_\_\_
77. What is your mother's political preference?
- (1) Democratic Party: \_\_\_\_\_ (5) John Birch Society: \_\_\_\_\_
  - (2) Republican Party: \_\_\_\_\_ (6) Ku Klux Klan: \_\_\_\_\_
  - (3) Socialist Party: \_\_\_\_\_ (7) Uncertain: \_\_\_\_\_
  - (4) Communist Party: \_\_\_\_\_ (8) Other: \_\_\_\_\_
78. My mother: (Indicate her highest level of formal education.)
- (1) Did not complete elementary school: \_\_\_\_\_
  - (2) Graduated from elementary school: \_\_\_\_\_
  - (3) Did not complete high school: \_\_\_\_\_
  - (4) Graduated from high school: \_\_\_\_\_
  - (5) Did some college work: \_\_\_\_\_
  - (6) Graduated from a two-year community or junior college: \_\_\_\_\_
  - (7) Graduated from a four-year college or university: \_\_\_\_\_
  - (8) Did some graduate work: \_\_\_\_\_
  - (9) Received a Master's degree: \_\_\_\_\_
  - (10) Received a doctorate (Ph.D. or Ed.D.): \_\_\_\_\_
  - (11) Received a medical degree (M.D. or D.D.): \_\_\_\_\_
79. If you mother has had a job or position outside the home, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_. (Try to be as specific as possible. Examples: secretary, nurse, elementary school teacher, saleswoman, etc.)

APPENDIX B

OCCUPATIONAL STATUSES

MODIFIED OCCUPATIONAL RATINGS<sup>1</sup>

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Score</u>
President of U.S.	96
U.S. Supreme Court Justice	96
Physician	93
State Governor	93
Veterinarian	93
Cabinet Member in Federal Government	92
Diplomat in the U.S. Foreign Service	92
Mayor of a Large City	90
Astronaut	89
College Professor	89
Scientist	89
Something in Science	89
U.S. Representative in Congress	89
Banker	88
Government Scientist	88
Admiral	87
County Judge	87
Head of Department in State Government	87
Minister	87
Architect	86
Chemist	86

---

<sup>1</sup>Original scale by Paul K. Hatt and C. C. North in Delbert C. Miller, Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurements. New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1964, pp. 108-110. Modified by Billy Lewis Cooper, 1975.

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Score</u>
Dentist	86
Lawyer	86
Member of Board of Directors (Large Corp.)	86
Nuclear Physicist	86
Priest	86
Psychologist	85
Civil Engineer	84
Electrical Engineer	84
Engineer	84
Airforce Pilot	83
Airline Pilot	83
Artist	83
Professional Athlete	83
Anthropologist	82
Owner of Factory	82
Sociologist	82
Accountant for Large Business	81
Biologist	81
Geologist	81
Musician in Symphony Orchestra	81
Professional Business	81
Talented Pianist	81
Army Officer	80
Captain in the Regular Army	80
Coast Guard	80
Dramatics	80



<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Score</u>
Fashion Designer	80
H.S. Principal	80
Building Contractor	79
Counselor in Large School	79
Dancing Teacher	79
Economist	79
Elementary Principal	79
Forest Ranger	79
Public Relations	79
Home Economist	79
Physical Therapist	79
Jet Engineer	79
Job Analyst	79
Pharmacist	79
Registered Nurse	79
Agronomist	78
Commercial Art	78
Choral Director	78
Professional Worker	78
Public School Teacher	78
Teacher	78
Teacher and Counselor	78
Vocational Teacher	78
County Agricultural Agent	77
Railroad Engineer	77
Farm Owner and Operator	76

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Score</u>
Official of an International Labor Union	75
Radio Announcer	75
Newspaper Columnist	74
Owner-Operator of a Printing Shop	74
Social Worker	74
Computer Programmer	73
Drafting	73
Electronics	73
Electrician	73
Federal Government Agriculturist	73
Lab Technician	73
Librarian	73
Peace Corps	73
Technician	73
Skilled Craftsman	73
Undertaker	72
Mortician	72
Reporter on Daily Newspaper	71
Buyer	69
General Business	69
Government Job	69
Interior Decorator	69
Manager of a Small Store in a City	69
Owner of a Machine Shop	69
Owner of a Small Business	69
Auctioneer	68

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Score</u>
Bookkeeper	68
Dairy Farm	68
Farming	68
Key Punch Operator	68
Language Interpreter	68
Insurance and Real Estate Agent	68
Office Job	68
Merchandise and Secretary	68
Tenant Farmer	68
Traveling Salesman	68
Secretary	68
Typist	68
Fireman	67
Playground Director	67
Policeman	67
Railroad Conductor	67
Mail Carrier	66
Carpenter	65
Painter	65
Aircraft Mechanic	63
Automobile Repairman	63
Auto Parts	63
Diesel Engineer	63
Diesel Mechanic	63
Plumber	63
Car Mechanic	62

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Score</u>
Garage Mechanic	62
Local Official of a Labor Union	62
Mechanical Work	62
Owner-Operator of a Lunch Stand	62
Skilled Laborer	62
Army Skilled Man	60
Assembly Line	60
Corporal in Regular Army	60
Factory Worker	60
Machine Operator	60
Welder	60
Airline Steward/Stewardess	59
Barber	59
Beautician	59
Hair Dresser	59
Model	59
Practical Nurse	59
Work in Hospital	59
Clerk in a Store	58
Seamstress	58
Streetcar Motorman	58
Fisherman Who Owns Own Boat	58
Culinary Arts	54
Milk Routeman	54
Race Car Driver	54
Restaurant Cook	54

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Score</u>
Truck Driver	54
Hunting Guide	53
Lumberjack	53
Filling Station Attendant	52
Singer in a Night Club	52
Singer and Comedian	52
Singer	52
Tinker Field Worker	51
Construction	51
Babysitting	50
Ditch Digger	50
Farmhand	50
Oil Field	50
Coal Miner	49
Taxi Driver	49
Railroad Section Hand	48
Restaurant Waiter	48
Dock Worker	47
Night Watchman	47
Clothes Presser in Laundry	46
Soda Fountain Clerk	45
Bartender	44
Janitor	44
Maid	44
Sharecropper	40
Garbage Collector	35

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Score</u>
Street Sweeper	34
Shoe Shiner	33
Housewife	01

APPENDIX C

FACTOR ANALYSIS OF PIL SCALE

## FACTOR ANALYSIS OF PIL SCALE

## Unrotated Factors

<u>Item</u>	<u>Factor 1</u>	<u>Factor 2</u>	<u>Factor 3</u>	<u>Factor 4</u>
1	.56	-.38	-.10	.03
2	.59	-.49	-.17	.04
3	.51	.36	-.17	-.49
4	.66	-.01	-.05	-.31
5	.62	-.30	-.29	.11
6	.51	-.27	.34	.03
7	.38	.14	-.37	.22
8	.56	.18	-.20	-.06
9	.73	-.16	-.08	-.02
10	.67	-.12	.09	-.02
11	.62	-.04	.35	-.13
12	.56	-.02	.27	-.07
13	.44	.36	.06	.06
14	.35	.15	.04	.53
15	.38	.15	-.13	.15
16	.42	-.04	.62	-.04
17	.65	.21	-.05	.03
18	.30	.34	.27	.46
19	.64	.04	-.16	.30
20	.69	.32	-.05	-.23



VITA<sup>2</sup>

William Edwin Thompson

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: THE IMPACT OF COLLEGE SOCIALIZATION: PHASE I OF A LONGITUDINAL COHORT ANALYSIS

Major Field: Sociology

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Tulsa, Oklahoma, October 20, 1950, the son of Mr. and Mrs. E. N. Thompson.

Education: Graduated from McLain High School, Tulsa, Oklahoma, in May, 1968; received Bachelor of Arts in Education degree in Social Studies from Northeastern Oklahoma State University in 1972; received Master of Science in Education degree in History from Southwest Missouri State University in 1974; completed requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1979.

Professional Experience: Social Studies teacher, Stoutland Public Schools, 1972-74; Social Studies teacher, Broken Arrow Public Schools, 1974-76; Assistant Principal, Broken Arrow Public Schools, 1976-77; Graduate Teaching Assistant, Sociology Department, Oklahoma State University, 1977-78; Instructor of Sociology, The University of Tulsa, 1979.

Professional Organizations: Member of Oklahoma Sociological Association, Southwest Sociological Association, and Midwest Sociological Association.