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ABSTRACT

The retention and graduation of students is at the core of postsecondary education. This topic becomes increasingly relevant as tight budgets force state legislatures to seek increased accountability, and soaring tuition costs force students and parents to demand results for their investment. Numerous studies have been done exploring progression and the factors affecting it. However, few have framed the pursuit of a baccalaureate degree using the concept of anticipatory socialization. This study seeks to fill that void and link three fields of study: Organizational Theory, Anticipatory Socialization Theory, and Student Progression Research. A longitudinal cohort analysis was performed to assess the role of anticipatory socialization in increasing the likelihood of attainment of a baccalaureate degree. The anticipatory socialization mode of focus was attendance at a secondary faith-based institution as a socialization mechanism preparing students for attendance at a faith-based university. The hypothesis underlying the analysis suggested that students who are already socialized within a faith-based learning institution would exhibit higher graduation rates from a faith-based university, than students who graduated from non faith-based secondary institutions. Furthermore, using Tinto’s Stages of college student progression, it was argued that attrition rates would be higher for non-faith-based high school graduates during the freshmen year, when integration occurs. Finally, the subsequent enrollment of drop-out was examined in order to determine the types of institutions they subsequently transferred to. Logistic regression models confirmed the effect of faith-based secondary school enrollment and found that the stage of exit was different based on high school type. The significant factors affecting subsequent enrollment still require further research.
CHAPTER 1

PROBLEM STATEMENT

Student retention and attainment of the baccalaureate degree is at the heart of higher education in the United States. However, according to Adelman (1999) “while employers increasingly use ‘college degree’ as a screening device in hiring and legislatures everywhere ask for evidence of ‘graduation rates’, the research literature devotes infinitely more attention to access than to degree completion” (Introduction, para. 8). Furthermore, few theorists have examined undergraduate retention using an anticipatory socialization framework. This study seeks to fill this void in the literature by integrating the concepts underlying anticipatory socialization theory, student progression research, and organizational exit. Specifically this study seeks to suggest a model of university socialization using an anticipatory socialization framework. This is operationalized by examining the graduation patterns of students whose anticipatory socialization in preparation for attending a faith-based postsecondary institution was attendance at a faith-based high school.

Research Questions Guiding Study

Three research questions serve to guide this analysis and address the goals set out at the beginning of this study:
**Research Question 1**

Do students who attend a faith-based secondary institution exhibit higher graduation rates from a faith-based university than those attending a non faith-based secondary institution?

**Hypothesis 1:** Students who are already socialized within a faith-based learning institution will be more likely to persist at a faith-based postsecondary institution that those educated in non faith-based institutions.

This hypothesis is based on the model put forth by Pascarella, Terenzini, and Wolfe (1986), who examined the role anticipatory socialization (in the form of orientation programs) on student persistence. The authors base this model on the work of Tinto (1975) who developed a “longitudinal, explanatory model of the persistence/withdrawal process which is based to a great extent on the degree of fit between the student and the institutional environment” (p. 155). Pascarella, et al., suggest from Tinto’s work that “other factors held constant, the stronger the individual’s level of social and academic integration, the greater his or her subsequent commitment to the institution and the goal of college graduation...having important effects on institutional persistence/withdrawal decisions” (p. 156). For the purposes of the current study, anticipatory socialization takes place in the form of attendance at a faith-based secondary institution in preparation for attendance at a faith-based university.

**Research Question 2**

Are students who attended non-faith-based secondary schools more likely to exit a faith-based postsecondary institution during their first year when sensemaking and uncertainty is highest?

**Hypothesis 2:** Students who are already socialized within a faith-based learning institution and whom exit the faith-based university studied, are more likely to exit after the first year, while those who attended non faith-based high schools will exit during the first year.

This hypothesis follows from Hypothesis 1 above, but adds to the equation that the higher dropout rates will be seen during the first year of college. This assumption is
drawn from the stages of student progression developed by Tinto (1988), who proposed three stages of passage in students’ college careers: 1.) Separation, 2.) Transition, and 3.) Incorporation. It is during the Separation and Transition phases that the current analysis proposes differences in dropout rates will be exhibited. This is when sensemaking is most crucial and uncertainty is highest. Those not benefiting from the anticipatory socialization of a faith-based secondary school will have a harder time in this process. Once students complete this stage then the factors affecting dropout will not differ among students who attended faith-based high schools and students who attended public high schools.

Research Question 3

Will individuals who exit the organization later enroll in non-faith based postsecondary institutions?

Hypothesis 3: Students who exit the faith-based postsecondary organization who are socialized within a non faith-based secondary institution will be more likely to subsequently enroll in a non faith-based postsecondary institution.

This hypothesis suggests that students who exit the faith-based organization studied, due to problems with socialization, will later enroll in a postsecondary institution more congruent with their secondary school experience. These students will feel that there is less uncertainty involved in the socialization process of an institution that is similar to their anticipatory socialization process.

Theory of Education Underlying Current Hypotheses

The current hypotheses are based on the assumptions derived from the literatures on organizational theory, anticipatory socialization, and student progression. These assumptions are explored in the theoretical framework that follows.

Education as an Ambiguous Exchange
The framework underlying the hypotheses is based on a conceptualization of the education process as one of an “exchange” between the student and the institution they attend. This notion of the education process is grounded in contract theory. Nordin (1981) suggested this contract is an implicit or implied one. There are no explicit processes in place to ensure fulfillment of the postsecondary degree (i.e. contract). Thus, socialization becomes important in decreasing the levels of uncertainty during the postsecondary process. North (1990) proposed that institutions provide the “rules of the game” to reduce uncertainty. These institutions consist of “humanly devised constraints that structure human interaction. They are made up of formal constraints (rules, laws, constitutions), informal constraints (norms of behavior, conventions and self-imposed codes of conduct), and their enforcement characteristics” (p. 3). The notion of sensemaking, which Weick (1995) argues is how meaning is constructed at the individual and group level, becomes crucial is successfully navigating such arrangements.

The framework underlying the current analysis applies this notion of the education process and suggests a model for postsecondary attainment (Figure 1).
Contract theory and its focus on the changing paradigm of the student/university relationship from one of in loco parentis to one of contractual relationship support this framework. Though several studies have examined the contractual relationship inherent in the student/university relationship and its legal implications for higher education institutions, no studies in the literature apply it to a socialization model. Furthermore, no studies frame it using the notion of anticipatory socialization. While there are formal or implicit contracts found in postsecondary education (i.e. housing contracts, financial aid contracts) the notion of contract supporting the current hypothesis is one of the “implied contract” of the student/university relationship. Nordin (1981) described this relationship as “arising out of transactions between the parties which gives them mutual rights or obligations” (p. 152). In these terms, the students would be exchanging their time, effort, and money for knowledge and, in the end, a baccalaureate degree. Drawing from the work of sociologists and the institutional perspective of North (1990) this exchange would take place within the culture and norms of the institution. For the purposes of the current analysis, this culture and these norms are faith-based. Rousseau (1989) described the relationship between an individual and their organization as a “psychological contract”. This contract describes what the individual believes the organization has promised them. Fulfillment of the contract increases the individual’s satisfaction and decreases likelihood of exit from the organization.

**Anticipatory Socialization and Uncertainty**

Once this framework for the attainment of the baccalaureate degree is established for the current analysis, an equation of the function of anticipatory socialization can be added. A Venn Diagram (Figure 2) offers an excellent tool to depict this equation. Where A is equal to Perceived Faith-Based Environment and B is equal to Actual Faith-Based Environment, the greater the level of anticipatory socialization, the greater C. As C decreases, uncertainty in the sensemaking process will increase.
This forms the basis for the hypotheses of anticipatory socialization guiding the current analysis. It posits that anticipatory socialization (for the purposes of the current analysis attendance at a faith-based secondary school) will lower the uncertainty inherent in entering into and fulfilling the contract of attainment of a baccalaureate degree. This results from socialization and familiarity of the norms, etc. of the environment in which the contract takes place. This will be exhibited by higher baccalaureate completion rates (i.e. fulfillment of the postsecondary contract) and less chance of exit from the contract (i.e. student attrition).

A crucial relationship underlying the current hypotheses is the relationship between anticipatory socialization and uncertainty. Pascarella, Terenzini, and Wolfe (1986) examined the role of orientation programs as modes of anticipatory socialization. Their hypothesis suggested anticipatory socialization can effectively reduce uncertainty and that:

anticipatory socialization is a process or set of experiences through which individuals come to anticipate correctly the values, norms, and behaviors they will encounter in a new social setting. To the extent that such anticipatory socialization is effective, the individual should become more successfully integrated into the new setting and function effectively in it. (p. 156)
Following from this hypothesis, the relationship between anticipatory socialization and uncertainty within the environment would be as depicted in Figure 3.

![Graph showing the relationship between Anticipatory Socialization and Uncertainty](image)

**Figure 3**

**Relationship Between Anticipatory Socialization and Uncertainty**

**Factors Leading to Exit**

The current analysis expands on the available student retention literature, in applying to student progression the role that anticipatory socialization makes in the sensemaking process of organizational entry. It utilizes current knowledge about the significant factors in retention (i.e. high school academic performance) and suggests a hypothesis that is complimentary, yet more robust in its ability to gauge the difficulties inherent in university socialization (Figure 4).
A Model of University Socialization

The current analysis proposes a model of university socialization based on the notion of anticipatory socialization. It suggests that, for students not having attended a faith-based secondary school, the socialization process involved in acclimating to the faith-based environment of a university will involve increased levels of uncertainty and higher risk of exit from the organization (Figure 5).

**Figure 4**
Factors Leading to Student Attrition

**Figure 5**
Socialization of Students Not Attending Faith-Based Secondary School
Meanwhile, the socialization process for students who attended a faith-base secondary school will involve less uncertainty due to familiarity of the norms and values resulting from anticipatory socialization (Figure 6).

![Figure 6
Socialization of Students Attending A Faith-Based Secondary School](image)

**Anticipatory Socialization in Organizational Entry**

Finally, drawing from the work of Tinto and his stages of passage in students’ college careers: 1.) Separation, 2.) Transition, and 3.) Incorporation, the following hypothesis of student attrition is proposed (Figure 7). It suggests that after students have successfully achieved stage 2, then the likelihood of exit becomes more equalized regardless of type of secondary institution attended. This suggests that the effects of anticipatory socialization are most important in these early stages of the college career. This theory utilizes the concept of sensemaking proposed by Weick (1995). This is the process by which meaning is constructed in the organization, at both the individual and group level. The current analysis suggests that this sensemaking process is crucial in the transition phase.
A Theory of Transfer

One area in which there is little known, is why individuals choose to transfer to certain institutional types. This analysis attempts to begin examining that question by proposing a theory of transfer based on the model underlying the theory of university of socialization suggested above. Cost, perceived academic rigor, size, and location are all possible rationale for why an individual might choose to transfer to a certain institution (Figure 8). However, the choice factor suggested via the current model is congruence between the secondary school socialization experience of the student and the socialization experience they perceive they will experience at the transfer institution. This follows from the notion of anticipatory socialization forming the basis of the first two hypotheses. Transfer students will try to match their transfer choice to their own anticipatory socialization experience from their secondary school institution.
Figure 8
Factors Underlying Transfer Institution Type

Significance of Study

The great significance of this study is its exploration of a question not previously researched and integration of theories not previously combined in the literature. The following chapter provides strong evidence from the literature to support the current analysis as a unique one. It advances the literature of both student retention and organizational exit. The findings have both theoretical significance as well as practical use, thus should be helpful to practitioners and theorists in both organizational studies and education.

Implications for Future Theoretical Exploration

Findings from the current analysis can generate several theoretical questions for future study in organizational theory, educational theory, contract theory, and socialization theory, including:

1.) Do organizations rely upon different forms of anticipatory socialization in an effort to exclude certain individuals and perpetuate cultural norms?

2.) Is anticipatory socialization more important when entering into implied contracts, where expectations are not explicitly stated and uncertainty is
higher, as opposed to explicit contracts where the expectations of both parties are more certain?

3.) Is anticipatory socialization more important when entering into contracts in which the environment is extremely homogenous?

4.) Do the hypotheses underlying the current analysis hold true in other organizational environments? For example, does attending a large public secondary institution offer the same benefits of anticipatory socialization for subsequent enrollment in a large public university?

5.) Do the hypotheses examined in this analysis hold true for students at the K-12 level who transfer from public schools to faith-based ones? For example, do students, who receive state vouchers for attendance at a faith-based high school experience the same uncertainty and socialization patterns as presented in the model?

**Implications for Policy and Practice**

The findings of the current analysis could prove important to educational practitioners exploring reasons for student exit. This could be especially true at universities in which there is an extremely high level of homogeneity, thus suggesting an increased importance for strong forms of anticipatory socialization. Findings could prove vital in the enrollment management, including recruitment and retention. The model suggested could emerge as an invaluable tool to college administrators. In addition, state policy-makers analyzing the effects of state programs supporting enrollment at private, faith-based institutions could also utilize the model to incorporate the role that socialization experiences play on retention and graduation success.
CHAPTER 2
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter elaborates on the theoretical framework laid out in the Introduction. Three bodies of theory provide the framework for this study: Organizational Theories, Anticipatory Socialization Theories, and Postsecondary Retention and Graduation Theories.

Organizational Theories

The current analysis and the model proposed has its roots in organizational theory. This body of theory attempts to identify elements critical to reaching common goals by explaining individual and group behavior within organizations and by focusing on formal and informal structures, internal dynamics, personal needs, and responses to external environments. The study of organizations draws from several disciplines and has, throughout its history, emphasized the goals of the organization, the wants of its members, and the relationship between organizations and the environment in which they operate. Anthropology, psychology, sociology, and political science all form the basis for the study of organizations. Reviewing the evolution of organizational theory assists on understanding current theories underlying organizational exit and organizational socialization; both key concepts underlying the current hypotheses.

The Early Model of the Organization

In the late 19th century, organizational theories focused largely on issues of bureaucracies. These theories stressed a vertical hierarchy as the primary means of
maintaining administrative control. Max Weber (1947) wrote in his Administrative State, that bureaucracy prescribed the following elements:

1. Division of labor and functional specialization;
2. Vertical hierarchy;
3. Formal rules and procedures;
4. Maintenance of records and files;
5. Emphasis on neutral administration and professionalism.

Many of these principals would later be attacked by authors including Simon (1947). Theorists began to move away from the traditional notion of bureaucracy and began to focus on the individuals within organizations. Organizational studies expanded beyond the exploration of bureaucratic structure to explore theories of the private sector.

Frederick Taylor (1911) was another early influential theorist in organizational studies. He developed his theory of "Scientific Management" based on the four underlying values: efficiency, rationality, productivity, and profit (when applied to the private sector). His work drew much attention and at the time was a revolutionary advance in organizational studies. Many of his claims would be critically examined, however, as organizational theory turned to human relations and psychology for guidance.

**Human Relations and Psychology**

Elton Mayo’s (1933) work was a first shift in organizational theory toward a human relations and psychology perspective. His Hawthorne studies focused on how workers reacted to management and revealed the importance of informal structures. Later, other authors would also focus on psychological elements of organizations. Among these were Douglas McGregor (1960), whose thoughts on Organizational Humanism resulted in his Theory X and Y. This theory proposed that the traditional notion of workers as being motivated by money and finding comfort in routine behavior were not correct because they did not include the motivation humans felt by being included in decision making and valuing their work. Motivation was also a key element
of the work of Vroom (1964). His expectancy theory suggested that people perceive a link between behavior and consequences and this leads to motivation.

**Determining Behavior in Organizations**

The reasons underlying behavior within organizations has been studied through several different lenses. The role that power plays on the behavior of organizational members is one such lens. French and Raven (1968) identified five different types of power: coercive, expert, legitimate, referent, and reward. Perrow (1967, 1979) suggested that power should be viewed in terms of the distribution of risks and benefits among actors and that organizations can facilitate zero-sum power. Theories of power and organizational behavior have been based on two distinctive frameworks of organizations: the economic framework and the sociological framework.

Economic theories view power through the Functionalist Framework. This view suggests that power lies with individual. Rule following and organizational behavior depends on the sanctioning of rules (incentives and disincentives). The functionalist view also suggests voluntarism, meaning behavior is a conscience choice. Hardy and Clegg (1996) said that power in the functionalist approach was used to defeat conflict and gain consensus. Hickson, et al. (1971) took this notion a step further by proposing the strategic contingencies theory of power and organizational behavior, which suggested that power was related to uncertainty and control of it.

Sociological theories view power and organizational behavior through the Critical Framework. In this theory, power lies within social norms and values. People act in accordance with institutions because they provide cognitive frameworks for interpreting meaning. Hardy and Clegg said that power, as defined within the critical view, was used for domination and to prevent conflict. This view is consistent with Marx and Weber who both viewed power as domination. This is also consistent with the view of organizational behavior underlying the postsecondary retention model proposed in the current analysis, which emphasizes the role of social norms and values.
Exit and Organizations

The current study offers more than simply a socialization model for education, but it also expands on the work of behavior in organizations and organizational exit, as it focuses on student attrition. Several theorists have examined exit from organizations. Hirschman (1970) was one of the leading theorists in this area. He offered three mechanisms by which individuals deal with organizational problems: exit, voice, and loyalty. Exit occurs when individuals decide to leave the organization, while voice is the means by which individuals decide to air their grievances. Hirschman suggested that loyalty is a feeling of attachment one feels for an organization. Loyalty increases the cost of exit.

Jablin and Miller (1990) developed a socialization model of the organizational assimilation that examined organizational entry and exit. Their model included four stages: Vocational Socialization, Anticipatory Socialization, Encounter, and Exit. Jablin (1982) explored assimilation in the workplace, stating:

Essentially, organizational assimilation encompasses those on-going conscious and unconscious, behavioral and cognitive processes by which individuals join organizations, become integrated into the cultures of organizations, negotiate their roles in organizations, and in most cases exit these organizations and join new organizations and begin the process again as their work career unfold. (p. 31)

The current study carries a largely similar theory of organizational assimilation, however it expands Jablin’s model to explore why exit occurs during the encounter stage. It is during the encounter stage, the current analysis suggests, when exit is most likely. This proposition is based on Jablin’s depiction of this stage as when
indoctrination takes place and the individual experiences role dissonance as they try and reconcile their new environment with the expectations they had before entry. The intensity and quality of the anticipatory socialization will be crucial during this encounter phase. The current analysis uses this same proposition and applies it in an educational setting.

**Anticipatory Socialization**

One of the central concepts of the current analysis is that of anticipatory socialization. The theory of anticipatory socialization grew out of reference group theory. An underlying proposition of this group of theories is that how one perceives them self depends in part on how they think others perceive them. A pioneer in this area was Cooley (1902) who proposed:

In a large and interesting class of cases the social reference takes the form of a somewhat definite imagination of how one’s self - that is any idea he appropriates - appears in a particular mind, and the kind of self-feeling one has is determined by the attitude towards this attributed to that other mind. A social self of this sort might be called the reflected or looking-glass self... as we see our face, figure, and dress in the glass, and are interested in them because they are ours, and pleased or otherwise with them according as they do or do not answer to what we should like them to be; so in imagination we perceive in another’s mind some thought of our appearance, manners, aims, deeds, character, friends, and so on, are variously affected by it. (p. 183)

In 1950, Merton and Kitt proposed the notion of anticipatory socialization. This concept describes the process by which individuals identify a group they aim to belong and socialize themselves according to that group’s norms. Merton and Rossi (1966)
stated that individuals who engage in this process "take on the values of the non-
membership group to which they aspire, find readier acceptance by that group and
make an easier adjustment to it" (p. 512). This proposition forms the basis of the current
analysis.

Feldman (1981) applied Merton and Kitt’s concepts to socialization in the
workplace and proposed a three-stage process of socialization: anticipatory
socialization, encounter, and change and acquisition. During the anticipatory
socialization phase, the individual develops a picture of what they anticipate
membership in the organization to be like. During the encounter phase, the individual
actually enters the organization and reconciles their previously held notions with the
actual environment they experience. During the final stage, the individual develops
relationships with other members of the organization and gains independence so that
they can contribute to the organizational goals and also affect change they see is
necessary.

**Anticipatory Socialization and Education**

Few researchers have applied the concept of anticipatory socialization to higher
(1973) applied the concept of anticipatory socialization to the academic achievement of
working-class students in higher education. He found that these lower-class students
had equivalent grades and performance as upper middle-class students. He noted the
findings of previous researchers who suggested that as a result of upward mobility, “the
newcomer into a more privileged class may have difficulty in being accepted as a social
equal, and hence feel insecure in his claims to high status” (p. 264). Wegner, however,
found that working class students attending a public urban university did not in fact
experience more academic problems, have higher anxiety, or lower self-esteem. He
concluded that students undergo sufficient anticipatory socialization while in high
school, thus preparing them for the upward mobility in college.

Tierney and Rhoads (1993), examined the socialization of faculty members. They
utilized the concept of anticipatory socialization in this socialization process. They said
this occurs during graduate school. It is here where prospective faculty develop role and lifestyle expectations. These are based on their interactions with faculty and other students. Professional associations also contribute during the anticipatory socialization phase. The authors suggested four cultures that affect the anticipatory socialization phase: 1.) National culture, which consists of assumptions, norms, and stereotypes for professors in higher education in the United States; 2.) Professional culture, which differs based on the type of institution; 3.) Disciplinary culture, which consists of the methods and practices of the particular disciplinary field of interest; and 4.) Individual cultural, which is based on gender, race, ethnicity, and other demographic categories.

Pascarella, Terenzini, and Wolfe (1986) applied the concept of anticipatory socialization to student postsecondary persistence. These researchers explored freshmen orientation programs as a form of anticipatory socialization to better prepare students for their postsecondary careers. However, these authors worked with a limited sample (who were self-selected as orientation participants) and examined a socialization process that spanned only a two-day orientation session. Both limitations are addressed by the methodology used in the current analysis.

**Rational Choice and Anticipatory Socialization**

Several theorists have incorporated rational choice theory into research on the role of anticipatory socialization. Rational choice theory offers a possible means of explanation of why individuals exit organizations during the socialization process. This is crucial to the propositions underlying the current analysis. This body of research would suggest the decision to do so is based on a deliberate calculation of the costs and benefits of exit. In neoclassical theory, rationality is defined as choosing the action that results in the optimal amount of utility given the agents’ beliefs and desires. Decisions are believed to be well informed and no major distinction is made between reality and the agents’ perception of reality. At this point, New Institutional Economics deviates fundamentally from the neoclassical economy. In New Institutional Economics, the cognition of the agents is supposed to be limited and although they intend to be rational in their actions, in reality they are only limitedly so. According to Klein (1999) New
Institutional Economics is an “interdisciplinary enterprise combining economics, law, organization theory, political science, sociology and anthropology to understand the institutions of social, political and commercial life” (p. 456). Yamaguchi (1998) proposed that anticipatory socialization and rational choice theory were compatible for use in theorizing and stated that:

although rational choice theories are often regarded as representing an undersocialized conception of persons, questions of socialization are not outside of their theoretical scope. Unlike functional theories, rational choice theories assume that purpose inheres in actors and not in society, and such theories therefore regard socialization as a consequence of individuals’ purposive commitment to their roles, or to certain patterns of social behavior, rather than as a consequence of society’s need to reproduce its positive functions. (p. 163)

Hechter and Kanazawa (1997) explored the area of sociological rational choice theories and provided the most comprehensive account of the state of this theoretical construct found in the literature. They suggested that while rational choice theory has flourished in other disciplines, its integration into sociology has been slow. They proposed that this was due to the misconception that rational choice theory is based on the premise of what a rational person will do in a given circumstance. This, the authors suggested, is decision theory. In contrast, Hechter and Kanazawa proposed that genuine rational theories “are concerned exclusively with social rather than individual outcomes” (p. 192). They stated that “unlike decision theory, rational choice theory is inherently a multilevel enterprise. At the lower level, its models contain assumptions about individual cognitive capacities and values” and “at the higher level, rational choice models also contain specifications of social structures. These social structures serve both as the social and material context for individual action, and as new structures resulting from the actions of individuals whose behavior is described by the lower level assumptions” (p. 193).
Payne (2003) pulled in rational choice theory and anticipatory socialization by exploring both structuralist and economic models underlying theories as to why youth in Britain choose among various post-16 (the equivalent of postsecondary in the United States) paths. Anticipatory socialization is offered as a mode by which students’ perceptions of opportunities are formed. She summarized the two models of choice by stating that:

Structuralist models of choice suggest that the paths that young people take at 16 are largely shaped by constraints - institutional, economic or cultural - over which they have no control. Economic models of choice assume that their decisions are based on a rational assessment of the potential returns to each option. The model of ‘pragmatic rationality’ takes a middle position between these two poles. According to this model, while some rational calculation is involved in choices at age 16, these choices tend to be constrained by a realistic perception of opportunities, and the young person’s own attitudes, predispositions and personal history also play an important role. (p. 1)

**Sensemaking and Anticipatory Socialization**

Several theorists have explored the role of sensemaking in organizations. Sensemaking, Weick (1995) argues, is how meaning is constructed at the individual and group level. Pratt (2000) suggested that sensemaking is crucial in understanding how individuals feel about their organizations. This concept is most applicable in the current analysis. Weick pointed to the importance of identity construction and the role it plays in sensemaking. One such type of identity is social identity. Social identities are “that part of the individuals’ self which derives from their knowledge of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance of that membership” (Tajfel, 1981, p 255). Sensemaking for the purposes of the current analysis is the mechanism through which the importance of anticipatory socialization is exhibited. Anticipatory socialization is part of the sensemaking process. Louis (1980) examined individual entry
into a culture and the socialization process that follows. He suggested that “confusion” occurs before sense-making and that anticipatory socialization can contribute to this, depending on the congruence between the actual and perceived environment. This proposition is consistent with the theory underlying the current analysis, and its focus on the congruence between the perceived experience of attendance at a faith-based postsecondary institution and the actual experience students encounter upon matriculation.

**The effect of anticipatory socialization on sensemaking in an ambiguous environment.** While there are numerous books and manuals available to college students as to how to succeed in college, and there is also a good deal of literature as to the major variables that affect student retention, the pursuit of a college degree is still one in which there are no explicitly written set of actions for which students can be guaranteed successful completion. This notion is supported by looking at education via contract theory. There has been a copious amount of research done to frame education as a contract. Fowler (1984) used case law to show how the relationship between students and their institutions has shifted from one of in loco parentis back to one focusing on student rights. While there are formal or implicit contracts found in postsecondary education (i.e. housing contracts, financial aid contracts) the notion of contract supporting the current hypothesis is one of the “implied contract” of the student/university relationship. Nordin (1981) described this relationship as “arising out of transactions between the parties which gives them mutual rights or obligations” (p. 152). In these terms, the students would be exchanging their time, effort, and money for knowledge and in the end a baccalaureate degree. Drawing from the work of sociologists and the institutional perspective of North (1990) this exchange would take place within the culture and norms of the institution. For the purposes of the current analysis, this culture and these norms are faith-based. Rousseau’s (1989) proposed the notion of the “psychological contract”. He stated that this contract arose from an individual’s belief regarding the terms of exchange between them and the organization they join. Fulfillment of this contract has consequences on individual’s satisfaction level
and their likelihood of remaining in the organization. Following from the discussion above, sensemaking in an ambiguous environment (i.e. the one inherent in an implied contract) would appear to be more difficult. Thus, the role of anticipatory socialization is perhaps even more important.

**Socialization of Undergraduate Students**

Organizational socialization is defined as “a process by which an individual comes to appreciate the values, abilities, expected behaviors, and social knowledge essential for assuming an organizational role and for participating as an organization member” (Louis, 1980). Understanding the socialization process of undergraduates is paramount to the current hypotheses. One of the most in-depth accounts of this socialization process was offered by Weidman (1989). He suggested that undergraduates encounter two significant socialization processes: 1.) adjustment to the college organization and 2.) preparation for life path after college. His model focused primarily on noncognitive socialization outcomes such as values, goals, and aspirations. He examined social structure constraints which he defined as “normative contexts and interpersonal relations among an organization’s members” (p. 298). Weidman suggested seven dimensions to undergraduate socialization: 1.) parental socialization, 2.) non-college reference groups, 3.) student background characteristics, 4.) pre-college normative pressure, 5.) collegiate experience, 6.) in-college normative pressures, and 7.) socialization outcomes. The theory underlying the current study addresses the fourth dimension or the “Pre-College Normative Pressures”.
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Postsecondary Retention

There is an abundance of literature on the topic of student retention. According to the 2001 study *Postsecondary Progression of 1993-94 Florida Public High School Graduates: 2001 Update* conducted by the Florida Postsecondary Education Planning Commission:

Researchers conducting national, state, and institutional studies have identified a number of factors related to persistence and have extensively described the educational attainment levels of select groups of postsecondary students. In analyzing this type of research, however, it is imperative to remain cognizant of the fact that individual studies may vary significantly in terms of sample makeup, research methodology, experimental controls, and definition of persistence. Thus, the findings may be inconclusive or inconsistent in some areas. (p. 2)

One of the most frequently cited authorities on the topic of student retention is Tinto. Tinto (1988) proposed three stages of passage in students’ college careers: 1.) Separation, 2.) Transition, and 3.) Incorporation. The Separation stage brings about a decline in the amount of interactions between the individual and their former group members. With the Transition stage, the student interacts more with members of their new peer group and begins to acclimate to the environment as they learn the norms and values of the environment. It is here that they learn what actions will increase their likelihood of success. The Incorporation stage brings a sense of true membership in the new group. This stage sometimes involves a ritual to certify membership. Tinto states these stages can bring with them uncertainty and dissonance during the freshmen year and that “having given up the norms and beliefs of past associations and not yet having
adopted those appropriate to membership in a new community, the individual is left in a state of at least temporary anomie” (p. 442).

Tinto based his theories on the work of Van Gennep, a social anthropologist, who studied the stability of cultures over time via the rights of membership or passage within those cultures. Tinto proposed that the interventions designed to address student drop out need to take into account the ever evolving and changing nature of the student as they progress through the system and the three stages mentioned above. Pascarella, Terenzini, and Wolfe (1986) stated that “Tinto’s model...has guided much of the recent research on the issue of student disengagement from postsecondary institutions as well as from postsecondary education generally” (p. 155). The second phase (Transition Phase) of Tinto’s model is of primary concern in the current analysis. It is hypothesized that during this phase, the affect of anticipatory socialization will enable smoother transition and entrance into the incorporation stage. The hypothesis underlying this analysis suggests that it is during this Transition phase that students will exit the organization due to uncertainty. This proposition is supported in the earlier discussion of organizational assimilation and the role of sensemaking. It is suggested, in the current model, that once students successfully pass through this stage, then the likelihood of exit and the factors contributing to it become equivalent, regardless of type of secondary institution attended.

The specific factors studied in the literature on student retention range from those reflecting pre-college characteristics to those reflecting postsecondary educational involvement. Astin (1993) has been a major contributor to the literature on student progression. His 1977 work *Four Critical Years* was at one time the most frequently cited work in higher education literature (Budd, 1990). Astin developed a system for studying college student development he deemed the input-environment-output I-E-O model. According to Astin:

change or growth in the student during college is determined by comparing output characteristics with input characteristics. The basic purpose of the model
is to assess the impact of various environmental experiences by determining whether students grow or change differently under varying environmental conditions. (p. 7)

Astin utilized a sample of 38,587 students to research the factors leading to postsecondary attainment in a four-year period. Factors found to have strong significant positive effects on retention in Astin’s study include high school GPA, standardized test scores, high school academic rank, religion, gender, and social activism.

Adelman (1999) warned that in conducting studies examining the environmental or institutional affects on retention it is important to take into account the multi-institutional enrollment of many of today’s college students. Results attributing significance to institutional characteristics can be tainted if the student attended more than one institution. Because the current study only focuses on a single institution and first-time in college freshmen, this issue does not affect the model developed for the current analysis. Adelman used 29 variables in his regression model of baccalaureate degree attainment, categorized into six groups: 1.) Background: high school performance, aspirations, demography; 2.) Financial Aid Modes; 3.) Attendance Patterns; 4.) 1st True Year Performance; 5.) Continuing Performance Effects; and 6.) Satisfaction Indicators. Adelman suggested his findings advanced the proposition put forth by Alexander, Riordan, Fennessey, and Pallas (1982) that "academic variables are much more potent predictors of college completion" than social background variables (p. 324). He found that “academic preparation, continuous enrollment, and early academic performance…prove to be what counts” (Conclusion, para. 3).

The independent variables for the current analysis are drawn from these studies and are broken into four categories: Socioeconomic Factors; Secondary School Academic Achievement; Secondary School Extracurricular Involvement; Postsecondary Extracurricular Involvement; and Postsecondary Academic Achievement. Support for the inclusion of specific variables can be found in the Methodology section.
Faith-Based Versus Non Faith-Based Universities

A key assumption of the current analysis is that there is a distinct difference between faith-based and non-faith-based educational institutions. A historical analysis of the development of both sectors establishes support for this distinction.

The aspiration to develop institutions of higher learning in the United States was evident among early settlers to America. In his historical look at American higher education, Lucas (1994) quotes from a 1643 pamphlet which read:

and we had builded [sic] our houses, provided necessities for our livelihood, reared convenient places for God’s worship, and settled the civil government: one of the next things we longed for, and looked after was to advance learning and perpetuate it to prosperity. (p. 103)

The first institution founded in the States was Harvard University in Cambridge, Massachusetts. The chief aim of the institution was a faith-based one, as an early document read “Every one shall consider the main end of his life and studies to know God and Jesus Christ, which is eternal life…and therefore to lay Christ in the bottom, as the only foundation of all sound knowledge and learning” (Lucas, 1994, p. 104) and all students were required to read scriptures twice daily. Prior to the American Revolution all colleges held the dual purpose of educating civic leaders and preparing clergy. Even after denominationalism spread there was a blurred line between “public” and “private” status (Lucas). Several authors have proposed that a defining moment of distinction between public and private institutions came with the 1819 case of Dartmouth v. Woodward in which the state of Delaware had changed the status of Dartmouth from a private to a public institution (Kohlbrenner 1961, Herbst 1975). Whitehead 1977, however, proposed that this in fact was not a defining moment and that a distinction
between public and private institutions of higher learning did not become evident until after the Civil War. Novak (1974) stated:

To the participants in the college and community, then, the significance of the Dartmouth College Case was not the political battle between Federalists and Republicans or the contest between the state legislature and the United States Supreme Court. It was, rather, the question who would control the religious future of Dartmouth and Hanover. The Supreme Court’s 1819 decision in favor of the trustees was thus a major victory for the cause of evangelical education. (p. 563)

For the purposes of the current analysis, the catalyst for distinction between public and private faith-based institutions is not of the utmost importance but rather that such a distinction in fact exists.

**Religiously Affiliated Institution versus Faith-Based Institution**

The term faith-based is used throughout the current analysis, thus it is important to distinguish between the notion of “faith-based” and “church-related” as it applies to the current hypotheses. Just because an institution has an established relationship with a certain denomination does not mean that their curriculum has a faith-integrated base. The Council for Christian Colleges and Schools gives a good distinction for institutions that are faith-based (at least from a Christian standpoint) in their requirements for membership in the Council. These requirements include that the college has a board-approved institutional mission or purpose statement that is Christ-centered rooted in the historic Christian faith. Their curricular and extra-curricular programs reflect the integration of scholarship, biblical faith, and service. This obviously runs counter to the
separation of church and state paradigm surrounding public secondary and postsecondary schools.

The Current State of Faith-Based Institutions

The perception of the current state of faith-based institutions is mixed in the literature. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), the statistical body of the U.S. Department of Education, the number of religiously-affiliated higher education institutions grew 19.8% between 1980 and 2000 (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Fall 1980</th>
<th>Fall 2000</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Institutions</td>
<td>3,226</td>
<td>4,056</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Institutions</td>
<td>1,493</td>
<td>1,676</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Institutions</td>
<td>1,733</td>
<td>2,380</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious-Affiliated Institutions</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 927 religiously-affiliated institutions in 2000, the three largest denominations were Roman Catholic (25.8%), United Methodist (10.8%), and Baptist (7.3%). While the growth in private institutions has outpaced that of religiously-affiliated institutions, enrollment in religiously affiliated institutions has grown at a
greater pace than all other types. Between 1990 and 1998 enrollment at religiously affiliated postsecondary institutions increased 15.6% (Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Fall 1990</th>
<th>Fall 1998</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Institutions</td>
<td>13,818,637</td>
<td>14,549,189</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Institutions</td>
<td>10,844,717</td>
<td>11,176,184</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Institutions</td>
<td>2,973,920</td>
<td>3,373,005</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious-Affiliated</td>
<td>1,285,409</td>
<td>1,485,481</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While this suggests that the number of religiously affiliated institutions is alive and well, this does not necessarily point to growth in institutions with a faith-based mission: a distinction crucial to the current analysis. Several authors, including Marsden (1994) have suggested an actual decline in the number of faith-based institutions. Marsden states:

Persons concerned about the place of religion in American life might be particularly concerned that the largely voluntary and commendable disestablishment of religion has led to the virtual establishment of nonbelief or the near exclusion of religious perspectives from dominant academic life. While American universities today allow individuals free exercise of religion in parts of their lives that do not touch the heart of the university, they tend to exclude or discriminate against relating explicit religious perspectives to intellectual life. (p. 6)
In October, 2000 scholars and administrators attended a conference at Harvard University, sponsored by the Program on Education Policy and Governance at Harvard’s John F. Kennedy School of Government. The purpose of the conference was to discuss the future of faith-based institutions in the United States (Chronicle, 2000, October 20). The conference attendees “portrayed the cultural climate as increasingly welcoming of religious scholars and hospitable to religious institutions” (p. 1). This evidence of recent scholarly attention to the role and future of faith-based institutions makes the current analysis even more essential to the literature on sectarian education.

**Faith-Based Secondary Education as a Form of Anticipatory Socialization**

Now that faith-based universities and non faith-based universities have been differentiated, it is necessary to explore the same differentiation between faith-based and non faith-based secondary schools in order to support the hypothesis that attendance at a faith-based high school serves as a form of anticipatory socialization for later attendance at a faith-based university.

There has been much publicity in recent years of the strong culture of separation of church and state in public secondary schools. The debate, however, is not a new one. Valk (1995) suggests that “beginning in the early nineteenth century, debates regarding the place of religion in education became particularly intense with the emergence of public education and the common school” (p. 159). In an early Wisconsin Supreme Court ruling, the court said:

There is no such source and cause of strife, quarrel, fights, malignant opposition, persecution, and war, and all evil in the state, as religion. Let it once enter our civil affairs, our government would soon be destroyed. Let it once enter our
common schools, they would be destroyed. Supreme Court of Wisconsin. (Weiss v. District Board, 1890)

Renewed attention to these issues have emerged in part as a result of several high profile cases involving issues such as prayer before athletic competitions and the phrase “one nation under God” that is contained in the pledge of allegiance. The 1992 U.S. Supreme Court case of Lee v. Weisman prohibited prayer, benediction, or invocation at graduation ceremonies. In an attempt to skirt this ruling, several high schools indirectly sponsor such prayers by letting students deliver them. However, in the 2000 case of Santa Fe Independent School District v. Doe (2000), the Supreme Court said that even this indirect sponsorship of prayer at football games when recited by a student violated the law. An assumption underlying the current analysis is that such cases as these perpetuate and strengthen the culture of separation of church and state in public schools. Thus, the learning curve is steep for students who subsequently enroll in postsecondary school where faith is not only integrated into the curriculum but open practice is encouraged.

Several studies have been done to explore the unique differences of faith-based secondary schools. These studies have focused primarily on differences in educational achievement of students attending parochial schools. Many of these sprung from the work of Coleman (1966). The Coleman Report released in 1966 in response to the Civil Rights Act of 1964, found that student achievement was not related as much to the quality of the student’s school, as much as the social composition of the school and the child’s family background. In 1982, Coleman, Hoffer, and Kilgore found that parochial school children exhibited higher levels of academic achievement as compared to students at public schools as a result of academic and disciplinary policies in place in parochial schools. Jensen (1986) tested the findings of work such as Coleman’s and generated findings that support a school-effects model. He suggested that the more rigorous academic requirements of Catholic schools were a contributing factor to the
difference in educational achievement between students who attend parochial schools and those who attend public schools.

While these studies serve to lend clarity and insight into the differing academic achievement of students based upon the type of secondary school attended, none have explored the effect of attending a faith-based secondary school in the anticipatory socialization of students preparing to enter faith-based postsecondary institutions or the effect of the strong separation of church and state culture framing the education of students attending public secondary schools. This adds increased importance to the research questions underlying the current analysis.

Conclusions from the Literature

The literature review above offers evidence as to the importance of the current analysis. This study serves to fill a void in the literature by exploring a question not previously researched and integrating theories not previously combined in the literature. Few studies have framed postsecondary retention via an anticipatory socialization framework, and none have offered as comprehensive a model for undergraduate socialization. Furthermore, no studies found have examined the factors that affect the type of institutions students transfer to.

As presented in this chapter, there is evidence from the research on contract theory to support the proposed framework of education underlying the current model. The notion of the psychological contract also frames the ambiguous nature of the postsecondary contract. The findings from researchers applying anticipatory socialization theory to a variety of organizations also provide support for the relationship set forth at the beginning of this analysis between uncertainty and anticipatory socialization. The increased uncertainty during the organizational entry stage has also been evidenced in the literature on socialization and sensemaking. Clear evidence has also been presented to support the distinctiveness between public and
faith-based education forming the basis of the current analysis. The models presented in the Methodology chapter offer means by which to merge the evidence presented in this chapter and test the hypotheses suggested in the beginning of this study.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

Institution of Focus

The institution serving as the focus of the current analysis is a private university in the South that has a student body of approximately 4,500 students. The institution is a Southern-Baptist affiliated school with a strong faith-based mission. The mission statement of the institution states:

Some Christian colleges aim to defend the faith, to protect students from moral evil and to be a shield against intellectual currents not consistent with Christian belief. Others identify themselves as Bible schools where young people study and plan for vocational church work. Still others seek to offer a standard college education in a quasi-moral atmosphere, unsure of what would make them Christian, and equally uncertain as to whether they want to be considered a Christian college or university. (p. 1)

However, the strength of the faith-based mission is not unclear at the institution of focus as they seek to “to nurture persons, offering learning experiences and relationships in a Christian community, so that each participant may develop personal empowerment, academic and career competency, social and civic responsibility, and ethical and spiritual strength, and continuously to improve the effectiveness of the community” (a complete copy of the institutions Mission and Vision statement MCPVV can be found in
APPENDIX A.) The institution states their distinctiveness arises from its dedication to “rigorous academic inquiry in a Christian setting.” While several faith-based schools require faculty and staff members to sign a profession of faith statement, the institution of focus in the current study does not.

One unique aspect of the university curriculum at the institution of focus, and an example of the integration of faith into the academic work of their students is Convocation. Convocation credits are obtained by attendance at various Convo sessions. The purpose of Convo as stated by the university is so students may be made aware of the Christian worldview and become encouraged to develop sympathy with the Christian mission in the world. Entering freshmen must obtain 64 Convo credits during the course of their education.

**Cohort of Focus**

The cohort analyzed was composed of the 651 entering freshmen in Fall 1996. Only first-time in college students were included in the study. These students are those who have less than 21 credit hours at a postsecondary institution. This is the credit hour policy imposed by the university of study. Of these 651 students, 47 attended a private non-faith-based secondary school, 152 attended a private faith-based secondary school, and 452 attended a public secondary school.

**Research Design**

The proposed analysis serves to address the three research questions set out at the beginning of the study: A longitudinal cohort analysis forms the basis of the research
design. The progression of students in the cohort was tracked to determine patterns in progression to the baccalaureate degree.

**Hypothesis 1**

The first hypothesis of the current analysis suggests:

*Students who are already socialized within a faith-based learning institution will be more likely to persist at a faith-based postsecondary institution than those educated in non faith-based institutions.*

To test the first hypothesis of this study, a logistic regression analysis was performed to assess if attendance at a faith-based secondary school was statistically significant in the probability of graduation from a faith-based university. The Enter Method was used. Logistic regression was chosen since it is useful when the observed outcome is nominal. In their article examining the increased use of logistic regression as a tool for nominal dependent variables, Peng, Lee, and Ingersoll (2002) stated that both ordinary least squares (OLS) regression and linear discriminant function analysis were “found to be less than ideal for handling dichotomous outcomes due to their strict statistical assumptions, i.e., linearity, normality, and continuity for OLS regression and multivariate normality with equal variances and covariances for discriminant analysis” (p. 3).

Data incorporated into the logistic regression model were obtained through the university’s Student Information System.

**Hypothesis 1 Model**

The dependent variable in the study was attainment of the baccalaureate degree. This was coded as a dummy variable (1=Attained a Bachelor’s Degree and 0=Did Not Attain a Bachelor’s Degree). The independent variables included in the model were derived from the aforementioned literature on the factors affecting degree attainment. These independent variables are broken into: Socioeconomic Factors; Secondary School Academic Achievement; Secondary School Extracurricular Involvement; Postsecondary Extracurricular Involvement; and Postsecondary Academic Factors. To these variables
was added an independent variable to categorize the secondary school attended as public, private secular, or private sectarian. The model proposed is:

\[ DVGRAD = \text{Constant} + \text{BAPT(1)} + \text{GENDER(1)} + \text{COREGPA} + \text{ACTTEST} + \text{MATHTOT} + \text{SCITOT} + \text{APTOTAL} + \text{EXTRACUR} + \text{GREEK(1)} + \text{SUATH(1)} + \text{UNDECIDE(1)} + \text{MJRCHNG} + \text{PELLYES(1)} + \text{HSSIZE} + \text{ALUMFAM(1)} + \text{WHITE(1)} + \text{RANK} + \text{NATMER(1)} + \text{TRIG(1)} + \text{PTTERM} + \text{DORMSEM} + \text{FBHIGH(1)} + \text{PUBLIC(1)} + \text{RELVOC(1)} \]

Variable definitions are as follows:

**Dependent Variable:**

\[ DVGRAD \] – This is a dummy variable indicating if the student has completed the baccalaureate degree (1=yes and 0=no).

The study spans a six year time frame, which has typically become the standard for assessing degree completions. The U.S. Department of Education in the annual Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, Graduation Rate Survey (GRS), which is a standard in the Institutional Research field, utilizes six year graduation rates for full-time, first-time degree-seeking undergraduate students. Six-year graduation rates are also utilized in universities’ Common Data Sets (CDS). These education data sets are compiled by each postsecondary institution to provide data to publishers and the education community.

**Independent Variables:**

**Socioeconomic Factors**

1.) Gender – Dummy variable coded as (1=Female and 0=Male)

Astin (1993) found that females held an advantage of degree completion within the four year time period of his study.

2.) Baptist – Dummy variable coded as (1=Yes and 0=No)

In previous studies, religion was found to be a significant factor in postsecondary attendance. Astin (1993) found that Catholic and Jewish students had higher levels of attainment. Since the current study hypothesis focuses on anticipatory socialization, the
independent variable is operationalized to reflect if the student has a religious affiliation consistent with that underlying the university mission.

3.) White – Dummy variable coded as (1=Yes and 0=No)

The institution studied is predominantly Caucasian. This variable is included to determine if being a minority student in a predominantly Caucasian university affects persistence. According to a 2002 study conducted by the National Science Foundation:

Black and Hispanic students are less likely than their white and Asian counterparts to complete a bachelor's degree within 5 years. Forty-eight percent of whites, 47 percent of Asians, 34 percent of blacks, and 32 percent of Hispanics who entered a baccalaureate program in 1989 had earned their degree by spring 1994. Thirty-seven percent of both black and Hispanic students, compared with 27 percent of white students and 26 percent of Asian students, had earned no degree and were no longer enrolled in a bachelor's program in 1994. (p. 7)

Clewell (1986) found that exposure of African American students to other African American students provided significant increases in retention.

4.) Pellyes – Dummy variable coded as (1=Yes and 0=No)

This variable is designed to gauge a student’s family income. While income data is not available on every student, receipt of a Pell Grant serves as a good indication of family income bracket. Heller (2003) stated that:

Receipt of a Pell Grant is a good proxy to estimate the income bracket of students. For example, the most recent data available from the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study, a nationally representative survey of students conducted for the Department in the 1999-2000 academic year, indicates that 90 percent of all dependent Pell Grant recipients in 4-year institutions came from families with incomes below $41,000 and 75 percent of all Pell recipients had family income below $32,000. While these exact proportions can not be
compared to all families nationally, data from the 2000 Census can be used to approximate the distribution of all families with children under 18 years. In 1999, approximately 41 percent of all families with children had incomes below $40,000 and 29 percent had incomes below $30,000. Thus it is clear that the income distribution of Pell Grant recipients is much lower than that of all families with children in the nation. (p. 1)

Secondary School Academic Achievement

5.) Core GPA - A continuous variable representing the student’s GPA in the core high school courses of Math, Science, and English

Astin (1993) found that high school GPA was one of the two most important input factors in determining postsecondary achievement.

6.) ACT Test – A continuous variable representing the ACT Composite Score or a converted ACT score for those taking the SAT

Besides high school GPA, SAT composite score was the second most important input student characteristic affecting postsecondary educational achievement in Astin’s study. For the purposes of the current study, over 75% of entering freshmen at the institution of focus submit ACT scores as opposed to SAT scores, thus ACT is used in the current analysis.

7.) Math Total – A continuous variable representing the total units of secondary math the student took in high school

Kanarek (1989) found several math variables to be significant in predicting postsecondary completion. These included SAT Math Scores, number of mathematics units taken in high school, and self-reported mathematics ability. Due to the availability of data, math skills for the current analysis will be operationalized via number of math units taken.

8.) Trig – Dummy variable representing if student took trigonometry while in high school. (1=Yes and 0=No)

The rationale for inclusion is the same as it was for Mathtot.
9.) $Scitot$ – A continuous variable representing the total units of science the student took in high school

The same rationale for inclusion of the number of math units taken applies to this variable as well.

10.) $APTot$ - A continuous variable representing the total hours of AP credit the student received before entering the university

The inclusion of Advanced Placement credit in persistence studies found in the literature varies. Adelman (1999) stated that Advanced Placement credit “is more strongly related to degree completion than to mere entry into postsecondary education” (Section I, para. 21).

11.) $Natmer$ – Dummy variable representing whether the student was a National Merit recipient (1=Yes and 0=No)

National Merit recognition is a prestigious academic achievement and thus included as a further estimate of students’ academic achievement before entering the university.

 Secondary School Extracurricular Involvement

Inclusion of measurements of student secondary school extra-curricular activities is mixed in the literature. Such a variable is included in the current model as measures of secondary school engagement. It is proposed that higher engagement equivocates to more successful anticipatory socialization.

12.) $Extracur$ – A continuous variable representing the number of high school organizations involved in. Possible organization designations available via the university computer system are Student Government, performing arts, and band.

 Postsecondary Enrollment Factors

This set of variables is included to try and gauge the reasons the student originally enrolled in the university. While consistent data is not available in which the student lists the specific reasons, two variables were developed to act as proxies.

13.) $Alumfam$ – Dummy variable representing whether or not the student has in their family an alumnus of the university studied (1=Yes and 0=No)
14.) *Relvoc* – Dummy variable representing whether or not the student indicated an interest in a religious vocation when entering the university (1=Yes and 0=No)

**Postsecondary Extracurricular Involvement**

Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) found that participation in extra-curricular activities has a significant affect on baccalaureate degree completion. The following two variables are inserted into the model for the current study to gauge extracurricular involvement.

15.) *Greek* – Dummy variable representing student membership in a Greek letter social fraternity or sorority coded as (1=Yes and 0=No)

16.) *SLAthlete* – Dummy variable representing student participation on an intercollegiate athletic team coded as (1=Yes and 0=No)

**Postsecondary Academic Factors**

17.) *Undecide* – Dummy variable representing whether the student entered the University with a major of “Undecided” coded as (1=Yes and 0=No)

This variable is operationalized to represent uncertainty on the part of the student.

18.) *Mjrchng* - Continuous variable representing the number of times a student changed their major

This variable also reflects uncertainty.

19.) *Dormsem* – Continuous variable representing the number of terms the student lived on-campus

Several researchers have found that living on-campus offers invaluable socialization that increases retention. Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) found that:

Living on campus is perhaps the single most consistent within-college determinant of impact….Living on campus maximizes opportunities for social, cultural and extracurricular involvement; and it is this involvement that largely accounts for residential living’s impact on student change. (p. 611)
20.) \textit{PTterms} – Continuous variable representing the number of part-time terms in which the student was enrolled

It is suggested that the more part-time terms a student is enrolled, the longer they will take to graduate and the fewer opportunities for socialization on campus.

\textbf{Secondary School Identifier}

This is the variable of focus in the current analysis. There are three types of secondary institutions: Public, Private Faith-based, and Private Non-Faith Based. Home schooled students are grouped into Private Non-Faith Based. It is included in the analysis as two dummy variables, with Private Non-Faith Based excluded as a default variable.

21.) \textit{FBHigh} – Dummy variable representing if an institution was a faith-based high school (1=Yes and 0=No)

22.) \textit{Public} - Dummy variable representing if an institution was a public high school (1=Yes and 0=No)

23.) \textit{Hssize} – Continuous variable representing the size of the student’s graduating class

This variable is inserted to assess the impact of socialization in a small high school as preparation for attendance at a small, private university.

\textbf{Hypothesis 2}

The second hypothesis of the current analysis suggests:

\textit{Students who are already socialized within a faith-based learning institution and whom exit the faith-based university studied, are more likely to exit after the first year, while those who attended non faith-based high schools will exit during the first year.}

The longer students are in the organization the longer they have to assimilate, the more the differences in secondary experiences will even out between the two groups after the first year. This will be exhibited in higher dropout rates in the first year of study by students not benefiting from the anticipatory socialization of a faith-based secondary school.

\textbf{Hypothesis 2 Model}
A logistic regression analysis also served to test this hypothesis. The Enter Method was utilized. The rationale for use of a logistic regression is the same as it was for Hypothesis 1.

\[ \text{DROPGRUP} = \text{Constant} + BAPT(1) + GENDER(1) + COREGPA + ACTTEST + MATHTOT + SCITOT + APTOTAL + EXTRACUR + GREEK(1) + SUATH(1) + UNDECIDE(1) + MJRCHNG(1) + PELLYES(1) + HSSIZE + ALUMFAM(1) + WHITE(1) + RANK + NATMER(1) + TRIG(1) + PTTERM + DORMSEM + FBHIGH(1) + PUBLIC(1) + RELVOC(1) + \text{YEAR1GPA} \]

Where:

- \( \text{DROPGRUP}(1) \) – Dummy variable where 1=Drop in first year
- \( BAPT(1) \) – Dummy variable where 1=Baptist
- \( GENDER(1) \) – Dummy variable where 1=Male
- \( COREGPA \) – Continuous variable representing student high school core GPA
- \( ACTTEST \) – Continuous variable representing student ACT or ACT converted score
- \( MATHTOT \) – Continuous variable representing total number of math units taken in high school
- \( SCITOT \) - Continuous variable representing total number of science units taken in high school
- \( APTOTAL \) – Continuous variable representing total number of AP credits granted by postsecondary institution
- \( EXTRACUR \) – Continuous variable indicating total number of extracurricular activities student was involved in during high school
- \( GREEK(1) \) – Dummy variable where 1=Was in Greek organization
- \( SUATH(1) \) – Dummy variable where 1=Was on an intercollegiate athletic team
- \( UNDECIDE(1) \) – Dummy variable where 1=Entered the university as Undecided major
- \( MJRCHNG(1) \) – Dummy variable representing whether or not a student changed their major in the first year.
PELLYES(1) – Dummy variable where 1=Received a Pell Grant

HSSIZE – Continuous variable representing the size of the student’s high school graduating class

ALUMFAM(1) – Dummy variable where 1=Had family member who attended the university

WHITE(1) – Dummy variable where 1=White

NATMRT(1) – Dummy variable where 1-National Merit Finalist

RANK – Continuous variable representing student’s high school rank

TRIG(1) – Dummy variable where 1=Took trigonometry in high school

PTTERM – Continuous variable representing the number of part-time terms while at the university

DORMSEM – Continuous variable representing the number of semesters the student lived in the dorms

FBHIGH(1) – Dummy variable where 1=Attended faith-based secondary institution

PUBLIC(1) – Dummy variable where 1=Attended public secondary institution

RELVOC(1) – Dummy variable where 1=Indication of interest in a religious vocation

YEAR1 GPA – A continuous variable reflecting a student’s cumulative postsecondary GPA at the end of the freshmen year.

Rationale for inclusion of each variable is consistent with the rationale for inclusion in the model developed to test Hypothesis 1. Two revisions to the model have been made to test Hypothesis 2, however. First year GPA has been included in an effort to gauge the academic performance in the student’s first year. Adelman (1999) found that early postsecondary academic performance was a good indicator of eventual success. Secondly, the variable representing major change has been adjusted to represent whether a student changed their major in the first year, as opposed to the number of times they changed their major over their academic life. This adjustment was made in order to detect uncertainty in the first year.
Hypothesis 3

The third hypothesis of the current analysis suggests:

_Students who exit the faith-based postsecondary organization who are socialized within a non faith-based secondary institution will be more likely to subsequently enroll in a non faith-based postsecondary institution._

The level of uncertainty will be lower at this type of institution, thus the level of success in fulfilling the educational contract will increase. Thus non faith-based high school graduates who left the institution of focus will be more likely to subsequently enroll in public universities.

**Hypothesis 3 Model**

The National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) was utilized to obtain data on students who have exited the faith-based institution. The NSC is a repository of student data that postsecondary institutions (both public and private) send enrollment and graduation data to on a semester basis. Over 1,000 postsecondary institutions provide enrollment data to the NSC. This tool was used to gather enrollment records of students who left the institution of focus in the current analysis and subsequently enrolled in other institutions.

The model developed to test Hypothesis 3 was as follows:

\[
\text{TRANNONF} = \text{Constant} + \text{NONFAITH}(1) + \text{COREGPA} + \text{APTOTAL} + \text{MATHTOT} + \text{SCITOT} + \text{YEAR1GPA} + \text{PELLYES}(1) + \text{HSSIZE}
\]

Where:

- \(\text{TRANNONF}(1)\) – Dummy variable representing if the transfer institution is non faith-based (1=Non Faith-based and 0=Faith-based)
- \(\text{NONFAITH}(1)\) – Dummy variable representing if the secondary institution attended was a non faith-based (1=Non Faith-based and 0=Faith-based)
- \(\text{COREGPA}\) – Continuous variable representing student high school core GPA
- \(\text{APTOTAL}\) – Continuous variable representing total number of AP credits granted by postsecondary institution
MATHTOT – Continuous variable representing total number of math units taken in high school

SCITOT - Continuous variable representing total number of science units taken in high school

YEAR1GPA – Continuous variable representing the student GPA at the end of the first academic year

PELLYES(1) - Dummy variable coded as (1=Yes and 0=No)

HSSIZE – Continuous variable representing the size of the student’s high school graduating class

This model captures three primary groups of variables which could likely affect the type of transfer institution a student attends: 1.) Variables representing academic performance; 2.) Variables representing family income; and 3.) Variables representing secondary school environment.

**Academic achievement.** Public institutions tend to have lower levels of selectivity than their private counterparts. According to Trends in College Admissions 2000, the acceptance rate for public institutions was 67.6%, while the acceptance rates at private institutions was 60.1%. Furthermore, the average first year GPA’s of students entering private institutions tends to be higher than those enrolling in public institutions (Table 3) (2003 Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution Attended</th>
<th>C's and D's or lower</th>
<th>B's and Mostly C's</th>
<th>Mostly B's</th>
<th>A's and B's</th>
<th>Mostly A's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public 4-year</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private nonprofit 4-year</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some might argue that the higher average GPAs are due to grade inflation in private institutions. However, the cause of the higher average GPAs is not as important for the purposes of the current analysis. Rather, the focus is on the effect of the higher GPAs on transfer students’ perception of rigor and difficulty of the education provided.

The institution studied in the current analysis is categorized by the Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange (CSRDE) as a “Highly Selective Institution”. The CSRDE is a national organization that collects annual retention and graduation data from over 500 colleges and universities each year. Highly selective institutions exhibit higher average ACT scores and GPAs of their entering freshmen, than their peers. Students leaving the institution studied and transferring to other colleges might do so as a result of academic struggle. These students might choose to transfer to public institutions due to their higher acceptance rate and lower average entering student GPAs. Incorporation of First Year GPA into the model is intended to capture such academic struggle.

**Family income.** According to the 2003-04 Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac, the average tuition at private universities in 2003 was $19,710. By contrast, the average tuition at public universities was $4,694. Thus, cost could be perceived to be a factor when choosing the type of postsecondary institution in which to transfer. It could be argued that students leaving the institution studied in the current analysis did so for cost reasons, and in turn transferred to public institutions where the average tuition was less. Family income as defined by receipt of a Pell Grant (see rationale in Hypothesis 1 variable definition) serves as a proxy for ability to pay.

**Secondary school environment.** Two variables are included to capture secondary school environment factors. Both factors are potential socialization influences. The first is NONFAITH. This variable is the primary focus of the Hypothesis 3, which suggests that students who leave the institutions studied who had attended a non faith-based high school will more likely transfer to a public institution. The second variable included to gauge secondary school environment is HSSIZE. According to the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU), the average
enrollment of private institutions is 1,863, while the average enrollment of public colleges and universities is 6,871.

**Career Choice**

One area the current model can not capture is the role that availability of a certain major plays in students’ choices of subsequent institution of enrollment. It could be argued that students choose a particular institution to transfer to due to the availability of a certain degree program suited for their intended career. The last major in which a student held at the university of focus is available, however the degree program in which they enter into at their transfer institution is not available via the National Student Clearinghouse.
CHAPTER 4
DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Cohort Overview

There were 651 students in the cohort examined.

Demographic and Socioeconomic Overview

The cohort was predominantly (60.1%) female (Figure 9). This finding is consistent with trends in higher education nationally. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, in 2001 females received 57% of all bachelor’s degrees.
The study cohort was also predominantly white (94.0%). Geographically, most of the students in the cohort came from states in the Southeast (Figure 10). There were 209 students (32%) from Alabama. The fact that Alabama was the most represented state is not surprising, since that is the location of the university studied.
Over 50% of the cohort was Baptist. (Table 4) This is not surprising either, since the institution studied is a Baptist affiliated one. The next largest religious affiliations were Presbyterian and Methodist.

Table 4
Religious Origin of Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly of God</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of Christ</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of God</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episcopal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evang Free</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>66.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luthern</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nazarene</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecostal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Methodist</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitarian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were 152 students (about one-fourth) in the cohort who attended faith-based high schools (Figure 11). Less than 10% of the cohort attended private non-faith-based high schools and the vast majority of students (70%) graduated from public high schools.
Of the students attending a faith-based high school, 42.1% were Baptist.

High school size tended to be associated with whether a school was faith-based or not. Where size data was available, of the students in the cohort who came from high schools with graduating classes of less than 250, 36.1% were faith-based high schools (Table 5). Meanwhile, of students who came from secondary institutions with graduating classes of between 251 and 500 students, only a single individual was from a faith-based high school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FBHIGH</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Less than 250</th>
<th>251 to 500</th>
<th>501 to 750</th>
<th>751 to 1000</th>
<th>1000 or More</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within FBHIGH</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Size Group</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within FBHIGH</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Size Group</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>.4%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within FBHIGH</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Size Group</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

students who had applied for (not necessarily received) financial aid, had any sort of
income records. However, for those who had available income data, the average parental income was $71,578. Because of the fact that parental income data was not available for every member of the cohort, Pell Grant data was examined as well. Pell Grants are awarded to those who exhibit extensive financial need, thus, as stated above, can serve as a good proxy for family income bracket. There were 107 (16.5%) members of the cohort who received a Pell Grant (Table 6). Of these students, 92 had available parental income data. Over 83% of Pell Grant recipients came from families with incomes less than $50,000.

Table 6
Parental Income Group * Received Pell Grant Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental Income Group</th>
<th>Received Pell Grant</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than $50,000</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001 to $100,000</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,001 to $150,000</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,001 or More</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average family income of students receiving a Pell Grant was $34,535, while the average income for those who did not was $82,195 (Figure 12).
Academic Preparation and Involvement

Several factors were included in the analysis to measure the high school academic achievement and preparation of the cohort (Table 7). These measures, as indicated in the literature above, have been found by most researchers to have the most influence on postsecondary achievement. The first variable was Core GPA. This GPA was used as opposed to Total High School GPA. The Core GPA represents students’ grades in the core subjects of math, science, and English. The average Core GPA of students in the cohort was 3.46. The average high school rank of the cohort was 78.6. This means that the average student had a GPA that placed them better than 78.6 percent of their classmates. The average ACT was 24.8. For students submitting the SAT, scores were converted to ACT scores using the conversion chart developed by the College Board. There were 17 students who were National Merit Scholars.

Figure 12
Parental Income by Receipt of Pell Grant
Table 7
Cohort Academic Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement Indicator</th>
<th>Cohort Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core GPA</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Rank</td>
<td>78.6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; percentile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also of importance in the aforementioned literature is the number of math and science units taken by students in high school. Many researchers have found that math and science exposure contributes to academic success in college. The average number of math units taken by students in the cohort was 2.77, while the average number of science courses was 2.64 (Figure 13). The maximum number of units for both subjects was five. Less than one-tenth of the cohort (9.2%) had taken Trigonometry.

Figure 13
Cohort Math and Science Units
Advanced Placement (AP) credit was also found in the literature to have a significant effect on degree completion, although the findings were mixed among researchers. Of the 651 students in the cohort, 15.9% were given some amount of AP credit (Table 8). The average AP credit granted 6.57.

Table 8
AP Credits of Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>85.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>90.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>97.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>99.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The literature also suggested that high school involvement in extracurricular activities was an important contributor to postsecondary success. Sixty-nine percent of the cohort participated in at least one extracurricular activity in high school (Table 9).
Table 9
Extracurricular Activities of Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percent of Cohort Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Athlete</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Government</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service Organization</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Postsecondary Matriculation and Involvement

Reason for choosing university. There is not consistent data on the reasons why students chose to attend the university. However, data are available regarding whether students have alumni in their family (Figure 14). Over a quarter (27.2%) of the cohort had at least one member of their family who was an alumnus of the university studied.

Figure 14
Percent of Cohort With Alumni in Family
This has implications for the hypotheses underlying the current analysis. The basis of the study suggests that familiarity with attendance at a faith-based institution will reduce the uncertainty involved in degree attainment. Likewise, it could be argued that anticipatory socialization in the form of knowledge gained from family members who have attended the institution before them could reduce uncertainty as well, thus increasing likelihood of degree attainment.

There was also data available on how students originally indicated their interest in the institution (Table 10). Over a third (33.9%) of students originally expressed their interest in the institution via their test scores, expressing a medium interest in the institution.

### Table 10

**Prospect Codes of Cohort**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEST Scores (Medium Interest)</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Inquiry</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Visit</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEST Scores (Low Interest)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Visit</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral (Individual)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Scores (High Interest)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Visit</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Visit Referral</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Visit Referral</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996 Private Colleges Fair</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter of Inquiry</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral (Entity)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Prospects</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian College Fair</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None listed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Scores (No Intent Listed)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Visit Referral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Events</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995 Private Colleges Fair</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterson’s Site</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>651</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The means by which students first expressed their interest in the university was similar regardless of whether or not they had an alumnus in their family (Table 11). The top six methods were the same for both groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11</th>
<th>Alumni in Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Alumni in Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEST Scores (Medium)</td>
<td>TEST Scores (Medium)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Inquiry</td>
<td>Area Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Visit</td>
<td>TEST Scores (Low)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEST Scores (Low)</td>
<td>Telephone Inquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Visit</td>
<td>Campus Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral(Individual)</td>
<td>Referral(Individual)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data was also available on vocational interest. This further sheds light on students reasons for choosing the institutions. There were 55 students (8.4%) in the cohort who indicated an interest in a religious vocation when entering the university. These vocations include the ministry, church recreation, and church music composers.

**Uncertainty.** As stated in the methodology section, variables were included in the analysis in as effort to gauge uncertainty. One such variable was the declaration of a major. A little over one-quarter (30%) of the cohort entered the university as Undecided majors (Figure 15).

![Figure 15: Major at Matriculation](image-url)
Students who had attended faith-based high schools were less likely to enter the institution as Undecided (Figure 16). Over three-quarters (68.4%) of students from non-faith-based high schools entered with a declared major, while 76.8% of graduates of faith-based high schools entered with a major.

![Figure 16: Major Declaration by High School Type](image)

For students entering with a declared major, the average number of major changes was 1.14 (Figure 17). Students from faith-based high school had fewer major changes (1.09 on average) than those from non faith-based high schools (1.25 on average). This supports the hypothesis underlying the current analysis, suggesting that there is perhaps more uncertainty on the part of non faith-based high school graduates. Declaration of a major, for the purposes of the current study, is an indication of a higher level of certainty.
Extracurricular Activities. Two areas of extracurricular involvement for which data was available were participation in intercollegiate athletics and also membership in Greek letter organizations (Figure 18). Of the 651 students in the cohort, 11.8% played on an intercollegiate athletic team at the college. This does not include intramural activities. There were 328 (50.4%) students in the cohort who participated in a Greek letter organization while at the university. This does not take into account the length of time students participated in intercollegiate athletics or in Greek letter organizations, only that they held membership in these organizations at one point during their postsecondary career.
Retention and Graduation Rates

Over three-quarters (75.2%) of the cohort was retained by the university after the first semester. The first-year retention rates were higher for those students who had attended faith-based high schools (80.2% as compared to 73.7% for non faith-based high school graduates) (Figure 19).
The average university GPA at the end of the first year was 2.89. The average GPA for students attending a faith-based high school was 2.93 (as compared to a 2.76 average GPA for those who attended non-faith-based schools) (Figure 20).

![Figure 20](image.png)

**Figure 20**

1st Year GPA by High School Type

This retention and GPA data suggests that faith-based high school attendees exhibited higher academic achievement than their counterparts. This would be consistent with the theory underlying the current analysis.

One of the central findings of the current analysis deals with graduation rates. Graduation rates were higher for students attending a faith-based high school than students who did not (68.3% and 61.2% respectively) (Figure 21). This supports the main hypothesis underlying the current study. It begins to confirm the suggestion that as a result of the anticipatory socialization, students who attended a faith-based high school will be more likely than students who attended non-faith-based high schools to graduate from the faith-based college studied.
The average time to degree for the cohort was 21.97 semesters. The university calendar is structured such that five semesters equals one academic year. Thus, the cohort took an average of four years to complete their degree. This is contrary to the trends seen in higher education nationally. Most reporting agencies now measure graduation rates on six-year averages. Selingo (2001) found that:

The proportion of students taking more than six years to graduate rose to 30 percent in 1993, the most recent year for which data are available, from 25 percent in 1977. In 1993, 31 percent of undergraduates received their degrees after four years of work, down from 45 percent in 1977” (p. A22).

Students in the cohort who had attended a faith-based high school took an average of 21.75 semesters, while those who attended a non-faith-based high school took an average of 22.79 semesters (Figure 22).
Students in the cohort who had a family member who was an alumnus of the institution had lower graduation rates than those who did not (63.8% and 78.0% respectively) (Figure 23). This is contrary to the anticipated effect of having an alumnus in the family, as stated above.

Figure 22
Semesters to Degree by High School Type

Figure 23
Graduation Rates by Alumnus in Family
This could be a result of the fact that students who are related to alumni enter the institution due to familial pressure rather than a desire to attend the institution. Therefore, their commitment to the institution and their attainment of the degree could be lower than those students who chose the university on their own. To ensure this difference was not due to the fact that children of alumni were granted admission, despite lower levels of secondary school achievement, T-tests were run to compare Core GPA, ACT score, and High School Rank. No differences were found.

Graduation rates were slightly higher for students who did not express an interest in a religious vocation (Figure 24). This is contrary to the expected relationship between interest in a religious vocation and success at a faith-based postsecondary institution. It was suggested in the methodology section that such an interest could likely result in an increased desire for persistence.

![Figure 24](image_url)  
Graduation Rates by Interest in Religious Vocation
Hypothesis 1

The first hypothesis of the current study stated: *Students who are already socialized within a faith-based learning institution will be more likely to persist at a faith-based postsecondary institution that those educated in non faith-based institutions.*

To test this hypothesis, and examine whether or not attendance at a faith-based secondary institution was significant in predicting graduation from a faith-based postsecondary institution, a logistic regression was performed. The Enter Method was utilized. Due to diagnostic tests some adjustments were made to the original proposed model detailed in the Methodology section. The correlation between ACT Test Score and Core GPA was .515 and significant at the $p<.001$ level (Table 12). Thus, ACT Test Score was excluded from the model due to potential problems with multicollinearity.

**Table 12**
Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COREGPA</th>
<th>ACTTEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COREGPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.515(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTTEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.515(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

Rank was also excluded due to high correlation with Core GPA (Table 13).
Year 1 GPA was also found to be highly correlated with Core GPA (Table 14). This core GPA was determined to be a good indicator of Year 1 GPA and the latter was dropped from the model.

In addition, National Merit was also excluded due to the fact that there were only 17 students in the cohort who were National Merit finalists. This small “n” does not allow for strong predictive power of the variable. The final regression formula was as follows:
DVGRAD = Constant + BAPT(1) + GENDER(1) + COREGPA + MATHTOT + SCITOT + APTOTAL + EXTRACUR + GREEK(1) + SUATH(1) + UNDECIDE(1) + MJRCHNG + PELLYES(1) + HSSIZE + ALUMFAM(1) + WHITE(1) + TRIG(1) + PTTERM + DORMSEM + FBHIGH(1) + PUBLIC(1) + RELVOC(1)

When run, the model was statistically significant at the p<.001 (Table 15).

Table 15
Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step</td>
<td>296.325</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block</td>
<td>296.325</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>296.325</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The model also showed strong predictive capability in correctly predicting 93% of graduations and 77% of attritions (Table 16). Overall, the model was 88% correct in predictions. This suggests a large increase over simply estimating the percent of students who graduate to be 67% (the outcome with the greatest likelihood).

Table 16
Classification Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Predicted</th>
<th>Percentage Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cut value is .500

With regard to the variance explained by the model, the Nagelkerke R Square was .638 (Table 17). This means that over 63% of the variance in graduation rates was
explained by the model developed. While this is fairly high, it suggests there are still other factors not included in the current model that affect retention.

Table 17
Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-2 Log likelihood</th>
<th>Cox &amp; Snell R Square</th>
<th>Nagelkerke R Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>316.535</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>.638</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant variables (p<.05) in the model were: GENDER, COREGPA, EXTRACUR, ALUMFAM, DORMSEM, and FBHIGH (Table 18).

Table 18
Variables in the Equation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables in the Equation</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baptist(1)</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>1.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender(1)</td>
<td>-.755</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>4.980</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core GPS</td>
<td>1.234</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>6.612</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>3.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Credits</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td>1.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Credits</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.943</td>
<td>.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Total</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>1.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extracurricular</td>
<td>-.432</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>4.494</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek(1)</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td>1.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Athlete(1)</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>1.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided(1)</td>
<td>-.493</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>1.945</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Change</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>1.875</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>1.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Pell(1)</td>
<td>-.320</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Size</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alum in Family(1)</td>
<td>-1.015</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>8.331</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White(1)</td>
<td>-.449</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trigonometry(1)</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>.467</td>
<td>1.640</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>1.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Terms</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>2.802</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>1.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semesters in Dorm</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>111.308</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>2.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith-based High(1)</td>
<td>1.305</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>7.276</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>3.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public High(1)</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in Religious Vocation(1)</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td>1.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-6.912</td>
<td>1.974</td>
<td>12.255</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The primary independent variable of interest FBHIGH was statistically significant with a positive relationship with the probability of degree completion. This means that attendance at a faith-based secondary school was statistically significant in predicting graduation from the faith-based postsecondary institution examined. Odds Ratios (Exp(B)) were interpreted in order to allow for predictive statements to be made regarding the variables found to be significant. Holding all other variables constant, students who attended a faith-based high school were 3.7 times as likely to graduate than those who attended a non-faith-based high school. This lends support to the anticipatory socialization theory underlying this analysis.

Gender was also significant, with being male decreasing the probability of degree completion. Being a male student decreased the likelihood of degree attainment. Men were 53% less likely than women to graduate.

Core GPA was also significant, which is consistent with the findings of previous researchers discussed in the literature review above. With regard to Core GPA, for every 1 point increase in GPA, the likelihood of graduating increased 3.4 times. The average Core GPA of graduates was 3.51 as compared to a 3.36 average Core GPA for non-graduate (Figure 25).

![Bar Chart: Average Core GPA by Graduation Outcome](image-url)

**Figure 25**

*Average Core GPA by Graduation Outcome*
Secondary school extracurricular activity actually decreased the likelihood of degree attainment. Extracurricular Activities was found to be significant. However, it had a negative affect on the likelihood of attainment of a baccalaureate degree. This finding is contradictory to much of the research discussed above. For every additional extracurricular activity that students were involved in while in high school, their likelihood of degree attainment decreased by 35%.

Semesters Living in Dorm also had a positive affect on the probability of degree completion. This supports the proposition stated earlier, that living on campus contributes to students’ feelings of community and eases the socialization process. Living in the dorm while enrolled increased the likelihood of degree attainment for students in the cohort. For every additional semester living in the dorm, the likelihood of degree attainment increased by a factor of 2.1.

Having a relative who was an alumnus of the institution studied also decreased the likelihood of degree attainment. Holding all other variables constant, students who had an alumnus in their family showed a 64% decrease in their likelihood of degree attainment.

**The Role of Cost.** As mentioned in the methodology section, several variables were included in the model to rule out alternative hypotheses for exit from the university studied. The first alternative hypothesis that might be argued is that students who leave the university examined did so due to financial reasons. Private universities have higher tuition than do public schools, thus financial hardship could play a role. This alternative hypothesis becomes null when examining the data. The model run shows that receiving a Pell Grant (an indicator of need for the current analyses) was not statistically significant in predicting degree completion. Secondly, students who received Pell Grants had higher graduation rates than those who did not (72.9% and 65.4% respectively) (Table 19).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduated</th>
<th>Received Pell Grant</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Graduated</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Received Pell Grant</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Graduated</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Received Pell Grant</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For those students who had parental income data available, the graduation rates for students whose family income was less than $50,000 was the same as those whose family income was over $150,000 (63.6% and 63.2% respectively) (Table 20).
Hypothesis 2

The second hypothesis underlying the current study suggests:

_Students who are already socialized within a faith-based learning institution and whom exit the faith-based university studied, are more likely to exit after the first year, while those who attended non faith-based high schools will exit during the first year._

Student records of those who did not complete their degree at the university studied, were examined in order to determine if they dropped out during their first year. It is during this time that the hypothesis suggests socialization will be more difficult for students who did not attend a faith-based secondary school. Of the students who were not retained who had attended a non faith-based high school, a higher percentage dropped out during their first year as compared to students who attended a faith-based secondary institution. Of students who attended a faith-based high school and did not persist at the university, 61.4% left during their first year as compared to 67.8% of the non-persisters who had attended a non faith-based high school (Table 26).

![Drop in Year One by High School Type](image)

**Figure 26**
Drop in Year One by High School Type
The role of academic performance. Academic preparation, as measured via the ACT and High School Core GPA, were nearly identical for students who dropped out in year one and those who dropped out later in their career (Table 21).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 21</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COREGPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropped after year one</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropped in year one</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The model developed to examine Hypotheses 2 was similar to that developed to examine Hypotheses 1, with two exceptions. First, Year 1 GPA was included in order to gauge the academic performance during the first year. It might be argued by some that early academic performance would be the likely contributor to whether a student drops out in their first year. Due to its aforementioned correlation with Core GPA, the latter was dropped from the model. The average First Year GPA of students who dropped out in their first year was lower than those who dropped after year one (Table 22).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 22</th>
<th>Group Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 1 GPA</td>
<td>Dropped in year one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dropped after year one</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While the difference was not statistically significant (Table 23), it was still included in the model for theoretical purposes.

### Table 23

**Independent Samples Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 1 GPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>12.738</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-1.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-1.614</td>
<td>210.169</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MJRCHNG was adjusted in the second model so that rather than being the number of times a student changed their major, it was if a student changed their major in their first term. Finally, DORMSEM was dropped from the model due to the fact that all students are required to live in the dorms their first year.

The final regression model was:

\[
\text{DROPGRUP} = \text{Constant} + \text{BAPT(1)} + \text{GENDER(1)} + \text{MATHTOT} + \text{SCITOT} + \text{APTOTAL} + \text{EXTRACUR} + \text{GREEK(1)} + \text{SUATH(1)} + \text{UNDECIDE(1)} + \text{MJRCHNG(1)} + \text{PELYYES(1)} + \text{HSSIZE} + \text{ALUMFAM(1)} + \text{WHITE(1)} + \text{TRIG(1)} + \text{PTTERM} + \text{FBHIGH(1)} + \text{PUBLIC(1)} + \text{RELVOC(1)} + \text{YEAR1GPA}
\]

The model was significant at the \(p<.001\) level (Table 24).
The model explained a little over a third of the variation seen in likelihood of dropouts leaving during their first year ($R^2=.372$) (Table 25).

The model did fairly well in predicting whether or not a drop-out would exit during their first year (Table 26). It correctly predicted 87% of drop-outs in the first year. This suggests a large increase over simply estimating the percent of students who drop in year one to be 64% (the outcome with the greatest likelihood). It was less accurate (63%) in predicting drop-outs after year one.

The cut value is .500
The variables found to be significant (p. < .05) in the model were: GREEK, MJRCHNG, ALUMFAM, PTTERM, and FBHIGH (Table 27).

Table 27
Variables in the Equation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baptist(1)</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.702</td>
<td>1.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender(1)</td>
<td>-.160</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Credits</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>1.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Credits</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td>1.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Total</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.961</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>1.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extracurricular</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>1.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek(1)</td>
<td>1.239</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>6.544</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>3.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Athlete(1)</td>
<td>1.531</td>
<td>.867</td>
<td>3.117</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>4.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided(1)</td>
<td>-.848</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>2.929</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Change(1)</td>
<td>-.816</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>9.226</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Pell(1)</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>1.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Size</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>2.809</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>1.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alum in Family(1)</td>
<td>-1.004</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>3.885</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White(1)</td>
<td>-.620</td>
<td>.859</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trigonometry</td>
<td>-1.129</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>2.896</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Terms</td>
<td>-.774</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>5.083</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith-based High(1)</td>
<td>-1.716</td>
<td>.758</td>
<td>5.130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public High(1)</td>
<td>-.292</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.594</td>
<td>.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in Religious Vocation(1)</td>
<td>1.201</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>3.110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>3.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1 GPA</td>
<td>-.383</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>1.718</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.562</td>
<td>2.594</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variable of primary interest in the model (FBHIGH) had a significant and negative relationship to dropping out in the first year. Dropouts who had attended a faith-based high school were .18 times as likely as those who did not to drop out during their first year. This supports the relationship underlying Hypothesis 2.

Dropouts who had been in a Greek organization while at the university were 3.5 times more likely than those who had not to drop out during the first year. This is
contrary to notion that students in Greek letter organizations would develop a stronger sense of belonging during their first year, thus if they dropped out it would likely be later in their college career.

Changing one’s major during the first term had a negative affect on the likelihood of dropping out during the first year. Drop outs who changed their major during their first term were 56% less likely than those who did not to drop out later in their time at the university.

Having an alumnus in the family also decreased the likelihood that drop out would occur during the first year. Drop outs who had an alumnus in their family were .37 times as likely as those who did not to drop out during their first term. This could be due to family pressure to remain enrolled. This pressure could make students with alumni in their family persist longer before eventually leaving the university.

**Hypothesis 3**

The third and final hypothesis guiding the current study suggests:

*Students who exit the faith-based postsecondary organization who are socialized within a non faith-based secondary institution will be more likely to subsequently enroll in a non faith-based postsecondary institution*

The National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) had transfer records on 111 of the drop outs. The degree program in which students had enrolled was not available: only whether or not the student had enrolled in another college. Of these students, 79.3% transferred to institutions in their home state. Eighty-five percent of the transfer records were to public institutions. Of the drop-outs who were later tracked to another institution, 83% of those who had attended a non faith-based high school transferred to a public university, while 12% transferred to another faith-based university (Table 28). This percentage was similar to that of students who had attended a faith-based high school.
Differences in transfer type were apparent when looking at high school size (Table 29). For students who graduated from high school in a class of less than 250 students, 78% transferred to a public university, while 100% of all students who came from high schools with graduating classes of more than 500 transferred to public institutions. It is important to note, that 99% of all graduates from faith-based high schools came from classes of fewer than 250 seniors.
The correlation between the size of a transfer’s high school and the size of their transfer school was very low, with a Pearson Correlation of .138 (Table 30).

### Table 30
Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer School Size</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School Size</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average transfer institution size was 14,575 for students from high school graduating classes of less than 250, while the average transfer institution size of students from high school graduating classes of 1,000 or more students was 14,497 (Table 31).

### Table 31
Transfer Institution Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School Class Size</th>
<th>Transfer School Mean Size</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 250</td>
<td>14575.24</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10707.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251 to 500</td>
<td>16795.20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12018.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 to 750</td>
<td>20692.80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9352.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751 to 1000</td>
<td>13483.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 or More</td>
<td>14497.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15830.72</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>10893.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The role of academics.** Students who transferred to Faith-based institutions exhibited stronger secondary academic characteristics, as exhibited by Core GPA and
ACT, than students who transferred to private, non-faith-based or public institutions (Table 32). However, students who transferred to private non-faith-based institutions showed higher academic achievement in their first year before transferring. These students first year GPA was 3.18, as compared to a 2.57 average first year GPA for students who transferred to another faith-based institution and 2.23 for students who transferred to public institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer Control</th>
<th>COREGPA</th>
<th>ACTTEST</th>
<th>YEAR1GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faith-based Mean</td>
<td>3.6327</td>
<td>25.91</td>
<td>2.5685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.31677</td>
<td>3.081</td>
<td>1.07289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private, Non-Faith-based Mean</td>
<td>3.3217</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>3.1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.54216</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>.39267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Mean</td>
<td>3.3341</td>
<td>24.13</td>
<td>2.2304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.53038</td>
<td>3.163</td>
<td>1.16860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The role of cost. Some might argue, as with Hypothesis 1, that a primary reason a student would leave the faith-based institution of focus, and transfer to a public institution is due to cost. However, a nearly identical percentage of students who received Pell Grants transferred to public institutions as those who did not receive Pell Grants (83.3% and 84.8% respectively) (Table 33).
Table 33
Received Pell Grant * Transfer School Control Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Received Pell Grant</th>
<th>Transfer School Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faith-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For those who had available parental income data, 78.6% of those with family incomes of less than $50,000 transferred to public institutions while 93.5% of those with family incomes of between $50,000 and $100,000 transferred to public institutions (Figure 27).

Figure 27
Percent of Drop-outs Found Who Transferred to a Public University by Parental Income
Model results. The model run to examine what factors affected the likelihood of transfer to a public institution was:

\[ \text{TRANNONF} = \text{Constant} + \text{NONFAITH}(1) + \text{COREGPA} + \text{APTOTAL} + \text{MATHTOT} + \text{SCITOT} + \text{YEAR1GPA} + \text{PELYES}(1) + \text{HSSIZE} \]

Interest in religious vocation, which was originally included, was removed from the model since all transfers who indicated such an interest transferred to a public institution.

Indication of interest in a religious vocation had no impact on the choice of transfer school type, with all transfers that had indicated such an interest transferring to public institutions (Table 34).

| Table 34 |
|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| **Interest in Religious Vocation by Transfer School Control Crosstabulation** |
| | Transfer School Control |
| | Faith-based | Private | Public |
| Expressed Interest in Religious Vocation | No | Count | % within RELVOC | 11 | 6 | 87 |
| | % within RELVOC | 10.6% | 5.8% | 83.7% |
| | Yes | Count | % within RELVOC | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| | % within RELVOC | .0% | .0% | 100.0% |

The model developed was not significant at the p<.05 level (Table 35).

| Table 35 |
|------------------|-------------------|
| **Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients** |
| Chi-square | df | Sig. |
| 16.008 | 8 | .067 |
The model only explained 34% of the variance found in the dependent variable (Table 36).

### Table 36
**Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-2 Log likelihood</th>
<th>Cox &amp; Snell R Square</th>
<th>Nagelkerke R Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44.802</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the model had a fairly high prediction level overall, it performed poorly when predicting students who would transfer to faith-based colleges (Table 37). This is likely due to the small percentage of students found who ended up transferring to faith-based institutions. The model does, however, have higher prediction rate than simply estimating the percent of students who transfer to a non-faith based school to be 88% (the outcome with the greatest likelihood).

### Table 37
**Classification Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Predicted</th>
<th>Percentage Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer to Non-faith College</td>
<td>Transfer to Faith-Based College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Faith-Based College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Non-Faith College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Percentage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cut value is .500
Two of the variables were significant: NONFAITH and HSSIZE (Table 38).

Attendance at a Non Faith-based high school decreased the likelihood of attendance at a public transfer university by 10%. This is contrary to the hypothesis underlying the model. Every person increase in graduating class size increased the likelihood of transferring to a public institution by one percentage point.

### Table 38
**Variables in the Equation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-faith High (1)</td>
<td>-2.407</td>
<td>1.087</td>
<td>4.903</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core GPA</td>
<td>-1.326</td>
<td>1.057</td>
<td>1.574</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Total</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>1.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Credits</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>2.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Credits</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.944</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.905</td>
<td>1.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1 GPA</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>1.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Pell(1)</td>
<td>-.182</td>
<td>1.225</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td>.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Size</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>5.710</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>1.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.598</td>
<td>4.419</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>13.439</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND FUTURE ANALYSES

Faith-based Secondary Enrollment as a Form of Anticipatory Socialization

Findings from the current analysis suggest a strong socialization theory of university enrollment and success. Through the three hypotheses tested in this analysis, the case appears quite strong that faith-based secondary enrollment serves as a mechanism of anticipatory socialization for subsequent enrollment in a faith-based university. Such socialization has an effect on if a student will persist and also, if they do not, when they will exit the institution.

The study found that high school core GPA and living on campus increased the likelihood of degree attainment at a faith-based college. Being male, having an alumnus of the institution in the family, and participation in multiple extracurricular activities in high school decreased the likelihood of graduation from the institution studied. The finding related to extracurricular involvement runs counter to most findings from previous researchers, and thus deserves future exploration. The finding related to the effect of having an alumnus in the family is a new one not found in the literature review forming the basis for this study. This too warrants future analysis and perhaps should extend beyond the issue of alumni relation of persistence, but also explore the effect of alumni relation on initial university choice.

Most importantly for the theory underlying this analysis, attendance at a faith-based high school increased likelihood of degree attainment from the institution studied. Students from faith-based secondary institutions showed less uncertainty than their
peers after enrollment, as measured by declaration of a major and changes in chosen major. Graduates of faith-based high schools also exhibited higher levels of academic achievement their first year as shown by their first year GPA.

The profile of persisters that emerges is as follows (Table 39):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dropped-out</th>
<th>Persisted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core GPA</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Composite</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Rank</td>
<td>75th percentile</td>
<td>81st percentile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Math Units</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Science Units</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Total</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>$70,970</td>
<td>$68,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen Year GPA</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Type</td>
<td>31.7% of Faith-based high school graduates dropped-out compared to 38.8% of Non Faith-based high school graduates</td>
<td>68.3% of Faith-based high school graduates persisted as opposed to 61.2% of public high school graduates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beyond providing a model for persistence at the university studied, the current analysis utilizes Tinto’s stages of student integration to suggest that anticipatory socialization is most crucial during the first year of enrollment. The following profile of drop-time emerges (Table 40).
Table 40
Drop-out Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dropped-out During Year 1</th>
<th>Dropped-out After Year 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core GPA</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Composite</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Rank</td>
<td>74&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; percentile</td>
<td>75&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; percentile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Math Units</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Science Units</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Total</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>$67,737</td>
<td>$77,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen Year GPA</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61.4% of drop-outs who attended a Faith-based high school dropped-out <strong>during</strong> year 1 compared to 67.8% of Non Faith-based high school graduates who left the university</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.6% of drop-outs who attended a Faith-based high school dropped-out <strong>after</strong> year 1 compared to 32.2% of Non Faith-based high school graduates who left the university</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The model suggests that students who leave the university are more likely to exit during their first year if they did not attend a faith-based high school. This higher drop-out rate is evidenced during Tinto’s stages of separation and transition. The study
found that joining a Greek letter organization, changing one’s major during the first year, and being enrolled part-time increased the likelihood of drop-out during the first year. Drop-outs who had an alumnus in their family were less likely to exit during the first year. Having attended a faith-based high school as a mechanism of anticipatory socialization, decreased the likelihood of drop out during the first year. This supports the proposition that once students finish the Transition phase and enter the Incorporation phase that the factors affecting drop-out will be similar for students regardless of type of high school attended.

Transfer and Finding a Fit

The anticipatory socialization model that fit so well to attrition patterns of students at a faith-based university was also applied to the subsequent enrollment of drop-outs. The theory followed that students who had attended non faith-based high schools and left the university studied, would subsequently enroll in non faith-based postsecondary institutions where they would find a better fit based on their non faith-based secondary experience. This suggests a rational choice based decision process, by which students will seek out postsecondary institutions that best match their own secondary socialization experiences.

The vast majority of drop-outs subsequently enrolled in public institutions in their home state. Some might argue that this is due to the fact that public institutions are more readily available that private institutions. According to the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU), 80% of the nation’s population lives within 50 miles of a private university. However, without the benefit of survey data related to reason for enrolling in institution in home state it is impossible to know whether this was due to the desire to return home or whether it was simply that students had returned to their home state and enrolled while deciding where to go next.

The profile based on transfer institution type is as follows (Table 41):
The analysis found that attendance at a non faith-based high school and high school size were the two factors found to be significant in the likelihood of transferring to a non faith-based university. While non faith-based high school graduates were more likely to transfer to non faith-based universities, the vast majority of faith-based high school graduates transferred to non faith-based universities as well. This model, however, did not have the level of statistical significance found in the previous models. In addition, there was a lot of variance in transfer school type that was not explained by the variables included. This area warrants further study.
Limitations of Current Analysis

The limitations of the current analysis fall into three categories.

Student Perceived Adaptation

One factor missing from the current analysis is the adaptation perspective of the students themselves. A future longitudinal analysis is proposed to track the Fall 2004 entering first-time in college freshmen cohort at the same faith-based institution at the center of the current study. The Anticipated Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (ASACQ) will be administered to students prior to entering the institution. This test gauges the students’ anticipated ability to adjust academically and socially. Differences in results between those attending a faith-based secondary institution and those attending a public secondary institution will be examined. During the end of the sophomore year, the students will be given the Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (SACQ) to gauge actual adaptation to college. This will correspond to Tinto’s Transition Stage. Differences will again be analyzed between those attending faith-based secondary schools and those attending public secondary schools. Finally, after six years, the methodology underlying the current analysis will be duplicated and assessed in light of the findings from both the ASACQ and the SACQ.

Ethnographic Study

Future exploration of this topic also lends itself to ethnographic study. Harris and Johnson (2000) described ethnography as a written description of a particular culture – the customs, beliefs, and behavior – based on information collected through fieldwork. This will allow for the identification the specific cultural elements, norms, and cues that are exhibited in the culture. These items can not be captured through the traditional quantitative analyses found in the current study. This will further direct the specific areas where retention efforts can be maximized.
Subsequent Enrollment

The model developed to examine the subsequent enrollment of students who did not persist, did not perform well in predicting subsequent enrollment in faith-based institutions. The variance explained by the model was also fairly low. This warrants future examination. Survey analysis of drop-outs who are later found enrolled in other institutions could assist in identifying the reasons they chose enrollment a particular institutional type. One area that the current analysis could not capture would be availability of a certain major at another institution.

Theoretical Implications

While the current methodology is based on a case study design, the hypotheses underlying the current analysis lend themselves to the development of several comparative research designs. The uniqueness of the current analysis is its application of the notion of anticipatory socialization. This same concept of the congruence between the secondary and postsecondary experience can be applied to several socialization environments. While the current analysis focused on the faith element of the socialization environment, university control, size, mission, Carnegie classification, research focus, teaching focus, setting (urban/rural), and the percentage of commuter students are all possible environmental elements that contribute to the socialization experience. Each of these elements could be examined and findings could be invaluable to better understanding of student retention. A design that incorporates a large national or regional population that crosses universities and types, or a comparative design examining the entire freshmen population of a few chosen institutions are both possibilities.

Organizational Studies in Education

The current analysis provides insight into why individuals leave organizations via an anticipatory socialization lens. Most focus in organizational studies has been on the socialization process and the role of anticipatory socialization as a means to
understand one’s role. Anticipatory socialization has not frequently been incorporated into the literature on organizational exit. The current findings help to fill in this gap, by suggesting anticipatory socialization as a means to prevent exit.

**Retention Literature**

The current study goes beyond simply offering a list of variables that are significant in university retention. Rather, it offers a model for university socialization central to understanding university retention. It expands upon previous studies that have attempted to offer such a socialization model for retention, such as Pascarella, Terenzini, and Wolfe (1986) who examined the role that orientation programs, as a means of anticipatory socialization, played on first year retention. These authors worked with a limited sample (who were self-selected as orientation participants) and examined a socialization process that spanned only a two-day orientation session. The authors state that their study was limited by the “rather short period of time (one academic year) over which the sample was followed” (p. 172). The socialization model offered in the current analysis extends beyond the freshmen year to offer insight into what socialization factors affect attrition at different stages during the postsecondary career and also how socialization affects the subsequent enrollments of non-persisters. This final area is one that had not been previously explored in the literature.

**Empirical Policy Study Implications**

**Enrollment Management and Recruitment**

The first policy area for which the findings of the current analysis could prove useful is the area of recruitment and enrollment management. Dennis (1998) defined enrollment management as the process of forecasting trends that will affect higher education and, in turn, planning for the future. Donhardt (1995) suggested that enrollment management influences the entire enrollment spectrum from recruitment through graduation. Dennis stated that enrollment management involves:
1. Knowing what makes students enroll;
2. Understanding the relationship between students who withdraw and those who persist;
3. Knowing how students pay for their education;
4. Strategically preparing to meet the future and financial needs of a school; and
5. Linking enrollment management with retention management

Findings from the current study suggest that increasing recruitment efforts in faith-based high schools could help maximize retention levels at faith-based universities. Also, publications describing the college should state explicitly about its faith-based mission and how that is interwoven into the curriculum.

**Retention Programs**

Pascarella, Terenzini, and Wolfe (1986) suggested the notion of an extensive orientation as a means of anticipatory socialization to increase retention. The current analysis also offers retention program policy alternatives, while addressing the aforementioned shortcomings of the Pascarella, et al. study. There will, of course, always be students from non faith-based secondary institutions who choose to attend a faith-based private university. The findings of the current analysis could serve to guide the development of retention programs during the first year aimed specifically at students who attended such high schools. These programs could lend the support necessary as students begin the socialization process and face uncertainty based on their pre-conceived notion of the environment. Mentoring or pairing with students who attended faith-based high schools could also provide support for non faith-based high school graduates as they acclimate.

**Voucher Programs and Tax Incentives**

The findings of the current research also have potential implications for state K-12 voucher programs policies. Several states have such voucher programs in place. Students are given state monies to transfer to private institutions, many of which are faith-based, participating in the state program. As an alternative to the voucher notion, which has caused much controversy, several states have introduced tax credits. States,
including, Arizona, Florida and Pennsylvania have enacted legislation providing tax credits to individuals who contribute to private school tuition scholarship organizations (Manzi and Larson, 2001).

Some programs require allowing voucher students to opt out of required religious activities in the school. A 1998 national survey of private and religious school groups showed that officials were unwilling to accept public funds for voucher programs if they were forced to permit exemptions from religious instruction or activities. The survey, conducted by the U.S. Department of Education, revealed that 66% of school officials would not participate in such programs.

Much of the research in this area has focused on the role of competition and improvement of education and also the subsequent academic performance of students who utilize vouchers. Chubb and Moe (1990) argued that introducing market mechanisms into public education would improve efficiency and quality. Research has also shown that in many cases, voucher students leave their private transfer school before they graduate. The Milwaukee voucher program, in its fifth year of existence, had a student attrition rate of 28 percent (Witte, et. Al., 1995). As of 1999, over 6,300 low-income students were using the voucher program (Loconte, 1999). They were attending primarily Catholic, Protestant, and Islamic schools. Officials say they know of no students being excused from religious activities. However, even if students are excused, it is hard to quantify all the means by which faith enter the daily educational activities in parochial or faith-based schools.

While several analyses have looked at voucher programs, none have explored elements of the socialization involved in such programs. The findings of the current analysis could prove useful in this area. The same theories underlying the socialization problems that non faith-based high school students experience in attendance at faith-based universities, could also be tested when looking at transfer of non faith-based K-12 students to faith-based elementary or secondary schools. Study findings could also be applied to the effect that attendance at a faith-based secondary school, due to receipt of a
voucher, has on postsecondary attendance plans. Does it increase students’ likelihood of choosing a faith-based university?

**State Grant Money for Attendance at Private Institutions**

Findings also are relevant to the issue of states using public monies to provide grants for state residents to attend private postsecondary institutions. According to the Institute for Higher Education Policy (2002):

The states differ in how they use student aid to enable student “choice” to attend private, non-profit, or proprietary institutions. The majority of states maintain comprehensive programs that are accessible to students in both public and private institutions, and then provide higher awards to students in independent institutions through cost-based means of measuring student need, and/or through tuition-sensitive award formulae. Costs are managed in the programs by capping award maximums, typically through limits in the annual appropriations bill. Both California and New Jersey set their maximum awards for students in private institutions at a level that approximates the average cost that the state would otherwise pay to subsidize students in a public four-year institution. (p. 12)

Several states, including Florida, have merit scholarship programs that students can use for attendance at public or private institutions. Those choosing to attend private institutions receive scholarships that cover part of the tuition costs. Virginia, Florida, and Alabama also have resident access grant programs designed to provide grants to state resident students who opt to attend a private institution in their state. These programs have been viewed to provide access, while keeping residents in the state.

Findings from the current study are applicable to such programs in that monies are provided by the state without regard to the unique socialization elements involved in attendance at private faith-based institutions. Most analyses of such programs have
focused solely on monetary costs of programs and the role such programs play in keeping talented students in the state for their postsecondary education. Such socialization issues that lead to lower retention rates at faith-based private institutions could be explored for incorporation into program reviews examining grant programs.

**Future Questions**

Several questions for future exploration emerge from the findings of the current study.

**Perpetuating Cultural Norms**

Do organizations rely upon different forms of anticipatory socialization in an effort to exclude certain individuals and perpetuate cultural norms?

Stout and Cormode (1998) defined the institution as “an embedded social structure of rules and hierarchies created to embody and perpetuate a set of cultural norms and values among its members” (p. 64). Several researchers have examined the perpetuation of cultural norms in organizations. Findings from the current research could be utilized when examining organizational polices to assess which, if any, could be exclusionary in nature. Specifically if these policies prevent socialization opportunities for those not already experiencing a form of anticipatory socialization.

**Implied Contracts**

Is anticipatory socialization more important when entering into implied contracts, where expectations are not explicitly stated and uncertainty is higher, as opposed to explicit contracts where the expectations of both parties are more certain?

The notion of the “Implied Contract” is one that had been explored in the literature examining the current state of the student-university relationship. This concept was also articulated in the literature exploring the “psychological” contract, which is that that exists between an individual and the organization to which they belong. The current analysis explored the role of anticipatory socialization and
uncertainty when entering into organizations. However, it lends itself to future examination of how the importance or effect of anticipatory socialization might differ when entering into implied contract as opposed to explicit ones. The impact of such research would extend beyond the higher education literature, and be pertinent to several areas of organizational study.

**Homogeneity**

Is anticipatory socialization more important when entering into contracts in which the environment is extremely homogenous?

Many such studies have arisen from the fact that voluntary groups are largely homogeneous in composition (Popielarz and McPherson 1995). McGavran (1970) explored this concept when examining church membership. The Homogeneous Unit Principal (HUP) is an outgrowth of this work and suggests that individuals will join churches in which they see consistency with their own culture. McGavran stated that "It takes no great acumen to see that when marked differences of color, stature, income, cleanliness, and education are present, men understand the gospel better when expounded by their own kind of people. They prefer to join churches whose members look, talk, and act like themselves" (1980, p. 227). This notion of anticipatory socialization could prove even more important for individuals who do not fit the social, demographic, or cultural norms of largely homogeneous groups.

**Faith-based Postsecondary Students Attending Public Universities**

Replication of the current analysis in a public institution of higher education would allow for testing of the role of anticipatory socialization further. Differences in persistence of students in a public university based on their type of secondary institution could provide an even more comprehensive model of postsecondary socialization. Furthermore, findings from such studies could strengthen retention programs at public universities aimed at students who are experiencing difficulty socializing. This would also prove applicable in light of the increased accountability measures placed on public universities by state legislatures who demand increased retention and graduation rates in return for state funds.
APPENDIX A

MCPVV STATEMENT OF UNIVERSITY STUDIED
MCPVV Statement of XYZ University

(University name has been changed for anonymity)

FOUNDATIONAL STATEMENTS

“At all levels of activity, everyone must be pulling together. We must share basic understandings among all operational units. True constancy of purpose is achieved by reaching reasonable commonality concerning mission, customers, critical processes, values, vision.”

MISSION

“Mission identifies the raison d'etre of an organization, the irreducible value that it contributes to its internal and external constituencies. It defines the difference the organization is determined to make. With no frills, it articulates its distinctive character. Here is our mission statement

The mission of XYZ University is to nurture persons, offering learning experiences and relationships within a Christian community, so that each participant may develop personal empowerment, academic/career competency, social/civic responsibility, ethical and spiritual strength; and continuously to improve the effectiveness of the community.”

CUSTOMERS

“The customers of XYZ University are those persons who transact with the University; those who may transact with the University; those who benefit from the opportunities XYZ offers; those who have a personal interest or involvement in XYZ; and those who have the capacity or potential to affect XYZ or to be affected by XYZ.

The primary customers of XYZ University are currently enrolled students. Among other customers are: students’ families; prospective students; faculty and staff employees, retirees, and former employees; Alabama Baptists; Southern Baptists; Christian community; alumni; contributors, vendors and suppliers; and potential employers and graduate/professional schools.”
CRITICAL PROCESSES

“Critical processes are those operating, cross-functional processes essential to an effective working relationship with the primary customers of an institution, and to fulfillment of the mission. They define activities which must be continuously improved if quality is to be optimized throughout the organization.

The critical processes of XYZ University follow.”

CRITICAL PROCESSES Learning - “Design and implement formal and informal programs that provide information, insight, and integration of knowledge and practice, supplementing classroom and work experiences with campus involvements that nurture the physical, intellectual, emotional, social, vocational and spiritual capacities of each person, and increase international awareness.”

CRITICAL PROCESSES Planning - “Assess strengths and weaknesses, identify emerging needs and opportunities, eliminate what is no longer needed. Devise strategies to optimize the deployment of available resources in meeting the highest priorities of the institution.”

CRITICAL PROCESSES Enrolling – “Identify, attract, recruit and retain students likely to contribute most to the community, and to benefit most from XYZ’s distinctive educational process, meeting their needs for guided instruction; personal support; financial assistance; academic, social and spiritual advising; career guidance; and vocational placement.”

CRITICAL PROCESSES Staffing - “Identify, attract and employ faculty and staff academically qualified, personally suited to offer effective instruction or other service congruent with the mission of this University. Be responsive to the material, personal, social and spiritual needs of the community. Sustain the educational enterprise and each person with needed administrative, technical and support services in ways that affirm the values of this University and fulfill its mission.”

CRITICAL PROCESSES Funding - “Establish and cultivate relationships that will yield human and material resources. Assemble, manage and deploy the
fiscal resources necessary to defray current and capital costs of University operations. Maintain an unimpeachable process of fund accounting, a prudent investment of assets, and a cost-conscious preservation of the aesthetics and utility of the physical campus.”

CRITICAL PROCESSES Living - “Plan and manage a responsive campus environment in which beauty and usefulness support the learning process. Provide safe, secure and hospitable residential quarters. Offer necessary support services to meet physical, social, spiritual and personal needs of the community. Encourage wholesome, nutritious and appealing dining. Demonstrate ecological awareness and responsibility. Encourage wholeness and health, and the following of Christian standards in corporate and personal endeavors.”

CRITICAL PROCESSES Marketing - “Provide an accurate, comprehensive and appealing interpretation of XYZ to its public to bolster the pride of the community, to enhance the reputation of the University, to stimulate additional customers to support its mission and to increase public awareness of the value of its services.”

CRITICAL PROCESSES Complying - “Identify every educational, denominational and governmental agency whose approval is necessary or desirable. Understand the criteria and regulations by which each accredits, certifies and approves. Meet or exceed such standards in all areas of University life, or decline to do so as a justifiable act of deliberate choice.”

VALUE STANDARDS

“Operational beliefs, tested over many years, provide dependable norms for organizational behavior. These non-negotiable convictions are essential to its integrity and expressive of its mission. As a Christian community of learners, XYZ University holds dear:

- belief in God as Creator and in the traditions of the Christian faith
- the ministry and mission of the church
- the infinite worth of persons and the development of the full potential of each person at every stage in life, and 'love of neighbor as one's self'
- the making of ethical choices based on the life of Jesus Christ, the teachings of the Bible, the well-being of others and an informed conscience
- openness, truthfulness, justice and fairness among persons of both sexes, all races and ethnic identities, all ages and all levels of giftedness; and respect for opinions, convictions and beliefs different from one’s own
- the aspiration for personal achievement, economic self sufficiency and public usefulness
- a work ethic characterized by diligence, honesty, thrift and a sincere effort to do one’s best
- civic awareness and responsibility, the processes of representative government, understanding of other cultures, and sensitivity to other people, places and systems
- service to community and constituency, within the University and the wider society”

This Values Standard underlies the Code of Values Held by Students and Employees

STUDENT CODE OF VALUES

Preamble We as the XYZ University community affirm the value of a peaceful and purposeful community, founded on the moral and ethical integrity of students and faculty. We commit ourselves to the Christian values on which XYZ University was founded. We expect that our commitment to mutual responsibility and a spirit of cooperation will create a community that is orderly, caring and just. We hold the following values:

Worth of the Individual We value the intrinsic worth of every individual in the community. Our respect for other individuals includes an appreciation of cultural backgrounds different from our own, an understanding of different attitudes and opinions, and an awareness of the consequences of our actions on the broader community.

Self-discipline We value personal responsibility and recognize the individual’s need for physical, intellectual, spiritual, social and emotional wholeness. We value the full development of every student in terms of a confident and constructive self-image, of a commitment to self-discipline, and of a responsible self-expression.

Integrity We value a campus community that encourages personal growth and academic development in an atmosphere of positive Christian influence. We affirm the necessity of academic standards of conduct that allow students and
faculty to live and study together. We value the fair and efficient administration of these standards of conduct.

*Respect for Property and the Environment*  We value the rights and privileges of owning and using property, both personal and University, and the benefits of preservation and maintenance of property and of our natural resources. In our stewardship of property we recognize the accountability of our actions to the future of the XYZ community.

*Respect for Community Authority*  We value our privileges and responsibilities as members of the University community and as citizens of the community beyond the campus. We value the community standards of conduct expressed in our system of laws and value the fair administration of those laws, including university, municipal, state or federal laws.

**ADMINISTRATIVE CODE OF VALUES**

To further implement the Statement of Mission and Purpose, the President developed a Statement of Management Philosophy. Its intent is to guide in applying the values expressed in the Statement of Mission and Purpose to everyday business, administrative and management matters in all levels of the University.

1. We intend to be valued by our constituency and respected by the general public.
   - We want to be a university of which students, alumni, trustees, foundations, friends and our community are proud.
   - We want to be among the two or three institutions people most readily think of when speaking of a good "Christian University" or "a Baptist University."
   - We want to be a university respected and appreciated worldwide for its beautiful campus, solid academic program and strong Christian commitment.

2. We intend to be honest in all dealings.
   - We will not make exaggerated claims to quality and excellence.
   - We will not speak untruthfully to one another, to the press or to constituents.
We will pay bills, honor commitments, keep our word, protect our honor.
We will abide by local, state and federal laws and regulations within our chartered purpose, and within the bounds of conscience.

3. We intend to be resourceful.
   - We will attract capable personnel and ask them to assume heavy workloads in exchange for a fair and competitive salary and benefits.
   - We will avoid interest-demanding indebtedness for current operations.
   - We will purchase the best value rather than lowest-price with the long-range prospect in view, choosing that which is "satisfactorily adequate" rather than what is elegant.
   - We will balance budgets, control costs, limit the number of personnel, and maintain an operating cost advantage that will allow a price advantage over similar institutions.

4. We intend to be a better-than-average educational institution.
   - Discounting self-adulation, XYZ University intends to be, on the basis of measurable standards, more effective and more successful than the average institution of its size and type.
   - We will try the new and different, readily discard what doesn't work effectively, and enhance that which is effective in our quest for quality.
   - We will cultivate "world awareness" as a distinctive aspect of university life, work and reputation.
   - Without apology, and as an aspect of its uniqueness, the University itself will live by Christian values and will articulate in a winsome manner its Christian commitment to all publics.

5. We intend to be a community of caring persons.
   - We will not discriminate.
   - We will share our faith and beliefs because they are crucial to persons.
   - We will have time and respect for one another, and for the integrity of one another.
   - We will maintain an active program of student activities and religious activities so as to impact most effectively the lives and lifestyles of students.
   - We intend to market aggressively the University to local, national and worldwide publics.
   - We will encourage persons in the employ of the University to see the marketing consequences of their work, and of their work when done well.
o We will inspire loyalty among Baptists, alumni, friends, students and other close publics, a loyalty which should find expression in contributions, support for recruitment of the quantity and quality of students needed, and in general approbation.

o We will be pleasantly responsive to inquiries and to opportunities.

o We will assure that publications and public contacts reflect the caliber of institution XYZ University seeks to be.

VISION

“Vision is the future to which an institution aspires as it fulfills its mission and expresses its values. It describes the attainable progress most cherished and most worthy of the commitment of every member of the community. The vision of XYZ University is to be among the finest and truest Christian universities in the world, acknowledged as one of the most distinctive universities because it so effectively meets students’ needs, and uniquely reckons with academic learning and the Christian faith, having such influential Christian scholar-teachers on the faculty and graduating strong Christian leadership. Aggressive in emphasizing learning, the integration of knowledge and the relationship of Christian faith to all human concerns—intellectual, emotional, physical and spiritual. An ideal setting where Christian community values predominate in classroom and residential settings, where diagnostics direct assistance and mentoring to the unique needs and gifts of each student, and where Christian charity is normative aware of and involved in global economic, political, cultural and religious challenges confronting society, and encouraging leadership in meeting those challenges -secure in its distinctive identity, choosing to be a developing model rather than replicating another; applying quality improvement principles and practices to managerial and academic processes.”
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