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David E. Drew and John A. Creager
During the past few years, new kinds of students have been entering our colleges and universities. No longer can the uppermiddle class white male, who moves smoothly from a college preparatory program in high school directly into college, be regarded as the "typical" student. Among the various groups of nontraditional students that make for greater heterogeneity within the college population are those from racial or ethnic minorities, those from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, those whose academic ability or high school preparation is relatively poor (as judged by conventional criteria) and those who are older than the average undergraduate. One subgroup of this last category consists of those whose college education was delayed or interrupted by military service during the Vietnam era, whether they actually served in Southeast Asia or not. It is generally recognized that such students may benefit from college at least as much as the "typical" student.

In response to the challenges presented by these new kinds of students, a number of what are thought to be exciting innovations-e.g., open admissions, examination for credit, external degrees-have been introduced, many of them directed at older students, such as veterans, whose special needs stem in large part from their lack of an earlier opportunity to attend college.

Certainly higher education needs creative approaches for dealing with such problems. A11 too often, however, the academic community enthusiastically endorses new ideas without carefully considering their implications. This enthusiasm is frequently
accompanied by a failure to recognize that the idea may not really be all that new. Thus, educational theorists have a tendency to reinvent the wheel with great fanfare. So it is with some of the "innovations" relating to nontraditional students. For instance, many advocates of the open university tend to ignore the impressive work which the university extension systems have been doing for decades. Similarly, the far-reaching effects of a major social experiment--the World War II GI Bill--are often overlooked.

Following World War II, large numbers of ex-servicemen--by definition older than the average undergraduate--pursued a college education at a cost to the Federal government of millions of dollars. But despite this vast sum, and the massive number of students involved, little was done in the way of solid empirical research on the performance and experience of these ex-servicemen. One striking exception is the well-known study by Frederickson and Shrader (1952), whose sample of colleges was, unfortunately, limited to 16 .

Each of the two Asian wars since World War II was followed by a new G.I. Bill. Early assessments indicated that the proportion of Vietnam-era veterans who took advantage of this legislation was much smaller than the proportion of World War II veterans who made use of the original GI Bill. The standard explanation for this lower rate was that, in contrast to the typical middle-class serviceman of World War II, the Vietnam-era veteran was much more 1ikely to be from a disadvantaged social background and thus less likely to be college-oriented. To compensate for this, a number of Federal, state, local, and civic groups were mobilized to inform the returning veteran about new educational benefits available
through the most recent legislation. Perhaps as a result of these programs (and the new, more generous law), it is now the case that "Vietnam-era veterans are making greater use of their educational benefits under the GI Bill than did the veterans of World War II and the Korean Conflict" (ACE, HENA, 1972, p. 4). This article noted a study by the Veterans Administration which found that Vietnem-era veterans are going to college at the rate of 21.9 percent compared with 20.1 percent for the Korean Conflict veterans and 13.8 percent for those who served in World War II.

Unfortunately, as before, there has been virtually no largescale empirical research about the Vietnam-era veteran in college. The need for such data has been recognized for some time. Frank Newman, Director of a key HEW task force on higher education, has commented in Senate hearings:

> There is no study that we have been able to find that supports [the] fact [that] returning GI students are better students. Every person I have ever talked to believes it. One of the interesting things is we have never studied it...(U.S. Senate, 1971, p. 2464 )

A review, "Veterans in College" by Brent Breedin of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education notes that "there appears to be little research on the Vietnam veteran's performance in the classroom."

Any useful research on veterans as college students should start by contrasting the characteristics of such students with those of other students as they enter college. This report has that goal and draws upon the data base developed for longitudinal research purposes by the Cooperative Institutional Research Program
of the American Council on Education. Thus, statistics presented in this report are derived from a large national sample of both veterans and nonveterans.

## The Cooperative Institutional Research Program

Each fall since 1966, when the Cooperative Institutional Research Program was launched, approximately a quarter of a million first-time, full-time freshmen have completed questionnaires designed to elicit a wide range of biographical and demographic data, as well as information on high school activities and behaviors, educational aspirations, career plans, financial arrangements, and current attitudes. These data provide input to the Council's longitudinal research base, further developed through followup questionnaires sent periodically to subsamples of each entering cohort.

This framework makes possible both descriptive profiles and longitudinal studies of undergraduate development. Through the use of weighting procedures (Creager, 1968), the results of both types of studies may be generalized to estimates of national parameters of higher education.

National normative reports have been produced on entering freshmen (e.g., ACE, Staff of the Office of Research, 1971) and at subsequent intervals in the college experience (Bayer, Drew, Astin, Boruch, and Creager, 1970) as well as with respect to specific subgroups of students (e.g., Drew, 1970; Bayer, 1972). Analytical studies have been conducted on such topics as theories of undergraduate aspirations (Drew and Astin, 1972). An accessing system makes these data available to social and educa-
tional researchers (Bayer, Astin, Boruch, and Creager, 1969); concurrently, steps have been taken to assure the confidentiality of the information provided by questionnaire respondents (Astin and Boruch, 1970).

A more extensive and detailed description of the various projects growing out of the ACE Cooperative Institutional Research Program can be found in The ACE Office of Research: Its Purposes and Activities (1972).

## The Student Information Form

The Student Information Form (SIF), a four-page document containing a series of objective items, is typically administered to freshmen after they have matriculated but before they have experienced college: i.e., during the orientation period. Many items on the SIF remain unchanged from year to year so that trends among entering freshmen over time can be traced and analyzed; in addition, items are added to and dropped from the questionnaire each year. One such item, introduced in the fall of 1970 , asked the entering freshman to indicate whether he had served in the armed forces. In 1971, this "veteran-status" item was modified slightly as follows: Are you a Veteran? (Mark one) 0 No

0 Yes, I served in Southeast Asia
0 Yes, but I did not serve in Southeast Asia.
A copy of the complete form used in 1971 is attached as Appendix A. The questionnaire was constructed so that the responses could be recognized by optical scanning equipment and converted into a data tape for subsequent computer analysis. Because of their inclusion
on questionnaires from prior years, most of the items have been extensively pretested.

## Sampling and Weighting

This report is based on responses to the SIF of the most recent cohort of entering freshmen on whom data are available: those enrolled as first-time, full-time freshmen in the fall of 1971. Although details of that survey have been reported in the published national norms for 1971 entering freshmen (ACE, Staff of the Office of Research, 1971), a few highlights are relevant to the present study. The population base consisted of 2,543 institutions listed in the Education Directory (USOE, 1970), which have freshman classes of at least 30 and which do not require undergraduate credits for admission. The student population consisted of the first-time, full-time students entering those institutions. Of 487 institutions participating in the 1971 survey, 326 provided data that met the quality-control requirements for inclusion in the national norms. The stratification and participation of these institutions are summarized in Table 1.

The present study compares the percentages of students in each of the subgroups of the normative sample (as defined by their responses to the veteran status item described earlier) giving responses to various categories of each item. A1though some veterans are women, their numbers are too small to provide stable and meaningful normative data. It was decided, therefore, to limit this study to the responses of male students in the normative sample.

Ideally, the weighting factors for the veterans and the nonveterans subsamples should be recomputed, but such a procedure was not
possible because the relevant population parameters--such as the numbers of veterans enrolled in all institutions in each stratification cell and the proportion of veterans in each sample institution completing the Student Information Form--are unknown. It is therefore necessary to use the general survey weighting factors and specify the possible biases thus entailed. These considerations apply not only to specialized norms for the veterans subsample of the general freshman survey but also to norms for any specialized subsample, (e.g., black students, Jewish students).

The weighting of freshman data consists of the product of two factors, a weight among colleges and a weight within colleges. The among-college weight is the ratio of the first-time, full-time freshman enrollments cumulated for the population colleges in the relevant stratification cell to those enrollments for the sample colleges. The purpose of this weight is to render item counts (and derived statistics) in the sample reasonably representative of the population of freshmen entering the population of colleges and universities. The use of this weight for the veterans subsample assumes that variations among the sample institutions in the proportion of veterans average out to be the same as the proportion of veterans in the population institutions within each cell of the stratification design. Not only does this assumption appear to be plausible, but also the averaging process is carried further when weighted counts are pooled across stratification cells to form aggregate counts in the reported normative groups. The cell weights are computed separately for each sex in the total survey sample and need not be recomputed for exclusion of female students and all-female institutions in the present study. These weights for male students are shown in Table 1.

The second, or within-college, weight is the ratio of the enrollment of freshmen entering a particular sample institution to the number of freshmen in that institution who completed the SIF. As indicated above, quality-control procedures are used to judge whether data from a given institution are admissible into the normative sample. The use of this weight on the veterans subsample assumes that veterans within a sample institution complete the Student Information Form in the same proportion as nonveterans. The quality controls also indirectly constrain the degree to which this assumption is likely to be seriously violated. Nevertheless, it is possible for the two ratios to be somewhat different. This second type of weight is also computed separately for each sex and does not have to be recomputed for the exclusion of female students. The actual weight applied to each student's responses is the product of these two weights.

Distribution of Veterans by Institutional Type in 1971

The total number of participants in the 1971 entering freshman sample was 171,509 . The sampling and weighting procedures made possible estimates of the national distribution of responses for a weighted total population of $1,634,154$ entering freshmen, of whom 54 percent were men. Table 2 presents information on the number of participants and the weighted population estimates for both the veterans group and the comparison group of nonveterans. These data are presented separately for all institutions, and for two-year colleges, four-year colleges, and universities.

Table 3 (abstracted from the 1971 national norms) shows the percentages of each of three normative groups--nonveterans, veterans
who served in Southeast Asia, and veterans who did not serve in Southeast Asia--entering the various institutional types.

Of those men entering college, about 5 percent were veterans; 2.7 percent had served in Southeast Asia, and 2.3 percent had not. The fluctuations within types of institutions are interesting. For example, 8.1 percent of the men entering two-year colleges were veterans, as opposed to 1.8 percent of the men entering universities. Because of very low base rates, normative tables were not prepared for the finer categories of institutions.

As Breedin (1972) notes, the strong representation of veterans in public institutions is a phenomenon which began with the Korean War GI Bill. The World War II Bill, by allowing substantial tuition payments to the institution, had made it easier for veterans to attend private institutions (many of which, of course, have large tuitions). But because the government lost substantial revenues to entrepreneurial educational establishments, the bill that followed the Korean War made changes in the funding provisions. From that point on, a flat amount per month has been allocated to the veteran, with no additional payment to the school. In consequence, ex-servicemen have tended to enroll in the less expensive public institutions. Recently, several institutions, e.g., in Illinois and Massachusetts, have even taken steps to waive tuition completely for veterans.

The National Normative Profile of Veteran Students

The major content of this report is the set of normative tables following this text. There are two groups of tables. In the first group, pp. 29 to pp. 36, the responses of veteran men are compared
with those of nonveteran men. All figures are national population estimates of entering freshmen. In the second group of tables, pp. 37 to pp. 44, the responses of the two subgroups of veterans--those who served in Southeast Asia and those who did not--are compared. All statistics are given for three types of institutions--two-year colleges, four-year colleges, and universities--as well as for all institutions. ${ }^{1}$

Given the various logistical constraints on purely random participation in the original total survey and possible biases in weighting discussed above, the computation of sampling errors, or confidence limits, on the reported categorical response percentages is both difficult and tenuous. Some idea of the accuracy in the weighted estimates can be given in terms of the standard errors for each normative group, as these are computed for simple random sampling from an infinite population of students. These values, where the population parameter is assumed to be 50 percent, are shown in Table 4.

For items where the response percentages deviate appreciably from 50 percent in either direction, the sampling errors are somewhat reduced. On most items of interest, e.g., the student's race, the response percentages do differ significantly from 50 percent. Thus, for example, the standard error for nonveterans in all institutions (based on the 50 percent population parameter) as shown in Table 4 is .17. However, for the first race category, "white/Caucasian," the response percentage is 89 for which the standard error is reduced to. 10 .
${ }^{1}$ See Appendix B for items in which the original categories have been collapsed for reporting purposes.

The values in Table 4 are also reduced, but only slightly, when allowance is made for finite sampling and stratification, the latter being used to ensure some sampling in all sectors of higher education and to provide a basis in the weighting procedures for disproportionate sampling of institutions.

Since the normative groups in this report are statistically independent, comparing percentages between groups involves the standard error of the difference of the two percentages: $\sqrt{\mathrm{SE}_{\% 1}^{2}+\mathrm{SE}_{\%}^{2}}$. Thus, differences between veterans and nonveterans in the "all institutions" comparison which exceed 2 percent can be considered significant. In comparisons based on the finer breakouts larger differences are required to achieve significance. In the most extreme case-Southeast Asia veterans versus non-Southeast Asia veterans in universities--the required difference could be as large as 10 percent.

Some allowance should also be made for the unknown amounts of nonrandom sampling fluctuations for which, as noted earlier, the weighting procedures could not compensate. Thus, reported percentages which are just barely "significant" should still be interpreted with caution.

## Interpretation of Results

In this section, we shall highlight some of the differences that emerge from examination of the national normative tables. Differences Between Veteran and Nonveteran Students

Naturally, the veterans were older: whereas the modal age of nonveteran freshmen was 18, the modal age of the veterans was 22 to 25 .

Traditional measures of the socioeconomic status of college students include parents' income and education and fathers' occupation.

By all these measures, the veterans were clearly from more disadvantaged backgrounds. Both their fathers' and mothers' education tended to be less than that of the parents of other students; similarly, their parents had lower incomes. Among the specific findings with respect to father's occupation, a significantly lower percentage of veterans had fathers who were businessmen and a significantly higher percentage had fathers who were skilled, semiskilled, or unskilled workers.

Veterans entering college were less likely to be white than were other students. The percentage of blacks among the veterans was higher than that among the nonveterans at all types of institutions, particularly the four-year colleges (where 13 percent of the veterans, compared with 8.6 percent of the nonveterans were black) and in the universities ( 6.2 percent of the veterans, as compared with 2.7 percent of the nonveterans).

As to religious background, the veterans were more 1ikely to be Protestant and less likely to be Jewish or "other" than were the nonveterans.

While only 1.2 percent of the nonveterans were married at the time of entry to college, 38 percent of the veterans were married. This difference is undoubtedly a function of the veterans' being older.

Veterans were significantly more likely than were other students to be going to an institution close to their homes. This tendency may simply indicate that they are more likely to regard their current residence as "home" than are typical freshmen, who are more likely to interpret the word as referring to their parents' residence.

Veterans generally had poorer academic records in high school than did nonveterans. Similarly, they were less likely to have recorded various secondary school achievements: in particular, being president of a student organization, winning a varsity letter in sports, being editor of the school paper, having original writing published, belonging to the scholastic honor society, and winning National Merit Scholarship recognition.

The educational aspirations of the veterans were lower. About 60 percent of them planned, as freshmen, to go no further than the baccalaureate; the comparable figure for nonveterans was 48 percent.

The veterans indicated less concern about financing their college education. Clearly, they expected to be aided greatly by GI Bill benefits resulting from their military service. Consequently, they were less likely to indicate loans, scholarships or grants, part-time or summer work or, of course, family aid as major sources of support.

Veterans were more likely to plan to major in business or in the category "other fields: technical" and less likely to plan a preprofessional major. These preferences were paralleled by their answers to the question on probable career.

In response to an item asking why they decided to go to college in the first place, veterans were more likely to give as reasons: gaining a general education, becoming more cultured, improving their reading and study skills, and learning more about things that interest them. They were less likely to say that they had come to college because they wanted to meet new and interesting people or because their parents wanted them to go.

In selecting their particular college, veterans based their decision more often on its proximity to their homes or its special educational programs and less often on its reputation.

The SIF included a number of items about attitudes toward political and social matters and about matters directly pertaining to college life. Veterans were less likely to believe that the death penalty should be abolished and that an individual person can do little to change our society.

On academic issues, veterans were more likely to support various forms of regulation of students by college officials, i.e., with respect to off-campus behavior, student publications, student protest, and banning campus speakers. Veterans were less likely to believe that faculty promotions should be based in part on student evaluation and that grades should be abolished. However, they were more likely to believe that everyone should be given an opportunity to go to college regardless of past performance or aptitude test scores and that open admissions should be adopted by all publicly-supported colleges.

Each student was asked to indicate his current political preference, the alternatives being "far left," "libera1," "middle-of-theroad," "conservative," and "far right." About 40 percent of each group considered themselves "middle-of-the-road." Of the remainder, more students in each group defined themselves as left of center than right of center by about a two-to-one margin. But veterans had a slightly greater tendency than did nonveterans to characterize themselves as conservative. Thus, 38.1 percent of the veterans defined themselves as far left or liberal, as compared with 40.4 percent of
the nonveterans. Similarly, 21.4 percent of the veterans defined themselves as conservative or far right, as compared with 15.9 percent of the nonveterans.

Each student was asked to indicate the importance to him of a number of life goals; alternatives ranged from "essential" to "not important." The goals given higher priority by veterans than by nonveterans were raising a family and never being obligated to people. Those goals given relatively low priority by veterans included having an active social life, having friends different from themselves, being very well-off financially, and succeeding in their own businesses.

Veterans consistently rated themselves lower than did nonveterans on a number of personal traits, including academic ability, athletic ability, mathematical ability, general popularity, popularity with the opposite sex, intellectual self-confidence, and writing ability. Exceptions to this pattern included defensiveness, drive to achieve, mechanical ability, and leadership ability, on which their self-ratings were higher than those of other students.

The SIF asked students to indicate their expectations about their future college experiences. Some of these items (as with other parts of the questionnaire) were inappropriate for veterans. For example, one question asked for the student's "best guess" as to the likelihood of his getting married while in college; since a large proportion of veterans were already married when they entered college, no meaningful comparisons could emerge from their responses. On those items which did apply to veterans as well as nonveterans, differences emerged: More of the veterans planned to vote in the 1972 presidential
election, and fewer expected to change their major field or career choices, or to join social fraternities. They were more inclined than were nonveterans to anticipate poor academic performance (a prediction consistent with their high school history) and to feel they would need extra time to complete their degree requirements. More of them planned to work at an outside job while in college. In response to another related item, veterans were more likely to say that they would probably require special help in English and mathematics. Finally, more of the veterans expected to be satisfied with their college.

The freshmen were asked to indicate which activities they had engaged in during the "past year in school." Approximately half of these items, e.g., "failed to complete a homework assignment on time," were inappropriate for the veterans since only 2.6 percent had graduated from secondary school in 1971. Some veterans may, however, have been taking some part-time, postsecondary education in 1971; for them such an item would be meaningful. Of the remaining items, some are appropriate for the veterans as well as for the other students but would have a slightly different meaning, e.g., "studied in the library." That is, while veterans may have studied in the library, it is not the same situation as a high school student studying in the school library. Finally there are a number of items for which the meaning to veterans and to other students would be essentially the same, e.g., "took vitamins," "discussed politics," "discussed sports."

Differences Between Veterans Who Did or Did Not Serve in Southeast Asia

With a few, mostly minor, exceptions, the characteristics of veterans entering college did not appear to be related to whether the veteran had served in Southeast Asia or not. Whatever differences
exist are likely to be a function of specific criteria the Department of Defense used at various times in making personnel decisions. That length of prior service may be one such criterion is suggested by the difference in the age distribution of veterans entering college in 1971. Nearly three-fourths of those who had served in Southeast Asia were in the 22 to 25 year-old age group when entering college in 1971, whereas only half of those serving elsewhere were in this age group.

Veterans who had not served in Southeast Asia were likely to be somewhat more able academically than those who had, but manifested the full range of possible responses to items asking for high school grades, high school rank, self-ratings of academic ability, expected need for special tutoring or remedial work, and past activities such as reading poetry and discussing religion or politics. The nonSoutheast Asia veterans were more likely to check academic high school achievements but less likely to check achievements in sports; they were also more likely to have decided on a career.

Veterans who served in Southeast Asia were considerably more likely ( 90 percent) than those who did not ( 74 percent) to depend on their military service benefits as a major source for financing college. Although the two groups cited essentially the same general reasons for going to college, non-Southeast Asia veterans more often indicated that they chose their particular college because of the educational programs it offered. The two groups differed little in their attitudes, opinions and goals. The Southeast Asia veterans were more likely to attend colleges close to home and tended to agree more strongly with statements concerning opportunities to attend college. Generally, regardless of the item on which comparisons are made, the
differences between Southeast Asia and non-Southeast Asia veterans were small compared with those between veterans and nonveterans entering college.

## Some Unanswered Questions

The veterans included in this study were those who entered college as full-time students for the first time in 1971. Since many veterans had some college experience before entering the service, and since many ex-servicemen attend school on a part-time basis, substantial numbers of veterans entering college were not included in this study. This fact limits comparisons of statistics from this study with those from other sources: e.g., the Veterans Administration. It is likely that most of those veterans who had some college experience prior to their military service were interrupted in their education by their country's demand upon them; it is also possible that some used military service as a socially acceptable reason for dropping out or as a ready, temporary solution to financial difficulties. In any case, those with some prior college education were likely to have had different military experiences than did those who never entered college previously; consequently, they may also have different patterns of future development.

Why, despite being somewhat older than the average student, do some veterans go to college on a part-time basis? Have they acquired families or other financial responsibilities that necessitate their working at outside jobs?

Despite the low base rate for female veterans entering college, this is an especially interesting group both from the standpoint of military experience and motivations for going to college. A sufficient
sample might be obtained by pooling several cohort samples and studying those characteristics which are commonly included in the freshman survey instruments.

The veteran-status item in our survey characterizes the veteran in terms of only one factor in his service experience: whether or not he served in Southeast Asia. Other factors in their service experi-ence--branch of service, length of service, rank achieved when separated, career area, and training obtained while in the service--may well be important in differentiating veterans not only with respect to their characteristics on college entrance but also to their future development. To cite only one possible question of the many that could be explored: Do veterans pursue in college those careers in which they become interested while in military service?

The development patterns of veterans who go to college would appear to be a substantial area for empirical research in support of the national commitment to aid returning veterans. With reduced military involvement in Southeast Asia, and even disengagement a possibility, many men will be returning to this country at a time when the job market conditions may be unfavorable. Many will need advice on the best ways to use their Federal benefits. Such advice, if it is to be meaningful, must have a firm base in empirical research. In an age of accountability, veterans, nonveterans, government decisionmakers and taxpayers need information on the benefits and impacts associated with the costs of the current GI Bill.

Table 1

1971 ACE Sample and Weights Used in Computing National Norms

| Stratification Cell for Sampling | Number of Institutions Participants |  |  | Ce11 Weights Applied to Data Collected From Men ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Population | Total | Used in Norms |  |
| $\frac{\text { Public University }}{\text { Selectivity }}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Less than 550 | 72 | 20 | 7 | 8.9 |
| 2. 550-599 | 31 | 10 | 5 | 7.0 |
| 3. 600 or more | 16 | 7 | 5 | 3.1 |
| $\frac{\text { Private University }}{\text { Selectivity }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Less than 550 | 18 | 8 | 6 | 2.5 |
| 5. 550-599 | 14 | 5 | 2 | 6.9 |
| 6.600 or more | 35 | 18 | 7 | 7.2 |
| 4 -Year Public College ${ }^{\text {4 }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Selectivity: |  |  |  |  |
| 7. Less than 450 | 97 | 10 | 5 | 19.2 |
| $8 . \quad 450-499$ | 66 | 13 | 9 | 8.8 |
| $9 . \quad 500$ or more | 73 | 16 | 11 | 6.2 |
| 10. Unknown | 87 | 12 | 6 | 15.2 |
| 4-Year Private Nonsectarian |  |  |  |  |
| Selectivity: |  |  |  |  |
| 11. Less than 500 | 75 | 22 | 13 | 5.1 |
| 12. 500-574 | 38 | 11 | 8 | 3.3 |
| 13. 575-649 | 50 | 24 | 20 | 2.6 |
| 14. 650 or more | 45 | 26 | 20 | 2.2 |
| 15. Unknown | 156 | 17 | 9 | 11.2 |
| 4-Year Catholic 11.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Selectivity: |  |  |  |  |
| 16. Less than 500 | 62 | 17 | 16 | 3.9 |
| 17. 500-574 | 72 | 20 | 14 | 3.5 |
| 18. 575 or more | 39 | 16 | 12 | 1.5 |
| 19. Unknown | 45 | 5 | 4 | 19.1 |
| 4-Year Other Sectarian |  |  |  |  |
| Selectivity: |  |  |  |  |
| 20. Less than 450 | 56 | 15 | 10 | 4.6 |
| $21.450-499$ | 54 | 13 | 10 | 6.2 |
| 22. 500-574 | 73 | 26 | 22 | 3.5 |
| 23. 575 or more | 54 | 23 | 18 | 2.5 |
| 24. Unknown | 95 | 6 | 5 | 19.9 |
| 2-Year Public 19.9 |  |  |  |  |
| 25, Enrollment: |  |  |  |  |
| 25,26,27. Less than 500 | 408 | 28 | 19 | 17.0 |
| $28,29.500$ or more | 378 | 36 | 18 | 25.2 |
| 2-Year Private 20.2 |  |  |  |  |
| 30,31. $\begin{aligned} & \text { Enrollment: } \\ & \text { Less than } 250\end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 30,31. 32. | 163 | 21 | 16 | 10.3 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}32 . & 250-499 \\ 33 . & 500 \text { or more }\end{array}$ | 50 | 9 | 6 | 11.8 |
| Predominantly Black ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 34. Public 4-year | 36 | 16 | 9 | 4.6 |
| 35. Private 4-year | 49 | 12 | 9 | 6.5 |
| 36. 2-year | 17 | 2 | 2 | 8.8 |

$\mathrm{a}_{\text {Ratio }}$ between the number of 1970 first-time, full-time men enrolled in all colleges and the number of first-time, full-time men at colleges in the ACE sample.
Table 2

By Veteran Status and Type of Institution:
1971 Freshmen Men

| Norms Group | Number of <br> Institutions in the Sample ${ }^{\text {a }}$ $\qquad$ |  |  |  | Unweighted Sample Size |  |  |  | Weighted Population Estimates |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SE Asia } \\ & \text { Vets } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Non-SE } \\ \text { Asia Vets } \end{gathered}$ | A11 Vets | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Non } \\ & \text { Vets } \end{aligned}$ | SE Asia Vets | $\begin{gathered} \text { Non-SE } \\ \text { Asia Vets } \end{gathered}$ | A11 <br> Vets | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Non } \\ & \text { Vets } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | SE Asia Vets | Non-SE Asia Vet | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A11 } \\ & \text { s Vets } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Non Vets. |
| A11 Institutions | 204 | 189 | 236 | 298 | 1,406 | 1,347 | 2,753 | 89,672 | 23,528 | 20,749 | 44,277 | 845,045 |
| Two-Year Co.1leges | 54 | 53 | 56 | 58 | 687 | 548 | 1,235 | 14,665 | 16,752 | 13,595 | 30,347 | 345,564 |
| Four-Year Colleges | 124 | 112 | 152 | 208 | 474 | 579 | 1,053 | 46,279 | 4,831 | 5,384 | 10,215 | 296,717 |
| Universities | 26 | 24 | 28 | 32 | 245 | 220 | 465 | 28,728 | 1,945 | 1,770 | 3,715 | 202,764 |

[^0]Table 3
Percentages of 1971 Entering Freshmen Men By Veteran Status and Institutional Type
$\left.\left.\begin{array}{lccc}\hline \hline & & & \text { Nonveteran }\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}\text { Southeast Asia } \\ \text { Neteran }\end{array}\right) ~ \begin{array}{c}\text { Non-Southeast } \\ \text { Nsia Veteran }\end{array}\right)$

## Approximate Standard Errors of Item Response Percentages When Population Parameter is 50 Percent

|  |  | Standard Error |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Norms Group | Southeast <br> Asia Veterans | Non-Southeast <br> Asia Veterans | Al1 Veterans | Nonveterans |
| A11 Institutions | 1.33 | 1.36 | .95 | .17 |
| Two-Year Colleges | 1.91 | 2.14 | 1.42 |  |
| Four-Year Colleges | 2.30 | 2.08 | 1.54 | .41 |
| Universities |  |  |  | .23 |

## References

American Council on Education, Higher Education and National Affairs. Vol. 21, No. 30, 1972.

American Council on Education, Staff of the Office of Research. The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 1971. ACE Research Reports, Vo1. 6, No. 6. Washington: ACE, 1971.

Astin, Alexander W., and Boruch, Robert F. A 'Link' System for Assuring Confidentiality of Research Data in Longitudinal Studies. ACE Research Reports, Vo1. 5, No. 3. Washington: ACE, 1971.

Bayer, Alan E. The Black College Freshman: Characteristics and Recent Trends. ACE Research Reports, Vo1. 7, No. 3. Washington: ACE, 1972.

Bayer, Alan E., Astin, Alexander W., Boruch, Robert F., and Creager, John A. User's Manual: ACE Higher Education Data Bank. ACE Research Reports, Vo1. 4, No. 2. Washington: ACE, 1969.

Bayer, Alan E., Drew, David E., Astin, Alexander W., Boruch, Robert F., and Creager, John A. The First Year of College: A Follow-up Normative Report. ACE Research Reports, Vo1. 5, No. 1. Washington: ACE, 1970.

Breedin, Brent. Veterans in College. Research Currents, Washington: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education; George Washington University, March 1, 1972.

Creager, John A. General Purpose Sampling in the Domain of Higher Education. ACE Research Reports, Vo1. 3, No. 2. Washington: ACE, 1968.

## References (Continued)

Drew, David E. A Profile of the Jewish Freshman. ACE Research Reports, Vol. 5, No. 4. Washington; ACE, 1970.

Drew, David E. and Astin, Alexander W. "Undergraduate Aspirations:
A Test of Several Theories," The American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 77, No. 6. (May, 1972), pp. 1151-64.

Fredericksen, Norman, and Shrader, W. B. Adjustment to College--A Study
of 10,000 Veteran and Non-Veteran Students in Sixteen American
Colleges. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1952.
U.S. Office of Education. Education Directory: Higher Education 1967-70.
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington: 1970.
U.S. Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Hearings Before The

Subcommittee on Education. Edcuation Amendments of 1971, Part 5.
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington: 1971.

1971 National Norms
Weighted National Norms By Veteran Status:
Freshmen Men
SWYON TVNOII甘N OヨIH9İM
WEIGHTED NATIONAL NORMS

FRESHMEN MEN: FALL, 1971


  



$$
\begin{aligned}
& 000 \infty 00 \infty \\
& n 000 \infty \\
& 000 \\
& 0
\end{aligned}
$$

AJOR SOURCES OF FINANCIAL
UPPORT FOR COLLEGE (I)
PART-TIME OR SUMMER WORK
SAVINGS FROM FULL TIME EMPLOY
PARENTAL OR FAMILY AID OR GIFTS
PARENT'S MILITARY SERVICE
PERSONAL MILITARY SERVICE
SCHOLARSHIPS AND GRANTS
LOANS-NDEA/GOV'T INSURED/COLLEGE
OTHER REPAYARLE LOANS
OTHER REPAYARLE LOANS

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { PROBARLE MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY(2) } \\
& \text { AGRICULTURE (INCL FORESTRY) }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { AGRICULTURE (INCL FORESTRY) } \\
& \text { BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES } \\
& \text { BUSINESS }
\end{aligned}
$$

ENGLISH
HEALTH PRUFESSIONS (NON-M.D.)
HISTORY POLITICAL SCIENCE
HEALTH PRUFESSIONS (NON-M.D
HISTORY, POLITICAL SCIENCE
HUMANITIES (OTHER)
HUMANITIES (OTHER)
FINE ARTS
MATHEMATICS OR STATISTICS
PHYSICAL SCIENCES
SOCIAL SCIENCES
OTHER FIELDS (TECHNICAL)
OTHER FIELDS (NONTECHNICAL)
BUSINESS
EDUCATION
ENGINEFRING
PROBABLE CAREER OCCUPATION (2)
ART IST (INCL PERFORMER)
BUSINESSMAN
CLERGYMAN
COLLEGE TEACHER
DOCTOR (M.D. OR D.D.S.)
DUCTOR (M.D. OR D.D.S.)
EDUCATOR (SECONDARY)
ELEMENTARY TEACHER
FARMER OR FORESTER
HEALTH PROFESSIONAL
RESEARCH SCIENTIST
OTHER
UNDECIDED

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 35.1 \\
& 11 \\
& 51.3 \\
& 51
\end{aligned}
$$

WEIGHTED NATIONAL NORMS
by veteran status and type of institution
FRESHMEN MEN: FALL, 1971
SWYON TVNOIIVN GヨLHSIBM
 (*)
**) THIS ITEM IS REPORTEN FOR
THIS TTEM IS REPORTED FOR THE FIRST TIME IN 1971 . ITEMS NOT INDTCATED WITH I **' ARE REPEATED OR MODI-
FIE OUESTIONS FROM ONE OR MORE OF THE EARLIER SURVEYS.
1)
SINCE IT IS POSSIBLE THAT SOME STUDENTS MAY HAVE CHECKED MORE THAN ONE RESPONSE CATEGORY FOR THIS ITEM,
THE PERCENTAGES MAY SUM TO MORE THAN IOO.
SINCE IT IS POSSIBLE THAT SOME STUDENTS MAY HAVE CHECKED MORE THAN ONE RESPONSE CATEGORY FOR THIS ITEM,
THE PERCENTAGES MAY SUM TO MORE THAN IOO.
(2)
3) RECATEGORIZATION OF THIS ITEM FROM A IONGER LIST IS SHOWN IN APPENDIX C OF THE I97I NAT'L NDRMS REPORT,

| ITEM | ALL INSTITUTIONS |  | TWO-YEAR COLLEGES |  | FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES |  | UNIVERSITIES |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SE ASIA VETERANS | NON-SE ASIA VETERANS | SE ASIA VETERANS | NON-SE ASIA VETERANS | SE ASIA VETERANS | NON-SE ASIA VETERANS | SE ASIA VETERANS | NON-SE ASIA VETERANS |
| AGE BY DECEMBER 31, 1971 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 OR YOUNGER | . 0 | . 0 | . 0 | . 0 | . 0 | . 0 | - 0 | . 0 |
| 17 | . 0 | . 0 | . 0 | . 0 | .0 | . 0 | . 0 | . 0 |
| 18 | . 3 | 1.9 | . 2 | 1.0 | .2 | 4.8 | 1.0 | . 2 |
| 19 | - 5 | 8.4 | .4 | 5.5 | .4 | 17.2 | 1.5 | 4.1 |
| 20 | 3.2 | 6.5 | 3.2 | 6.2 | 2.4 | 6.9 | 5.6 | 8.0 |
| 21 | 10.4 | 8.0 | 10.1 | 8.0 | 9.3 | 6.5 | 15.1 | 12.5 |
| 22-25 | 72.9 | 50.6 | 73.2 | 53.8 | 72.0 | 42.1 | 72.1 | 52.3 |
| 26 OR OLDER | 12.8 | 24.4 | 12.9 | 25.4 | 15.8 | 22.5 | 4.6 | 22.9 |
| FATHER'S EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GRAMMAR SCHOOL OR LESS | 22.1 | 20.8 | 23.6 | 20.9 | 20.0 | 19.4 | 14.1 | 24.1 |
| SOME HIGH SCHONL | 23.6 | 24.5 | 22.9 | 26.8 | 26.8 | 20.2 | 22.1 | 19.3 |
| HIGH SCHOOL. GRADUATE | 32.9 | 31.6 | 33.5 | 31.5 | 28.6 | 32.9 | 38.9 | 28.8 |
| SOME COLLEGE | 10.7 | 11.9 | 10.2 | 12.1 | 12.0 | 11.6 | 11.2 | 10.9 |
| COLLEGE DEGREE | 8.0 | 8.0 | 7.4 | 6.9 | 9.6 | 9.5 | 9.3 | 11.4 |
| postgramuate degree | 2.7 | 3.3 | 2.4 | 1.8 | 2.9 | 6.3 | 4.4 | 5.4 |
| MOTHER'S EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GRAMMAR SCHOOL OR LESS | 11.7 | 13.4 | 11.7 | 14.6 | 12.4 | 11.2 | 9.6 | 10.5 |
| SOME. HIGH SCHOOL | 22.3 | 21.8 | 21.4 | 22.1 | 26.7 | 22.3 | 18.8 | 18.7 |
| HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE | 48.5 | 45.8 | 51.0 | 46.7 | 39.7 | 43.2 | 49.1 | 46.7 |
| Sume college | 12.0 | 9.9 | 10.8 | 8.9 | 15.3 | 11.1 | 13.2 | 14.1 |
| COLLEGE DEGREE | 4.2 | 8.4 | 3.4 | 7.8 | 5.1 | 9.8 | 8.9 | 8.6 |
| Pustgraduate degree | 1.3 | .7 | 1.6 | . 0 | . 8 | 2.3 | . 4 | 1.4 |
| RACIAL BACKGROUNT (1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WHITE/CAUCASIAN | 88.5 | 89.7 | 89.6 | 90.7 | 82.7 | 86.5 | 93.5 | 90.9 |
| BLACK/NEGRO/AFRO-AMERICAN | 7.9 | 8.0 | 6.2 | 6.9 | 14.8 | 11.4 | 5.6 | 6.8 |
| AMERICAN INDIAN | - 9 | 1.7 | - 9 | 2.3 | 1.2 | . 7 | . 2 | . 5 |
| ORIENTAL | 0.4 | . 3 | .4 | . 2 | . 3 | .5 | . 6 | . 0 |
| MEXICAN-AMERICAN/CHICANO | 2.1 | 1.5 | 2.7 | 2.1 | . 5 | . 3 | . 8 | . 5 |
| PUERTO RICAN-AMERICAN | . 2 | . 7 | . 2 | . 6 | . 5 | 1.0 | . 2 | . 0 |
| OTHER | . 9 | .7 | . 8 | . 6 | 1.3 | . 7 | . 5 | 1.8 |
| ESTIMATED PARENTAL INCOME |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LESS THAN \$4,000 | 10.8 | 9.8 | 10.6 | 10.7 | 12.1 | 7.4 | 9.2 | 10.1 |
| \$4,000 - \$5,999 | 11.7 | 12.2 | 11.8 | 11.6 | 12.3 | 14.8 | 9.0 | 9.2 |
| \$6,000 - \$7,999 | 15.8 | 17.0 | 15.3 | 18.0 | 17.8 | 15.3 | 15.5 | 13.8 |
| $\$ 8,000$ $\$ 10,000-\$ 9,999$ | 15.8 19.7 | 15.2 | 15.9 | 15.6 | 15.3 | 14.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 |
| $\$ 10,000-\$ 12,499$ $\$ 12,500-\$ 14,999$ | 19.7 11.8 | 17.1 | 20.6 11.5 | 18.1 | 17.4 | 13.5 | 17.9 | 20.6 |
| $\$ 12,500-\$ 14,999$ $\$ 15,000-\$ 19,999$ | 11.8 9.4 | 11.2 9.1 | 11.5 10.0 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 11.6 | 15.8 | 11.1 |
| \$20,000 - \$24,999 | 3.3 | 9.17 | 3.1 | 8.2 | 7.4 | 10.9 | 8.9 | 10.5 |
| \$25,000 - \$29,999 | . 5 | . 9 | . 4 | . 5 | . 4 | 2.4 | 4.9 1.4 | . 2 |
| \$30,000 - \$34,990 | . 3 | . 9 | . 2 | . 8 | 1.0 | 1.0 | . 2 | . 8 |
| \$35,000-\$39,999 | -1 | . 3 | . 0 | . 3 | . 6 | . 4 | . 0 | . 7 |
| \$40,000 OR MORE | . 8 | 1.5 | . 5 | 1.6 | 1.2 | 1.6 | 1.3 | . 6 |

WEIGHTED NATIONAL NORMS
RAN STATUS AND TYPE OF INSTITUTION
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| ITEM | $\begin{gathered} \text { ALL } \\ \text { INSTITUTIONS } \end{gathered}$ |  | TWO－YEAR COLLEGES |  | Four－year colleges |  | UNIVERSITIES |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SE ASIA vETERANS | veterans <br> $\underset{\text { VETESEAS ASIA }}{\text { NOT }}$ | SE ASIA VETERANS | veterans <br> NON－SE ASIA | SEASIA VETERANS | NON－SE ASIA | $\underset{\substack{\text { SE ASIA } \\ \text { veterans }}}{\text { det }}$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { NON．SE ASIA } \\ \text { VETERANS }}}{ }$ |
| average grade in high school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A OR A＋ | － 2 | ． 7 | ． 0 | － 6 | ． 4 | 1.0 | 1.7 | .7 |
| A－ | ． 5 | 2.0 | ． 4 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 4.0 | ． 0 | 1.2 |
| B＋ | 4.2 | 5.2 | 3.2 | 3.6 | 6.5 | 8.7 | 6.8 | 7.0 |
| 8 | 13.2 | 14.2 | 11.8 | 12.6 | 16.6 | 18.8 | 17.0 | 12.3 |
| 8 － | 14.2 | 16.9 | 15.0 | 15.9 | 11.1 | 19.6 | 14.6 | 15.7 |
| ${ }_{\text {c }}^{\text {c }}$ | 27.3 | 24.5 | 27.4 | 25.7 | 28.2 | 20.8 | 24.4 | 26.6 |
| C | 36.5 3.9 | 32.7 | 37.3 | 35.9 4.4 | 34.7 | 24.4 | 34.2 | 33.6 |
| D | 3.9 | 3.8 | 4.9 | 4.4 | 1.3 | 2.7 | 1.4 | 2.8 |
| RANK IN HIGH SCHOOL CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOP QUARTER | 6.7 | 11.1 | 3.9 | 5.8 | 12.6 | 22.6 | 15.9 | 15.4 |
| SECOND QUARTER THIRD QUARTER | 24.1 50.0 | 25.6 | 20.6 | 22.2 | 32.4 | 31.9 | 34.2 | 31.7 |
| FOURTH GUARTER | 50.0 19.3 | 45.6 17.8 | 54.5 21.0 | 49.8 22.2 | 40.0 15.0 | 36.3 9.2 | 35.0 15.0 | 42.4 10.5 |
| SECONDARY SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PRESIDENT STUDENT ORGANIZATION | 9.4 | 10.0 | 8.1 | 8.3 | 13.7 | 15.2 | 9.8 | 7.9 |
| High rating state music contest | 4.5 | 4.6 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 7.7 | 7.1 | 3.9 | 3.7 |
| STATE／REGIONAL SPEECH CONTEST | 2.3 | 3.4 | ？． 0 | 2.8 | 3.9 | 4.2 | 1.2 | 5.4 |
| MAJOR PART IN A PLAY | 10.5 | 12.9 | 8.7 | 12.1 | 16.7 | 14.6 | 11.2 | 13.7 |
| VARSITY LETTER（SPORTS） | 36.9 | 33.3 | 35.5 | 27.6 | 39.9 | 46.4 | 41.1 | 37.1 |
| AWARD IN ART COMPETITION | 5.7 | 5.7 | 7.2 | 6.1 | 1.7 | 5.2 | 3.6 | 4.1 |
| EDITOR OF SCHOOL PAPER | 2.7 | 3.6 | 2.0 | 3.3 | 5.2 | 4.0 | 3.2 | 5.0 |
| ORIGINAL WRITING PUBLISHED | 4.4 | 5.8 | 3.8 | 5.9 | 4.7 | 6.3 | 8.4 | 3.4 |
| NSF SUMMER PROGRAM STATE／REGIONAL SCIENCE PROGRAM | ． 5 | .6 | ． 7 |  | ． 0 | ． 6 | ． 0 | .3 |
| STATE／REGIONAL SCIENCE PROGRAM SCAMLASTIC HONOR SOCIETY | 1.0 | ． 9 | 1.0 | ． 7 | ． 6 | 1.4 | 1.3 | ． 5 |
| SCHOLASTIC HONOR SOCIETY NATIONAL MERIT RECOGNITION | 1.9 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 3.7 | 8.5 | 5.3 | 6.0 |
| NATIONAL MERIT RECOGNITION | 1.9 | 2.1 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 2.4 | 3.6 | 1.4 | 1.8 |
| YEAR FINISH SECONDARY SCHODL＊＊ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GRADUATED IN 1971 Dİ NOT GRADUATE IN 1971 | 1.4 | 4.0 | 1.3 | 3.7 | 1.3 |  | 1.8 | 1.6 |
| din not graduate in 1971 | 98.6 | 96.0 | 98.7 | 96.3 | 98.7 | 94.6 | 98.2 | 98.4 |
| highest degree planned |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NONE ASSOCIATE（OR EOUIVALENT） | 5.6 | 8.6 | 6.5 | 10.3 | 3.1 | 5.5 | 3.5 | 5.5 |
| ASSOCIATE（OR EOUIVALENT） BACHELORIS（B．A．，B．S．） | 16.8 | 15.8 | 22.5 | 23.2 | 2.1 | 1.8 | 4.5 | 1.6 |
|  | 38.8 | 34.0 | 36.5 | 35.2 | 44.1 | 30.7 | 45.8 | 34.6 |
| MASTER＇S（M．A．，M．S．） | 22.9 | 22.8 | $20 . ?$ | 15.8 | 31.0 | 35.9 | 26.3 | 36.3 |
|  | 2.9 | 8.3 2.3 | 4.8 2.7 | 5.3 1.6 | 9.0 3.0 | 14.5 3.4 | 10.0 5.0 | 12.8 |
| LL．B．OR J．D．（LAW） | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 5.0 | 4.7 | 3.5 | 2.7 |
| B．D．（DIVINITY） | ． 3 | ． 7 | ． 1 | ． 3 | 1.0 | 2.1 | ． 0 | ． 0 |
| OTHER | 3.7 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 6.0 | 1.6 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 2.0 |
| Concern about financing college |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NO CONCERN | 44.2 | 41.0 | 46.6 | 42.3 | 39.5 |  | 35.6 |  |
| SOME CONCERN | 47.4 | 51.5 | 44.9 | 51.1 | 52.9 | 51.3 | 55.7 | 55.3 |
| Major Concern | 8.3 | 7.5 | 8.5 | 6.6 | 7.7 | 9.6 | 8.7 | 8.9 |

RESHMEN MEN: FALL, 1971


| ITEM | institutions |  | two-year colleges |  | Four-year colleges |  | UNIVERSITIES |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\underbrace{\text { SETERANS }}_{\text {SE ASIA }}$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { NoN.SE ASIA } \\ \text { veterans }}}{ }$ |  | $\underset{\text { chen }}{\substack{\text { NoN.SE ASIA } \\ \text { viterans }}}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {cte }}^{\text {SEASEAA }}$ |  |
| reasins noted as very important |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In deciding to go to college ** | 6.5 | 7.5 | 5.2 | 6.0 | 11.4 | 11.9 | 5.3 | 5.1 |
| Contribute more to my community | 17.6 | 19.0 | 16.2 | 18.3 | 23.6 | 19.2 | 15.6 | 23.8 |
| get a hetter job | 77.2 | 75.8 | 79.2 | ${ }^{6} 0.2$ | 74.2 | 70.0 | 67.9 | 59.4 |
| gain a general education | 58.9 | 57.9 | 57.9 | 55.8 | 62.6 | 59.6 | 57.7 | 68.8 |
| IMPROVE READING/STUDY SKILLS | 35.8 | ${ }^{33.8}$ | 36.9 3.5 | 35.1 | 36.8 | 29.4 | 23.9 | 29.6 |
| NOTHING RETTER TO Do | 3.2 29.8 | 1.5 31.8 | 3.5 29.7 | 1.3 32.0 | 3.1 36. | 1.9 31.4 | 1.8 20.3 | 1.2 26.8 |
| BECOME MORE CULTURED | 29.8 58.2 | 54.8 | 61.3 | 58.7 | 51.2 | 48.6 | 48.6 | 43.1 |
| LEARN MORE ABOUT MY INTERESTS | 60.1 | 68.7 | 58.8 | 71.0 | 67.0 | 62.0 | 65.2 | 71.7 |
| meet new/interesting people | 28.4 | 30.5 | 29.1 | 31.1 | 27.0 | 27.9 | 25.3 | 33.9 |
| Prepare for grad or prof school | 35.9 | 37.7 | 36.2 | 36.9 | 35.1 | 41.0 | 35.3 | 33.7 |
| reasons noted as very important in sflecting this college |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COLLEGE HAS A GOOD REPUTATION | 27.5 | 2.5 30.7 | 26.4 | 25.9 | 28.7 | 41.7 | ${ }^{33} 8$ | 32.8 |
| most friends going to this col | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 3.9 | 2.5 | 4.5 | 3.3 |
| Low tuition | 20.9 | 23.9 | 24.4 | 26.6 | 11.0 | 18.7 | 15.0 | 19.4 |
| AdVICE OF STMEONE WHD ATTENDED | 13.2 | ${ }^{15.8}$ | 12.8 34.8 | ${ }^{16.3}$ | 15.4 | 15.2 35.1 | ${ }^{10.3}$ | 13.3 |
| SPECIAL. EDUC PROGRAM OFFERED | 31.7 | 38.2 | 34.0 | 39.1 4.0 | 23.4 2.1 | 35.1 1.2 | 33.4 | 40.5 |
| NOT ACCEPTE ANYWHERE ELSE ADVICE OF GIITANCE COUNSELOR | 2.5 5.8 | 2.9 5.5 | 2.5 6.6 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 1.2 3.6 | 3.4 3.4 | ${ }^{3} \cdot 0$ |
| wante] to live at home | 21.9 | 21.3 | 24.0 | 24.5 | 19.3 | 14.1 | 9.4 | 19.9 |
| need for special help in (1) ** ENGLISH | 32.4 | 26.0 | 32.0 | 26.3 | 34.3 | 25.8 | 30.6 | 24.6 |
| READING | 14.4 | 13.7 | 15.2 | 14.0 | 12.4 | 12.8 | 12.6 | 24.6 14.2 |
| mathematics | 46.7 | 44.5 | 45.6 | 46.2 | 48.5 | 40.2 | 51.7 | 44.5 |
| SOCIAL Studies | ${ }_{1}^{4.2}$ | 3.6 15 | 13.6 | 3.9 15.9 | 3.3 12.5 | 3.3 | 3.1 16.8 | 2.6 |
| SCifnce | 13.7 24.2 | 15.5 23.0 | 13.7 22.2 | 20.1 | 12.5 28.2 | 16.0 30.3 | 16.8 31.3 | 11.1 22.4 |
| agree strongly or somewhat |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| govit not controlling pollution | 87.4 | 87.8 | 86.9 | 86.7 | 88.0 | 90.0 | 90.1 | 89.4 |
| gov't not protegting consumer | 75.8 | 78.3 | 75.9 | 79.3 | 74.3 | 76.0 | 77.9 | 77.1 |
| gov't not desegregating quickly | 47.7 | 48.2 55.3 | 47.7 55.4 | 49.9 50.5 | 48.6 | 45.4 55.0 | 49.6 51.4 | 43.6 |
| TOO MANY RIGHTS FOR CRIMINALS | 55.7 48.2 | 47.6 | $47^{\circ} \mathrm{B}$ | 47.2 | 51.4 | 46.2 | 47.8 | 54.8 |
| women's activities best in home | 48.1 | 49.2 | 49.8 | 52.4 | 44.3 | 46.8 | 43.1 | 31.2 |
| harely communicate with parents | 18.6 | 19.0 | 19.2 | 19.8 | 19.1 | 16.8 | 12.4 | 19.9 |
| should legalize marijuana | 45.7 | 44.9 | 44.9 | 44.7 | 45.7 | 43.1 | 53.1 | 52.4 |
| shmuld discourage large families | 70.0 | 71.1 | 70.0 | 12.1 | 69.2 | 68.3 | 71.9 | 72.3 |
| WOMEN SHOULD GET Job equality | 84.7 | 88.2 | 84.2 | 86.8 | 83.9 | 88.8 | 90.7 | 96.6 |
| ALL Should get col opportunity | 79.5 | 74.5 | 81.6 | 78.7 | 74.0 | 64.0 | 74.5 | 74.4 |
| can do little to change society | 42.3 | 42.5 | 43.8 | 43.6 | 39.7 | 38.3 | 34.9 | 47.3 |


| ITEM | ALLinstitutions |  | two-year colleges |  | FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES |  | UNIVERSITIES |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SE ASIA } \\ & \text { VETERANS } \end{aligned}$ | $\xrightarrow{\text { NON-SE ASIA }}$ VETERANS | SE ASIA vETERAN | $\underset{\substack{\text { NON.SE ASIA } \\ \text { VETERANS }}}{ }$ | SE ASIA vETERANS | NON-SE ASIA VETERANS | SE ASIA vETERANS | NON-SE ASIA VETERANS |
| AGREE STRONGLY OR SOMEWHAT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Col regulate students dff campus | 18.2 | 18.4 | 17.4 | 17.4 | 22.4 | 22.4 | 14.1 | 14.3 |
| BENEFIT OF COLIEGE IS MONETARY | 65.0 | 66.9 | 67.1 | 70.8 | 60.5 | 58.5 | 58.1 | 62.5 |
| Students hel.p evaluate faculty | 70.2 | 66.7 | 70.1 | 66.9 | 70.4 | 65.0 | 70.3 | 70.6 |
| ABDLISH COLLEGE GRADES | 27.2 | 28.6 | 27.0 | 27.7 | 28.9 | 31.5 | 24.0 | 27.0 |
| DE-EMPHASIZE ORGANIZED SPORTS | 23,6 | 29.9 | 23.8 | 32.2 | 23.7 | 24.6 | 20.9 | 28.1 |
| REGULATE STUDENT PUBLICATIONS | 42.1 | 41.7 | 42.8 | 44.7 | 41.5 | 38.8 | 37.8 | 27.5 |
| COLLEGE HAS RIGHT TO BAN SPEAKER | 37.4 | 39.8 | 38.1 | 40.4 | 36.2 | 40.7 | 34.6 | 32.4 |
| Give disadvantaged pref trtmnt | 43.7 | 39.0 | 44.5 | 39.6 | $45 . ?$ | 36.2 | 33.7 | 43.0 |
| CoL too lax on student protest | 57.6 | 58.8 | 59.2 | 61.8 | 53.5 | 56.2 | 54.4 | 43.0 |
| ADOPT OPEN ADMISSIONS AT PUB COL | 50.1 | 45.1 | 53.7 | 46.8 | 41.7 | 42.0 | 39.6 | 41.5 |
| USE SAME degref standard for all | 81.2 | 81.6 | 81.5 | 80.7 | 80.5 | 83.1 | 80.0 | 83.5 |
| CURRENT POLITICAL PREFERENCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FAR LEFT | 3.9 | 2.9 | 4.1 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 4.6 | 4.5 |
| LIBERAL | 34.8 | 34.5 | 33.7 | 33.7 | 38.1 | 33.4 | 35.9 | 43.6 |
| MIDRLE-OF-THE-ROAD | 41.4 | 39.6 | 43.6 | 40.4 | 34.1 | 40.3 | 41.2 | 31.2 |
| conservative | 18.3 | 22.1 | 16.8 | 22.2 | 23.9 | 22.6 | 17.1 | 20.0 |
| FAR RIGHT | 1.6 | - 9 | 1.8 | 1.2 | . 8 | . 4 | 1.1 | . 7 |
| OBJECTIVES CONSIDERED TO BE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ESSENTIAL OR VERY IMPORTANT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AGHIEVE IN A PERFORMING ART | 7.1 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.8 | 9.7 | 8.8 | 6.0 | 4.3 |
| BE AN AUTHORITY IN MY FIELD | 65.6 | 66.4 | 64.5 | 65.7 | 68.8 | 70.2 | 67.2 | 60.6 |
| OBTAIN RECOGNITION FROM PEERS | 40.2 | 40.0 | 39.3 | 37.9 | 43.7 | 43.9 | 39.4 | 43.7 |
| INFLUENCF PDLITICAL Structure | 17.2 | 14.1 | 16.5 | 12.6 | 19.3 | 17.2 | 16.6 | 17.0 |
| Influence sicial values | 27.1 | 29.6 | 25.8 | 26.9 | 31.6 | 35.8 | 26.8 | 31.9 |
| RAISE A FAMILY | $61 . ?$ | 64.4 | 61.1 | 64.7 | 61.8 | 65.3 | 60.0 | 59.9 |
| HAVE ACTIVE SOCIAL LIFE | 47.7 | 43.3 | 47.5 | 41.6 | 48.2 | 46.4 | 48.2 | 46.6 |
| HAVF FRIENDS DIFFERENT FROM ME | 48.1 | 49.0 | 48.3 | 47.3 | 46.0 | 52.4 | 52.3 | 51.9 |
| BE AN EXPERT IN FINANCE | 19.0 | 18.3 | 18.3 | 20.1 | 21.8 | 16.4 | 18.5 | 10.8 |
| BE ADMINISTRATIVELY RESPONSIBLE | 24.5 | 30.5 | 23.5 | 30.9 | 27.6 | 32.5 | 25.4 | 21.5 |
| RE VERY WELL-OFF FINANCIALLY | $41 . ?$ | 40.9 | 42.4 | 42.2 | 38.5 | 38.8 | 37.7 | 37.2 |
| HELP OTHERS IN DIFFICULTY | 53.7 | 57.1 | 54.1 | 56.1 | 54.5 | 60.4 | 48.4 | 54.7 |
| PARTICIPATE IN PEACE CORPSIVISTA | 8.9 | 8.1 | 8.9 | 7.8 | 9.3 | 8.8 | 7.9 | 7.8 |
| BECCMME A COMMUNITY LEADER | 13.9 | 15.7 | 11.2 | 13.7 | 21.5 | 21.9 | 17.8 | 11.9 |
| CONTRIBUTE TO SCIENTIFIC theory | 9.4 | 9.3 | 9.5 | 8.8 | 8.4 | 9.6 | 11.1 | 12.2 |
| WRITE ORIGINAL WORKS | 10.5 | 9.7 | 10.9 | 9.7 | 9.9 | 10.0 | 8.0 | 8.6 |
| NEVER BE OBLIGATED TO PEOPLE | 28.3 | 27.2 9.9 | 28.7 | 28.6 | $26 . ?$ | 25.7 | 29.9 | 20.1 |
| CREATE WDRKS OF ART KEEP UP WITH POLITICAL AFFAIRS | 10.1 43.9 | 9.9 42.2 | 10.3 42.5 | 9.6 40.9 | 8.9 48.4 | 9.2 4.1 | 11.7 44.3 | 13.8 42.9 |
| SUCCEET IN MY OWN BUSINESS | 47.4 | 48.4 | 42.5 | 51.2 | 48.1 | 44.0 | 42.8 | 40.1 |
| HELP CLEAN UP FNVIRONMENT | 43.5 | 44.0 | 42.4 | 42.1 | 46.7 | 47.3 | 45.3 | 49.1 |
| DEVEL.OP A PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE | 63.6 | 66.8 | 62.4 | 65.4 | 66.2 | 68.2 | 67.5 | 73.8 |
| PARTICIPATE IN COMMUNITY ACTION | 23.5 | 23.5 | 22.7 | 22.4 | 26.5 | 27.9 | 23.4 | 18.6 |
| Marry within next 5 YEaRS | 19.5 | 19.8 | 18.9 | 19.7 | 20.9 | 21.1 | 21.6 | 17.0 |








| ITEM | $\begin{gathered} \text { ALL } \\ \text { INSTITUTIONS } \end{gathered}$ |  | two-year colleges |  | FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES |  | UNIVERSITIES |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SE ASIA } \\ & \text { VETERANS } \end{aligned}$ | NON-SE ASIA vETERANS | SE ASIA VETERANS | NON-SE ASIA VETERANS | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { SE ASIA } \\ \text { VETERANS } \end{gathered}$ | NON-SE ASIA VETERANS | SE ASIA VETERANS | NON-SE ASIA VETERANS |
| Activities engaged in by |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| STUDENTS DURING THE PAST YEAR VOTED IN STUNENT ELECTION (3) | 22.3 | 23.1 | 20.4 | 21.7 | 27.6 | 25.7 | 23.8 | 25.2 |
| CAME LATE TO CLASS | 29.7 | 32.3 | 28.9 | 32.0 | 32.6 | 36.4 | 28.9 | 21.4 |
| PLAYED a musical instrument | 19.5 | 18.3 | 20.0 | 18.4 | 19.0 | 17.6 | 16.8 | 19.8 |
| Studied in the library (3) | 15.3 | 16.5 | 13.0 | 15.8 | 22.9 | 19.2 | 14.9 | 12.7 |
| ChECKED OUT A LIRRARY B00k (3) | 20.8 | 20.2 | 20.0 | 17.9 | 23.0 | 26.4 | 22.6 | 17.0 |
| ARRANGED DATE FIP STUDENT | 30.0 | 29.4 | 28.6 | 27.2 | 32.3 | 34.4 | 35.8 | 29.6 |
| OVERSLEPT ANO MisSed a class | 18.2 | 22.0 | 15.4 | 22.2 | 25.2 | 23.9 | 22.7 | 16.5 |
| READ ABOUT RIGHTS/RESPONSIBILITY | 41.0 | 42.4 | 37.9 | 38.6 | 5 5 .5 | 49.8 | 42.8 | 7.5 |
| TYPED A HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENT (3) | 9.1 | 9.8 | 8.4 | 9.3 | 17.8 | 20.7 | 22.8 | 16.4 |
| DISCUSSED FUTURE WITH PARENTS(3) | 19.1 | 43.3 | 41.3 | 41.1 | 46.5 | 48.7 | 45.5 | 41.9 |
| AKGUED WITH A TEACHER IN CLASS | 27.6 | 29.6 | 25.5 | 25.5 | 31.6 | 36.9 | 34.6 | 36.3 |
| attended a religious service | 62.5 | 65.4 | 61.1 | 52.5 | 68.0 | 72.1 | 50.3 | 65.6 |
| DEMONSTRATED FIR RACIAL CHANGE | 11.3 | 11.7 | 10.2 | 10.5 | 14.9 | 12.6 12.7 | 10.9 | 24.3 |
| DEMONSTRATEN FOR MILITARY CHANGE | 8.0 | 10.7 | 16.5 7.7 | 11.2 | 8.6 | 9.9 | 8.9 | 10.2 |
| dit extra reaning for course (3) | 6.8 | 9.4 | 6.7 | 9.5 | 6.4 | 9.6 | 9.0 | 8.6 |
| TOOK SLEEPING PILLS | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.1 | 4.9 | 4.3 | 2.4 | 5.3 | 5.0 |
| TUTORED ANOTHER STUDENT | 18.4 | 21.3 | 16.4 40.3 | 17.0 | 23.0 | 30.8 | 23.1 | 22.4 |
| PLAYED CHESS READ POETRY NOT REQUIRED | 32.8 | 13.2 41.1 | 40.3 32.5 | 39.6 | 42.1 | 47.6 | 40.8 | 46.5 |
| took a tranoullizing pill | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.5 | 7.5 | 5.9 | 3.8 | 7.5 | 6.3 |
| discussed religion (3) | 11.4 | 16.1 | 10.6 | 15.2 | 14.7 | 18.7 | 9.8 | 14.5 |
| TOOK VITAMINS | 46.2 | 44.3 | 46.9 | 43.7 | 44.8 | 45.1 | 43.6 | 45.4 |
| VISITEN ART GAILERY OR MUSEUM | 51.9 | 54.1 | 49.9 8.8 | 51.5 | 57.4 20.4 | 58.2 18.3 | 54.9 | 60.8 |
| PARTICIPATED IN H.S. POL. CMPG. PARTICIPATED IN DTHER POL. CMPG. | 1.8 5.4 | 14.7 | 8.8 3.6 | 12.0 7.4 | 9.8 | 18.3 6.7 | 8.9 | 13.3 |
| MISSED SCHOOL DUE TO ILLNESS (3) | 8 | 1.2 | , | 1.3 | 3 | 1.3 | . 6 | . 2 |
| Smaked cigarettes (3) | 34.2 | 30.6 | 34.0 | 33.4 | 36.5 | 23.6 | 29.6 | 32.3 |
| DISCUSSED POLITICS (3) | 15.6 | 20.2 | 13.4 | 18.8 | 22.0 | 21.0 | 17.8 | 28.1 |
| drank beer | 74.5 | 73.0 | 74.4 | 70.5 | 73.7 | 75.1 | 77.5 | 85.3 |
| DISCUSSED SPORTS (3) | 34.4 | 35.3 | 33.4 | 31.4 | 37.0 | 42.0 | 36.2 | 42.8 |
| READ ABOUT CIVIL RIGHTS | 67.7 | 70.4 | 64.4 | 65.6 | 17.0 | 77.4 | 71.1 | 83. |
| ASKED TEACHER FOR ADVICE (3) HAD VOCATIONAL GOUNSELING | 39.4 | 10.9 | 8.0 38.3 | 10.2 38.2 | 41.4 | 40.2 | 40.6 | 32.0 |
| Stayed up all night | 57.3 | 59.2 | 55.1 | 56.7 | 63.2 | 65.4 | 59.8 | 57.2 |

Appendix A
1971 Student Information Form


DIRECTIONS: Your responses will be read by an optical mark reader. Your careful observance of these few simple rules will be most appreciated :

Use only black lead pencil (No. $21 / 2$ or less).
Make heavy black marks that fill the circle.
Erase cleanly any answer you wish to change.
Make no stray markings of any kind.
Yes No
EXAMPLE: Will marks made with ball pen or fountain pen be properly read?

1. Your Sex:

Male ....
Female.
2. Are you presently married? Yes..O
3. How old will you be on December 31 of this year? (Mark one)

4. What was your average grade in secondary school? (Mark one)

5. Where did you rank academically in your high school graduating class? (Mark one)
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Top Quarter } \bigcirc & \text { 3rd Quarter } \bigcirc \\ \text { 2nd Quarter } \bigcirc & \text { 4th Quarter } \bigcirc\end{array}$
6. Did you graduate from secondary school in the class of 1971?

7. Are you a veteran? (Mark one)

10. What is the highest academic degree that you intend to
obtain? (Mark one)
None
Associate (A.A. or equivalent) .
Bachelor's degree (B.A.,B.S.,etc.)
Master's degree (M.A.,M.S.,etc.)
Ph.D. or Ed.D. $\qquad$
M.D.,D.O.,D.D.S., or D.V.M.

LL.B. or J.D. (Law)
B.D. (Divinity)
$\qquad$

Other
11. How many miles is this college from your home? (Mark one) 5 or less $6-10$ 11-50. 51-100 .....

101-500
More than 500
12. What is the highest level of formal education obtained by your parents? (Mark one in each column)

Father Mother

13. Do you have any concern about your ability to finance your college education?

None (I am confident that I will have sufficient funds)
(Mark one)

Some concern (but I will
one) probably have enough funds)
Major concern (not sure I will be able to complete college)
14. For each item indicate if it is a source for financing your education. (Mark one in each row)
Part-time or summer work
Savings from full-time employment
Parental or family aid or gifts

15. What is your best estimate of the total income last year of your parental family (not your own family if you are married)? Consider annual income from all sources before taxes. (Mark one) Less than $\$ 4,000$. \$4,000-\$5,999 \$6,000-\$7,999 \$8,000-\$9,999 \$10,000-\$12,499 . . \$12,500-\$14,999
 \$15,000-\$19,999 . . . \$20,000-\$24,999 ... \$25,000-\$29,999 \$30,000-\$34,999 \$35,000-\$39,999 $\$ 40,000$ or more
16. Are you: (Mark all that apply.) White/Caucasian
Black/Negro/Afro-American
American Indian
Oriental
Mexican-American/Chicano
Puerto Rican-American
Other
17. Mark one in each column:
Protestant
Roman Catholic.
Jewish
Other
None

18. In deciding to go to college, how important to you was each of the following reasons? (Mark one answer for each reason)

My parents wanted me to go


To be able to contribute more to my community (1)(3) (1)

To be able to get a better job (1)() (1)

To gain a general education and appreciation of ideas (1)(1)

To improve my reading and study skills . . . (V) (S) There was nothing better to do .......... (v)(S) (1) To make me a more cultured person .......(v)(S) (1) To be able to make more money (1)(5) (1) To learn more about things that interest me (V) (S) (N) To meet new and interesting people (ㄷ) (1) To prepare myself for graduate or professional school(1)(S) (1)
19. Below is a general list of things that students sometimes do. Indicate which of these things you did during the past year in school. If you engaged in an activity frequently, mark $\Theta$. If you engaged in an activity one or more times, but not frequently, mark (o) (occasionally). Mark (N) (not at all) if you have not performed the activity during the past year. (Mark one for each item) Voted in a student election Came late to class Played a musical instrument
 Not at
Noll (-)(1) (F) (N) Checked out a book or journal from the school library (F)(N) Arranged a date for another student .(©) (N) Overslept and missed a class or appointment (E) (N) Read about collegiate rights and responsibilities of students (F)(1) Typed a homework assignment . . . . (F) () (N) Discussed my future with my parents (F) (N) Failed to complete a homework

| assignment on time | (F)(N) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Argued with a teacher in class | (0) (N) |
| Attended a religious service | (F)(N) |
| Demonstrated for a change in some racial or ethnic policy | (0) (N) |
| Demonstrated for a change in some military policy | (F)(N) |

Demonstrated for a change in some administrative policy of my high school (®)® Did extra (unassigned) reading
for a course ©(1)®
Took sleeping pills (ㄷ)(1)
Tutored another student . . . . . . . . . (F) (N) Played chess . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ( ( (1) Read poetry not connected with
 Worked in a local, state, or national

| political campaign . | (-) (1) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Missed school because of illness | (F) (1) |
| Smoked cigarettes | (F)(N) |
| Discussed politics | (F)(N) |
| Drank beer | (F) (1) |
| Discussed sports | (F)(N) |
| Read about civil rights and liberties | (F)(1) |
| Asked a teacher for advice after class | (F)(N) |
| Had vocational counseling | (F)(N) |
| Stayed up all night | (-) (N) |

20. How would you characterize your political views? (Mark one)

21. Mark only three responses, one in each column.

## Your probable career occupation <br> Your father's occupation. -Your mother's occupation. <br> 돕(ㅗ

NOTE: If your father (or mother) is deceased please indicate his (her) last occupation.
Accountant or actuary
©()® Actor or entertainer Architect ©()®

Artist (1)(1) Business (clerical) (1)(®) ()(1)(1) Business executive (management, administrator)
Business owner or proprietor $\ldots$ (Y) (A)
Business salesman or buyer $\ldots$ (Y) (A)
Foreign service worker
(including diplomat) . . . . . . (Y) (M)

Interior decorator

| (including designer) | (1) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Interpreter (translator) | (1) |
| Lab technician or hygien |  |
| Law enforcement office |  |
| Lawyer (attorney) |  |
| Military service (career) | (1) $(1)$ |
| Musician (performer, c | (1) (M) |
| Nurse | (Y) (F) |
| Optometrist | (F) |
| Pharmacist | (1) $(\mathbb{M}$ |
| Physician | (1) $(1$ |
| School counselor | (F) (M) |

School principal or
superintendent .............(Y)(M)
Social worker . . . . ............(Y)(M)
Statistician .................. (Y) (M)

Therapist (physical,
occupational, speech) . .......(Y)(M)

Teacher (elementary) . . . . . . . (Y) (®)
Teacher (secondary) . . . . . . . . (Y) (M)

Veterinarian . . . . . . . . . . . . . (Y) (M)
Writer or journalist . . . . . . . . . (Y) (M)
Skilled trades . . . . . . . . . . . . (Y) (M)

Other
Undecided
©(®)
skilled)
Semi-skilled worker
Other occupation
(1) (1)

Unemployed
22. Rate yourself on each of the following traits as you really think you are when compared with the average student of your own age. We want the most accurate estimate of how you see yourself. (Mark one for each

23. Mark one in each row: $\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text { Agree Strongly } \\ \text { Aggee somewhat } \\ \text { Disagree somewhat } \\ \text { Disagree strongly }\end{array}\right.$

The Federal government is not doing enough to control environmental pollution


The Federal government is not do-


The activities of marr best contined to the home and family O ..O...O...O
The "generation gap" between me and my parents is so great that we can barely communicate.
Marijuana should be legalized O...O..O...O

Parents should be discouraged from having large families ○...
Women should receive the same salary and opportunities for advancement as men in comparable positions O Everybody should be given an opportunity to go to college regardless of past performance or aptitude test scores. Realistically, an individual person can do little to bring about changes in our society

○○... $\ldots \bigcirc$

24 Mark one in each row:

## Agree strongly Agree somewhat Disagree somewhat Disagree strongly

College officials have the right to regulate student behavior off campus
The chief benefit of a college education is that it increases one's earning power



The cher berning power

Colleges would be improved if organized sports
were de-emphasized $\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
College officials have the right to ban persons with
extreme views from speaking on campus
Students from disadvantaged social backgrounds should
be given preferential treatment in college admissions ..... ... O...O...O
Most college officials have been too lax in dealing with student protests on campus
Open admissions (admitting anyone who applies) should be adopted by all publicly-supported colleges


Even if it employs open admissions, a college should
use the same performance standards in awarding
degrees to all students.
25. What is your best guess as to the chances that you will: (Mark one for each item)

26. Do you feel that you will need any special tutoring or remedial work in any of the following subjects? (Mark all that apply)

27. Below is a list of $\mathbf{6 8}$ different undergraduate major fields grouped into general categories. Mark only three of the 68 fields as follows:
(1) First choice (your probable major field of study).
(2) Second choice.
(L) The field of study which is least appealing to you.

## PROFESSIONAL

Health Technology

| (medical, dental, laboratory) | (1) (2) (1) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Nursing | (1) (2) (1) |
| Pharmacy | (1) (2) (1) |
| Predentistry | (1) (2) (1) |
| Prelaw | (1) (2) (1) |
| Premedical | (1) (2) (1) |
| Preveterinary | (1) (2) (1) |
| Therapy (occupat. physical, speech) | (1) (2) (1) |
| Other | (1) (2) (1) |

## ARTS AND HUMANITIES

| Architecture |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| English (literat | (1) (2) (1) |
| Fine arts | (1) (2) (1) |
| History | (1) |
| Journalism (writing) | (1) |
| Language (modern) | (2) |
| Language (other) | (2) |
| Music | (2) |
| Philosophy |  |
| Speech and dr | (2) |
| Theolo | (2) (1) |
|  |  |

## BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE



## PHYSICAL SCIENCE



| Chemistry | (1) (2) (1) | Physical education |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Earth science | (1) (2) (1) | and recreation | (1) (2) (1) |
| Mathematics | (1) (2) (1) | Other (technical) | (1) (2) (1) |
| Physics | (1) (2) (1) | Other |  |
| Statistics | (1) (2) (1) | (nontechnical) | (1) (2) (1) |
| Other | (1) (2) (1) | Undecided | (1) (2) (1) |

Please be sure that only three circles have been marked in the above list.
28. Indicate the importance to you personally of each of the following: (Mark one for each item)

Becoming accomplished in one of the performing arts
 (acting, dancing, etc.)
(ㄷ) (1) (5) (1)
Becoming an authority in my field (ㄷ) (1)(5) (1) Obtaining recognition from my colleagues for contributions in my special field (ㄷ) (1) (5) (1)
Influencing the political structure $\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$. ©()()()() $(1)$
Influencing social values (ㄷ) (1)(ㄷ) (N)
Raising a family (E) (1) (5) (N)

Having an active social life
(ㄷ) (1) (5) (A)
Having friends with different backgrounds and
interests from mine
(ㄷ) (1) (5) (1)
Becoming an expert in finance and commerce
(ㄷ) (1)(5) (1)
Having administrative responsibility for the work of others . (E) (V) (N)
Being very well-off financially
(ㄷ) (1)(5) (1)
Helping others who are in difficulty
(ㅌ)(1)(5) (N)
Participating in an organization like the Peace Corps or Vista (E) (1) (S) (1)
Becoming a community leader .
(ㄷ) (1) (5) (1)
Making a theoretical contribution to science
(ㄷ) (1) (5) (1)
Writing original works (poems, novels, short stories, etc.) .... (ㄷ) (1)(5) (N)
Never being obligated to people
(ㄷ) (1) (5) (1)
Creating artistic work (painting, sculpture, decorating,etc.) .
Keeping up to date with political affairs
(ㄷ) (1)(5) (1)

Being successful in a business of my own
(ㄷ) (1)(5) (1)
Becoming involved in programs to clean up the environment.
Developing a meaningful philosophy of life
(E)(1)(S) (1)

Participating in a community action program
(5)

Participating in a community action program
(ㅌ) (1)(5) (1)
Getting married within the next five years
(ㄷ) (1)(5) (ㅅ)
29. Below are some of the reasons that might have influenced your decision to attend this particular college. How important was each reason in deciding to come here?
(Mark one answer for each statement.)
My relatives wanted me to come here
(1)(5) (1)

This college has a very good reputation
Most of my friends are going to this college.
(1)(5) (1)

Because of low tuition ......................
Someone who had been here before advised me to go ...... (V) (N)
Because of the special educational programs offered . . . . . . . (V) (S)
I was not accepted anywhere else . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . (V) (S) (N)
My guidance counselor advised me to go . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . (V) (S) (N)
I wanted to live at home . . .................................(1)(S) (N)

## DIRECTIONS:

The remaining circles are provided for items specifically designed by your college, rather than by the American Council on Education. If your college has chosen to use the circles, observe carefully the supplemental directions given you.
30. (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
31. (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
32. (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
33. (A) (B) (C) (D) (ㄷ)
34. (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
35. (A) (B) (C) (D) (ㄷ)
36. (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
37. (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
38. (A) (B) (C) (ㅁ) (ㄷ)
39. (A) (B) (C) (ㅁ) (ㄷ)
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# Appendix B <br> Coding Scheme for Collapsed Items <br> Probable Major Field of Study Probable Occupation Father's Occupation 

## Probable Major Field of Study

| Collapsed Category | Item Response Alternatives |
| :---: | :---: |
| Agriculture | Agriculture; Forestry |
| Biological Sciences | Biology (general); Biochemistry; Biophysics; Botany; Zoology; Other Biological Sciences |
| Business | Accounting; Business Administration; Data Processing; Secretarial Studies; Other Business |
| Education | Education; Physical Education and Recreation |
| Engineering | Aeronautical; Civil; Chemical; Electrical; Industrial; Mechanical; Other Engineering |
| English | English (literature) |
| Health Professions | Health Technology; Nursing; Pharmacy; Therapy |
| History and Political Science | History (Arts and Humanities) ; History (Social Science); Political Science |
| Humanities (Other) | Language (modern); Language (other); Philosophy; Theology; Other Arts and Humanities |
| Fine Arts | Architecture; Fine Arts; Journalism; Music; Speech and Drama |
| Mathematics and Statistics | Mathematics; Statistics |
| Physical Sciences | Chemistry; Earth Science; Physics; Other Physical Science |
| Preprofessional | ```Predentistry; Prelaw; Premedical; Preveterinary``` |
| Social Sciences | Anthropology; Economics; Psychology; Social Work; Sociology; Other Social Science |
| Other Fields (Technical) | Other Professional; Communications; <br> Computer Science; Environmental <br> Science; Electronics; Industrial Arts; Other Technical |
| Other Fields (Nontechnical) | Home Economics; Library Science; Military Science; Other Nontechnical |
| Undecided | Undecided |

Probable Occupation

| Collapsed Category | Item Response Alternatives |
| :--- | :--- |
| Artist (including Performer) | Actor or Entertainer; Artist; In- <br> terior Decorator; Musician; Writer |
| or Journalist |  |

Father's Occupation

| Collapsed Category | Item Response Alternatives |
| :---: | :---: |
| Artist (including Performer) | Actor or Entertainer; Artist; Interior Decorator; Musician; Writer or Journalist |
| Businessman | Accountant or Actuary; Business Executive; Business Owner or Proprietor; Business Salesman or Buyer |
| Clergyman | Clergyman; Clergy (other religious) |
| College Teacher | College Teacher |
| Doctor (M.D. or D.D.S.) | ```Dentist (including orthodontist); Physician``` |
| Educator (secondary) | School Counselor; School Principal or Superintendent; Teacher (secondary) |
| Elementary Teacher | Teacher (elementary) |
| Engineer | Engineer |
| Farmer or Forester | Conservationist or Forester; Farmer or Rancher |
| Health Professional | Dietician or Home Economist; Lab Technician or Hygienist; Optometrist; Pharmacist; Therapist; Veterinarian |
| Lawyer | Lawyer (attorney) |
| Military Career | Military Service (career) |
| Research Scientist | Scientific Researcher |
| Skilled Worker | Skilled Trades |
| Semi-skilled Worker | Semi-skilled Worker |
| Unskilled Worker | Laborer (unskilled) |
| Unemployed | Unemployed |
| Other | Architect; Business (clerical); Clinical Psychologist; Computer Programmer; Foreign Service Worker; Housewife; Interpreter; Law Enforcement Officer; Nurse; Social Worker; Statistician; Other Occupation |


[^0]:    298 instead of the 326 included in the National Norms for Entering Freshmen, 1971.

