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The American Freshman


## Dr. Helen "Lena" Stavridou Astin 1932-2015

This 50th CIRP Freshman Survey monograph is dedicated in loving memory to Dr. Helen "Lena" Astin, an exceptional scholar, teacher, colleague, mentor, and friend. Lena's commitment to understanding women's experiences and her passion, strength, and kindness will be carried on by those of us who were fortunate enough to know her and learn from her.
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## INTRODUCTION

Student protests and the return of court cases concerning affirmative action in admissions ranked among the top higher education stories of 2015. Protests on one college campus-the University of Missouri-led to the resignation of the institution's president. Additionally, the Supreme Court once again heard oral arguments in the Fisher $v$. University of Texas case challenging the legality of the University's admissions policies. Studies out of the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) analyzing data from surveys administered by the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) continue to inform these and other issues pertaining to the lives of college students and faculty.

In the fall of 2015, HERI released two critical research briefs that underscore the educational benefits of enrolling a diverse body of students. The first brief, written by Dr. Uma Jayakumar, analyzes data from the CIRP Freshman Survey and College Senior Survey (CSS). Jayakumar (2015) finds that increased same-race representation for students of color correlates with reduced racialized vulnerability and has no effect on the frequency with which students of color interact with peers from different racial or ethnic backgrounds. By contrast, White students who enroll at campuses with greater proportions of White undergraduates experience a decrease in both racialized vulnerability and the frequency with which they interact with peers from different racial and ethnic backgrounds.

A second research brief, authored by Drs. Sylvia Hurtado and Adriana Ruiz Alvarado, analyzes data from CIRP's Diverse Learning Environments (DLE) survey. Hurtado and Ruiz Alvarado (2015) find that Black and Latino students who enroll at

In the fall of 2015, HERI released two critical research briefs that underscore the educational benefits of enrolling a diverse body of students. more racially diverse campuses have lower likelihoods of reporting incidents of bias or discrimination to campus authorities compared to their peers who attend less racially diverse campuses. Similarly, the authors note that, as campus diversity increases, Latino students report experiencing less frequent incidents of discrimination and bias. Generally speaking, the same finding holds for Black students at the most racially diverse campuses compared to their peers at the least racially diverse campuses. The authors conclude by urging campuses to become more inclusive so that students from all backgrounds may thrive.

In addition to informing court cases, CIRP data continue to feature prominently in studies focused on science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education. For example, Dr. Juan Garibay (2015) analyzes data from the 2004 CIRP Freshman Survey and 2008 CSS to understand the factors that contribute to developing a stronger commitment to social agency, and the study has a specific focus on differences between students in STEM majors
and their peers pursuing degrees in other fields. Results show that students who start and persist as STEM majors during college have weaker commitments to social agency by the end of college compared to their peers who never pursued a STEM major. Garibay (2015) also finds that, although students' aspirations for many STEM-related careers (e.g., engineer, scientific researcher, computer scientist) have a negative association with a commitment to social agency by the end of college, students who plan to work in health professions actually exhibit a stronger orientation toward social agency than their counterparts interested in pursuing nonSTEM careers.

## In addition to informing court cases, CIRP data continue to feature prominently in studies focused on STEM education.

In another study focused on STEM education, Sax, Kanny, Riggers-Piehl, Whang, and Paulson (2015) analyze several years of data from the CIRP Freshman Survey to examine how the importance of students' math self-confidence in predicting intentions to major in STEM has changed over time. The authors find that, while students intending to major in STEM tend to have stronger confidence in their math abilities than their peers intending to pursue non-STEM majors, great variation exists with respect to math self-confidence across the subdisciplines within STEM. Additionally, the strength of the relationship between students' confidence in their math abilities and whether they intend to pursue a STEM major has changed over time, growing stronger for women intending to
pursue math/statistics but becoming weaker for women intending to pursue other STEMrelated disciplines.

HERI's continued contributions to the study of undergraduate STEM education extend well beyond studies published in 2015. For the past year, HERI researchers have worked closely with campuses funded by the National Institutes of Health under the Building Infrastructure Leading to Diversity (BUILD) initiative as well as leaders of the National Research Mentoring Network (NRMN). Over the next several years, data collected through HERI's suite of student and faculty surveys will be merged with other local and national datasets to inform the national evaluation of these initiatives, which aim to diversify the pool of individuals working in biomedical research careers.

In addition to research on STEM education, researchers have relied upon longitudinal CIRP data to examine the long-term effects of undergraduate experiences on civic engagement. Bowman, Park, and Denson (2015) examine civic outcomes for students six years after they graduated with their bachelor's degree. Using multilevel propensity score analysis to examine data from the 1994 Freshman Survey, 1998 College Student Survey (now known as the College Senior Survey), and the 2004 follow-up survey that focused on civic engagement, the authors find that students who participated in racial/ethnic student clubs and organizations in college tend to exhibit significantly more civic engagement across several dimensions six years after college compared to their peers who did not participate in such groups. The authors argue that these findings underscore the value of racial/ethnic student organizations on college campuses.

In a study focused on students' racial identity, Hurtado, Ruiz Alvarado, and Guillermo-Wann (2015) analyze data from the pilot administration of CIRP's DLE survey. The authors find that students at two- and four-year institutions who are more often exposed to a curriculum of inclusion and more frequently participate in cocurricular diversity activities report stronger racial identity salience (i.e., thought about their race/ethnicity more often). Similarly, having more frequent conversations about race and more frequent experiences with discrimination and bias correlate with students thinking about their racial/ethnic identity more often.

In addition to studies focused on students, researchers also published several studies using data from the HERI Faculty Survey during 2015. Eagan, Jaeger, and Grantham (2015) analyze data from the 2010-11 HERI Faculty Survey to examine correlates of job satisfaction for part-time faculty. The authors find that part-time faculty who have use of a private or shared office space and who feel respected by their full-time colleagues tend to express greater workplace satisfaction. In another study utilizing HERI Faculty Survey data, Eagan and Garvey (2015) examine the connection among faculty's social identity (race, gender), stress, and productivity. The authors describe that the relationship between feeling stressed due to subtle discrimination and research productivity depends upon faculty's race/ethnicity. White faculty tend to be unaffected in terms of research productivity as their levels of stress due to subtle discrimination increase; by contrast, faculty of color tend to produce significantly less research when they experience greater stress due to subtle discrimination.

In addition to the dozens of peer-reviewed journal articles, research briefs, monographs, book chapters, and conference presentations produced by researchers using CIRP data throughout 2015, HERI achieved a number of milestones. Dr. Sylvia Hurtado stepped down in March after serving as Director of HERI for 11 years. During her time as HERI Director, Dr. Hurtado brought a stronger focus on diversity and inclusion to the student and faculty surveys. She also helped to establish HERI as one of the premiere higher education research centers focused on undergraduate STEM education. Also of note, Dr. Hurtado added the DLE survey to the suite of tools campuses can use to understand their students' experiences. In 2015, more than two dozen campuses participated in the DLE survey, and more than twice as many institutions are on pace to participate during the 2015-16 survey cycle.

In July 2015, HERI welcomed Dr. Cecilia Rios-Aguilar as its new director. Dr. RiosAguilar joined HERI and the faculty at UCLA after working several years as an associate professor at Claremont Graduate University. Dr. Rios-Aguilar's research focuses on advanced quantitative methods, analysis of big data, and community colleges.

During the final quarter of 2015, we began introducing survey promotion packs, which are aimed at assisting campuses with marketing their surveys to students and faculty. Campuses can adapt these templates with local information about the timing of surveys and post advertisements and invitations around campus and on social media.

As we look toward 2016, we are excited to celebrate the CIRP Freshman Survey's 50 years of data collection with several events. We will be releasing our 50-year trends monograph this spring at the annual forum of the Association for Institutional Research, and we will have other celebratory events both locally at UCLA and at other national meetings. We will again offer our Diversity Research Institute in mid-June and the

CIRP Summer Institute in July. Additionally, we will offer our first-ever summer institute focused on Social Network Analysis in late June. Finally, in addition to the four student surveys we offer annually, we will be administering our triennial Faculty Survey, including a new optional module on faculty mentoring, beginning in late summer 2016.


Kevin Eagan
Director

## THE AMERICAN FRESHMAN: NATIONAL NORMS FALL 2015

Analyses of the 50th administration of the CIRP Freshman Survey find an increased commitment to student activism and augmented interest in community and political engagement among first-time, full-time college students. A new item asking students whether they received Pell grants provides for a first-of-its-kind look with CIRP Freshman Survey data at differences between Pell recipients and those who do not have Pell grants across a number of dimensions related to demographics, strategies for financing college, pre-college academic experiences, and students' college choice process. Differences in concerns for paying for college, applying to college, and choosing whether and where to enroll vary substantively by a number of characteristics, and we examine these issues across measures of sex, high school type, and time.

Several other new questions introduced on the 2015 instrument provide campuses and the nation with opportunities to understand

> Students who identify their sexual orientation as lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer, or "other" express more serious mental and emotional health concerns compared to their heterosexual/straight peers. the distinctiveness and diversity of their incoming cohorts. Students can now identify their sexual orientation and transgender identity on the survey, and findings suggest that students who identify their sexual orientation as lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer, or "other" express more serious mental and emotional health concerns compared to their heterosexual/straight peers. A new question about participation in summer bridge programs provides local campus researchers and social scientists with opportunities to understand the experiences of students in these programs and the efficacy of these programs in facilitating students' success. We wrap up the report on the entering freshman class of 2015 by highlighting experiences with and expectations for remedial work and special tutoring, differences in students who affiliate with a particular religion compared to peers who do not identify with a religion (i.e., Agnostic, Atheist, or "none"), and students' continued political leftward drift.

The results reported in this monograph are based upon 141,189 first-time, full-time students who entered 199 four-year U.S. colleges and universities of varying selectivity and type. Weights have been applied to these data to reflect the more than 1.5 million first-time, fulltime undergraduate students who began college at 1,574 four-year colleges and universities across the U.S. in the fall of 2015 . This means that differences of one percentage point in the results published here reflect the characteristics, behaviors, and attitudes of more than 15,000 first-year students nationally. We describe the full methodology of the 2015 CIRP Freshman Survey administration, stratification scheme, and weighting approach in Appendix A.

## College Freshmen Signal Revival of Student Activism, Political and Civic Engagement

The vast majority ( $96.9 \%$ ) of first-time, fulltime students who entered college in the fall of 2015 spent their senior year of high school witnessing (and perhaps even participating in) increased activism among high school and college students. Initially in response to officerinvolved shootings of Black men in places like Ferguson, MO, Charleston, SC, and Baltimore, MD, these protests have grown to bring needed attention and dialog to issues of racism and bigotry in the U.S., among other issues. Many of the protests and outcries on college campuses and in communities have occurred in response to local incidents of bias and discrimination and in solidarity with broader, national movements (e.g., Black Lives Matter).

Although the 2015 survey instrument did not specifically address these events or protests, for five decades, the CIRP Freshman Survey has asked students about their expectations for participating in student protests while in college
as well as the personal importance of connecting with their communities and influencing the political structure. The entering freshman class of 2015 ranks among the most ambitious in these areas compared to their counterparts who participated in any of the previous 49 administrations of the CIRP Freshman Survey.

Perhaps connected to the increased activism among college and high school students over the past year, first-time, full-time college students in 2015 report substantially greater likelihoods of participating in student protests and demonstrations while in college compared to their peers who entered last year. As shown in Figure 1, 5.6\% of all freshmen in 2014 indicated a "very good chance" that they would participate in student protests while in college; in 2015, that figure has increased to $8.5 \%$ of students, which is the highest level recorded for this item since its inception in 1967.

The rates of increase vary considerably by race/ ethnicity. Roughly $5.8 \%$ of Native American and 6\% of Asian American/Pacific Islander students

Figure 1. Expectations of Participating in Student Protests and Demonstrations, by Race/Ethnicity (\% Marking "Very Good Chance")

have strong expectations of participating in student protests in college, representing 2.1 and 1.8 percentage-point increases over their peers who started college in 2014. Black students in 2015 are the most likely to report a "very good chance" of participating in student protests while in college ( $16 \%$ ), and Black students also have experienced the greatest increase over 2014 with a 5.5 percentage-point jump. About one in 10 Latino students ( $10.2 \%$ ) report a "very good chance" of participating in student protests while in college, representing an increase of 3.2 percentage points over 2014. These figures for both Black and Latino students represent the highest recorded in the history of this item.

Incoming college students not only demonstrate stronger inclinations toward activism via intentions to join protests while in college but they also report substantially stronger commitments to engaging with their communities. Nearly three-quarters ( $74.6 \%$ ) of freshmen in 2015 consider helping others in difficulty to be a "very important" or "essential" personal objective.

As shown in Figure 2, students in recent years have increasingly rated helping others in difficulty as an important goal, and, in 2015, the item has achieved its greatest level of support since we first began asking it in 1966.

Two other items have reached all-time highs with the 2015 administration. More students than ever before indicate that becoming a community leader represents either a "very important" or "essential" life objective (39.8\%), up 3.4 percentage points over 2014. Students in 2015 also express strong commitment toward improving their understanding of other countries and cultures. Representing the greatest level of support for this item since we added it to the survey in 2002 , nearly three in five ( $59.2 \%$ ) rate this goal as "very important" or "essential," jumping 8.4 percentage points compared to 2014 .

Several other life objectives exhibit substantial increases over previous years yet fall short of achieving all-time highs. For example, students in 2015 place greater emphasis on wanting to

Figure 2. Recent Increases in the Importance Placed on Civic Engagement, 2011-2015 (\% Marking "Very Important" or "Essential")

help promote racial understanding ( $41.2 \%$ rating "very important" or "essential") and wanting to influence social values (43.9\% rating "very important" or "essential"). Students also seem to be substantially more committed to political engagement, as $22.3 \%$ report influencing the political structure as a "very important" or "essential" life objective. Roughly four in 10 students ( $40.4 \%$ ) also indicate that keeping up to date with political affairs represents a "very important" or "essential" objective.

Figure 3 shows how the goal of wanting to promote racial understanding varies by students' race/ethnicity. Just over one-third of White students ( $33.6 \%$ ) place significant importance on wanting to help promote racial understanding. By contrast, more than half of Latino (52.7\%) and nearly two-thirds of Black (63.8\%) students rate promoting racial understanding as a "very important" or "essential" personal goal, and these figures have increased by 2.5 and 6.4 percentage points for Latino and Black students, respectively, compared to 2014.

Similarly, findings in Figure 4 demonstrate variation by race/ethnicity with respect to the importance students place on influencing the political structure. Just 18\% of Asian American/ Pacific Islander students feel that influencing the political structure represents a "very important" or "essential" life objective with $20.3 \%$ of White students feeling similarly. By contrast, just over one-quarter of Latino students (26.7\%) and nearly one-third of Black students (32.5\%) believe influencing the political structure represents a "very important" or "essential" personal goal.

We do not know for sure whether the increases with respect to students' expectations to participate in protests, connect with their

Figure 3. Personal Importance of Helping Promote Racial Understanding, by Race

communities, and engage in the political process are directly related to the wave of activism among high school and college students over the past year. Recent developments may have signaled to students that a collective sense of belonging and working together to raise important issues on campus and in their communities can lead to change. College administrators around the country are paying attention to a revitalized student activism and have started to consider and act upon the demands of student protesters. We expect new forms of student activism to take place throughout 2016 given the presidential elections and the myriad national

Figure 4. Personal Importance of Influencing the Political Structure, by Race

issues that matter to U.S. college students (e.g., gun violence, racism and discrimination, immigration, college accessibility and affordability), and college students may play a vital role in upcoming federal, state, and local elections. At the very least, it seems clear that the entering college class of 2015 expects to be more involved with and committed to these issues than those who came before them.

## Pell Grants: A Necessary but Insufficient Mechanism to Pay for College among Low-Income Students

The ways in which students finance their college education persists as a perennial policy concern, particularly with respect to individuals from low-income backgrounds. The 2015 CIRP Freshman Survey includes a new bank of items about specific types of financial aid students relied upon to fund college expenses, including work-study, military benefits, and Pell grants. Pell grants provide low-income college students with funds that do not have to be repaid. Just
over one-quarter of first-time, full-time freshmen (26.6\%) self-identify as having received a Pell grant, and this section examines differences between Pell grant recipients and their peers who did not receive Pell grants across demographic characteristics, college financing strategies, academic backgrounds, and college choice.

Demographics. Whether students report having received a Pell grant varies considerably by gender and race/ethnicity. Women (28.8\%) are slightly more likely than men (24\%) to report having received a Pell grant. Additionally, Figure 5 shows that Black and Latino students ( $54.1 \%$ and $55.7 \%$, respectively) are more than three times as likely to receive a Pell grant as their White peers (17.1\%). One-quarter of Asian American/Pacific Islander freshmen (25\%), just less than one-third (29.4\%) of multiracial freshmen, and nearly half (48.2\%) of Native American freshmen report having received a Pell grant for the 2015-2016 academic year.

First-generation college students, which CIRP defines as those whose parents have no college

experience, are more likely to receive Pell grants compared to their peers whose parents had attended college or completed a degree. More than half ( $56.3 \%$ ) of first-generation students self-identify as Pell recipients compared to only $20.3 \%$ of continuing generation students.

Given the Pell grant program is designed to provide financial assistance to low-income college students, we would expect to see substantial differences in the distribution of family income between Pell recipients and non-recipients. Figure 6 shows the self-reported income distribution for Pell recipients and nonrecipients. The majority of students without Pell grants ( $57.6 \%$ ) report their parental income above $\$ 100,000$; by contrast, nearly two-thirds of Pell recipients ( $66.1 \%$ ) report their parents'/ guardians' income as less than $\$ 50,000$. In fact, nearly one-third of Pell recipients report their family income as less than $\$ 25,000$.

Financing college. For most low-income students attending a four-year college or university, the Pell grant represents a necessary but insufficient source of funding to pay for college given that the maximum award for the Pell grant is $\$ 5,775$ for the 2015-16 academic year (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). Thus, the Pell grant on its own may not cover the entire cost of attendance, including tuition, fees, room, board, and books (Gault, Reichlin, \& Román, 2014). Many Pell grant

Figure 6. Distribution of Parental Income, by Pell Grant Status
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recipients must therefore rely upon other forms of financial aid and income from work to cover all of the various expenses incurred as a college student.

Figure 7 highlights the disparity between Pell recipients and non-recipients with respect to their reliance upon family resources to fund their first-year educational expenses. Less than onethird of Pell recipients (32\%) anticipate utilizing $\$ 3,000$ or more in family resources to cover firstyear educational expenses compared to nearly

Figure 7. Reliance upon Alternative Resources to Pay for College, by Pell Grant Status
(\% Relying upon \$3,000 or More)

three-quarters ( $72.7 \%$ ) of students who did not receive a Pell grant. Further, when looking solely at the highest value in the range of responses ( $\$ 15,000$ or more), $40.2 \%$ of non-recipients expect this contribution from their family, compared to $5.2 \%$ of Pell recipients.

Pell recipients instead rely more heavily upon need- and merit-based aid, loans, and employment. More than half of Pell recipients (54.7\%) report having taken out at least $\$ 3,000$ in loans to finance their first-year educational expenses compared to $39.1 \%$ of students who did not receive a Pell grant. In fact, more than one-third of Pell recipients (35.9\%), compared to $27.1 \%$ of non-recipients, have taken out at least $\$ 15,000$ in loans to cover their firstyear expenses. A greater proportion of Pell recipients also report receiving merit-based aid compared to non-recipients ( $60 \%$ versus 46\%). Additionally, nearly half (45.4\%) of Pell recipients report having received work-study funds-more than 30 percentage points higher than students without Pell grants (11.1\%).

In addition to their work-study positions, 59.2\% of Pell grant recipients believe there is a "very good chance" they will get a job to cover college expenses compared to $41.4 \%$ of non-recipients. Further, $40.3 \%$ of Pell recipients believe there is at least some chance they will work full-time while in college compared to less than onequarter ( $24 \%$ ) of students who did not receive Pell grants. Notably, Pell grant recipients report having spent more hours each week working for pay during their last year of high school. Nearly a third (32.4\%) of Pell recipients worked at least 11 hours per week during their last year in high school compared to about a quarter (25.4\%) of non-Pell recipients.

Given how many different forms of financial aid Pell recipients expect to rely upon to finance their college education compared to their peers not in the Pell program, it may come as no surprise that Pell recipients express much greater concern about their ability to pay for college. In fact, the proportion of Pell recipients who have at least some concern about their ability to pay for college exceeds that of non-Pell students by nearly 30 percentage points ( $84.1 \%$ for Pell recipients versus $56.7 \%$ for non-recipients). Additionally, Pell recipients (21.7\%) are more than two-and-a-half times as likely as non-Pell recipients ( $8.4 \%$ ) to express "major" concerns about financing their education.

Academic background. As previously noted, Pell recipients have spent substantially more time working while in high school than their counterparts who did not receive a Pell grant. This additional time spent working may have translated into less time available for Pell recipients to spend studying and doing homework. Just over one-third (37.5\%) of Pell recipients report having spent more than five hours per week studying or doing homework during their last year in high school compared to nearly half of students (48.4\%) who did not report having a Pell grant.

Differences in the amount of time students could devote to studying and completing homework assignments may account for the differences in high school grade distributions between Pell recipients and non-recipients shown in Figure 8. More than one-third (34.1\%) of students without a Pell grant report earning high school GPAs of an A or A+ compared to just over one-quarter ( $25.9 \%$ ) of Pell recipients. Nearly half of Pell recipients (49.1\%) indicate high school GPAs of B+ or lower as opposed to $37.1 \%$ of their peers without Pell grants.

Figure 8. Differences in High School Grade Distributions, by Pell Grant Status

Choice. The college choice process differs for those who receive Pell grants and those who do not. Although relatively similar proportions of Pell recipients (73.9\%) and non-recipients ( $75.7 \%$ ) were admitted into their first-choice institutions, only about half of students with Pell grants (51.2\%) have enrolled in their first-choice campus compared to $61.4 \%$ of students without Pell grants. The CIRP

Freshman Survey asks students about the importance of a variety of factors in choosing to go to college in general and choosing their specific college in particular. Pell grant recipients are more likely than their non-Pell peers to consider being able to make more money ( $74.8 \%$ and $67.6 \%$, respectively), getting training for a specific career ( $79.7 \%$ and $74.6 \%$, respectively), and preparing for graduate or professional school ( $65.4 \%$ and $56.2 \%$,
respectively) as "very important" reasons to attend college in general.

Not surprisingly, finances weigh more heavily on the minds of Pell recipients when deciding where to enroll in college. Figure 9 shows that nearly all Pell recipients (92.9\%) consider having been offered financial assistance as either "somewhat" or "very important" in deciding to enroll at their current institution, 30 percentage

Figure 9. Factors Influencing College Choice, by Pell Grant Status (\% Indicating "Somewhat" or "Very Important")

points higher than non-recipients. The difference is even greater when just considering the top category for this factor, as nearly twice as many Pell recipients rate being offered financial aid as "very important" in choosing their current institution ( $71.2 \%$ versus $37.9 \%$ ). With respect to attending their first-choice institution, about a third of Pell recipients also believe that not being able to afford their first choice ( $33.8 \%$ compared to $22.9 \%$ of non-Pell recipients) and not being offered aid by their first choice ( $32.2 \%$ compared to $22.8 \%$ of non-Pell recipients) were at least somewhat important in their college choice process.

The findings presented here underscore the need to rethink financial aid, particularly for low-income students. Recent efforts to address financial aid in the U.S. include a new proposal by Kelchen and Goldrick-Rab (2015) to commit to providing the maximum Pell grant award to 8th graders who subsequently graduate from high school and enroll in college. Alternatively, presidential candidates have started to make financial aid in higher education an issue in their policy agendas. Some candidates have proposed offering up to two years of free tuition, but the most ambitious proposal would provide four years of college for all students enrolled in public institutions. Regardless of the proposal, the message from these findings is clear: low-income students need more financial aid to access and persist in college.

## Women More Concerned Than Men about College Finances

While nearly two-thirds of all incoming firstyear students have at least "some" or "major" concerns about their ability to finance college ( $64.6 \%$ ), women tend to express much greater
concern for this issue than their male counterparts. Women are 10 percentage points more likely than men to report any concern about their ability to pay for college ( $69.5 \%$ versus 58.7\%).

Despite women's concerns, or perhaps because of them, higher proportions of women report receiving several types of financial aid, including work-study, Pell grants, and scholarships/grants (need- and merit-based). More than half of women ( $53.5 \%$ ) in the sample have received merit-based grants or scholarships compared to just less than half of men (49.3\%). We note a larger gap between women and men with respect to need-based grants and scholarships (39.2\% versus $33.5 \%$ ). As reported above, a greater proportion of women are Pell recipients, and women's use of work-study funds to help finance their first-year expenses exceeds that of men by 3.8 percentage points ( $22.6 \%$ versus $18.8 \%$ ). By contrast, men have a slightly greater likelihood of utilizing military benefits ( $3.7 \%$ compared to $2.8 \%$ for women).

While nearly half of all students believe there is a "very good chance" they will get a job to help pay for college expenses ( $46.3 \%$ ), students who have some or major concerns about having enough funds to pay for college are more likely to report they will get a job to help pay for college (58.9\%). By contrast, students without concerns about their ability to pay for college are far less likely to expect to get a job to pay for educational expenses ( $23.4 \%$ ). Women who express either some or major concerns about paying for college are more likely than men to report there is a "very good chance" they will get a job to help pay for college ( $64.1 \%$ versus 51.3\%). Parental income also correlates with students' expectations for their likelihood of getting a job to pay for college expenses.


As shown in Figure 10, greater proportions of women than men reported a "very good chance" of getting a job in college across income ranges, but the gender gap decreases at higher levels of parental income.

Women who have some or major concerns about their ability to finance college are more likely than their male counterparts to view financial considerations (e.g., being offered financial assistance, cost of attending this college) as "very important" factors in choosing their college. Women also have a slightly greater likelihood of choosing their college because they perceive the graduates of that school "get good jobs" (59.9\% rate "very important") compared to $55.3 \%$ of men. In students' decision to attend college in general, men who have some or major concerns about paying for college are more likely than women to rate being able to make more money as a "very important" factor in deciding to attend college ( $75.3 \%$ versus $69.7 \%$ ).

Students' concerns about their ability to pay for college differ substantially based on the type of institution they attend. Across all institution types, the proportion of women expressing concerns about paying for college exceeds the rate of men by roughly 10 percentage points (see Figure 11). Students at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) have the greatest concerns about their ability to finance college compared to students at public and private colleges and universities. Women at HBCUs outpace both men and women at

Figure 11. Students' Financial Concerns, by Type of Institution (\% Indicating "Some" or "Major" Concern)

all institution types in their concern about financing college, as $79.4 \%$ have some or major concern about having sufficient funds to pay for college.

## Good Jobs and Graduate Schools Gain Favor in the College Choice Process

The CIRP Freshman Survey asks students about the importance of a variety of factors in deciding which college to attend. The report on the freshman class that started college in 2014 highlights the growing importance of early admissions programs on student enrollment decisions (Eagan et al., 2014). While early admissions programs continue to play an increasing role in the college choice process, students entering college in 2015 seem to be considering more practical and economic factors in the decision process.

In recent years, the percentage of students reporting economic and practical factors as "very important" in their choice of where to go to college has increased. Specifically, students now give more weight to post-college opportunities in their consideration of a specific college (see Table 1). The importance that students place on graduates' ability to get good jobs and graduates' admission to top graduate or professional schools has increased substantially since these questions first appeared on the CIRP Freshman

Survey in 1983. While the ability of graduates to obtain good jobs has always weighed heavily as a factor in students' college decision-making process, $60.1 \%$ of students indicate this as a "very important" consideration in 2015, representing an all-time high for this item.

Similarly, even though admission to graduate school has been an important consideration for about a third of college freshmen every year, it has increased to $37.6 \%$ in 2015 , which may correspond to students' increasing aspirations for advanced degrees (Eagan et al., 2014). A third item persists as the factor rated "very important" by the greatest proportion of students. Since 1972 when students first began rating the "good academic reputation" of the institution as a consideration in their college choice process, this factor has consistently been rated as "very important" by the greatest proportion of students. In $2015,69.7 \%$ of students have rated this factor as "very important," representing a 4.3 percentagepoint increase from 2014 and the highest level of importance this item has ever achieved.

The factors influencing decisions about where to go to college and whether to go to college seem to be moving in different directions. While economic and practical considerations seemed to weigh more heavily on students' choice of a particular college in 2015, these factors appear to be less salient in students' decision to attend

| (\% Indicating "Very Important") | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| This college has a very good academic reputation | 63.8 | 64.0 | 65.4 | 69.7 |
| This college's graduates gain admission to top graduate/professional schools | 32.8 | 33.0 | 32.9 | 37.6 |
| This college's graduates get good jobs | 55.9 | 53.1 | 53.4 | 60.1 |

Table 2. Recent Decreases in the Importance of Practical and Economic Reasons Influencing Students' Decision to Pursue a College Degree, 2012-2015

| (\% Indicating "Very Important") | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| To be able to get a better job | 87.9 | 86.3 | 86.1 | 85.2 |
| To be able to make more money | 74.6 | 73.3 | 72.8 | 69.9 |
| To get training for a specific career | 79.3 | 77.1 | 77.1 | 76.1 |
| To prepare myself for graduate or <br> professional school | 61.9 | 60.8 | 59.7 | 58.8 |

college overall. As shown in Table 2, the proportion of students who rate getting a better job as "very important" in their decision to attend college has dropped 2.7 percentage points after it peaked at $87.9 \%$ in 2012. We see a similar pattern with decreases in the proportion of students who consider the ability to make more money ( $74.6 \%$ in 2012 versus $69.9 \%$ in 2015), get training for a specific career ( $79.3 \%$ in 2012 versus $76.1 \%$ in 2015), and prepare for graduate/professional school ( $61.9 \%$ in 2012 versus $58.8 \%$ in 2015) as "very important" reasons to pursue a college degree. All of these reasons reached their peaks in 2012 and have since decreased.

## College Applications and Admission to First-Choice Institution Vary by High School Type

The application behavior of incoming freshmen has shifted over the years, as students increasingly apply to more colleges and universities with each successive cohort. Reports on previous administrations of the CIRP Freshman Survey have highlighted the increasing numbers of college applications students submit, and the entering class of 2015 has set a new record. Since 2005, the percentage of students who applied to seven or more colleges (in addition to the one submitted to the campus where they currently are enrolled) has more than doubled to $28.5 \%$ of all first-time, full-time students for the fall of 2015 .

The distribution of the number of applications students submit varies considerably by high school type. In 2015, a smaller proportion of students who attended traditional public high schools report having submitted at least seven college applications compared to students from other types of high schools. Among all traditional public school students, about a quarter $(25.1 \%)$ indicate having applied to seven or more colleges, which is nearly half the rate of their peers who attended private independent college-prep high schools (46.7\%).

The CIRP Freshman Survey also asks students if they were accepted by their first-choice college or university, regardless of where they enrolled. More students in 2015 than in 2014 indicate having been accepted to their first-choice institution, as $75.5 \%$ of students report admission to their first-choice college compared to $72.7 \%$ in 2014. Students' rates of acceptance to their first-choice institution vary based upon the kind of high school they attended. More than threequarters of all traditional public school students (77.3\%) were accepted by their first-choice college—higher than all other high school types. A similar percentage of students who attended private religious/parochial schools (75.4\%) report being admitted to their first-choice institution. By contrast, students attending public charter schools ( $68.6 \%$ ) and public magnet schools ( $67.3 \%$ ) have had lower rates of admission to their first-choice campus. Fewer than two-thirds of students who graduated from private independent college-prep high schools
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(63.8\%) report having been admitted to their first-choice college or university.

Similar to student acceptance patterns, members of the 2015 entering freshman class are slightly more likely to be enrolled at their first-choice institution. When this question first appeared on the survey in 1974 , nearly $80 \%$ of students stated that they had enrolled at their first choice college. Since then, this percentage has declined while the percentage of students indicating that their current institution was less than their third choice has increased. After dropping to an alltime low of 55\% in 2014, the proportion of students enrolling at their first-choice institution has rebounded to $58.9 \%$ in 2015.

As shown in Figure 12, whether students enrolled in their first-choice college also varies based upon the kind of high school students attended. Similar to acceptance rates, students from traditional public high schools have the highest rates of enrolling at their first-choice institution ( $60.3 \%$ ). Diverging from the patterns observed for college acceptance, students who attended private high schools, both religious/
parochial and independent college-prep (60.1\% and $51.8 \%$, respectively), have enrolled in their first-choice institution at higher rates than students who attended charter and magnet public schools ( $48.3 \%$ and $50.9 \%$, respectively).

## Examining Connections among Sexual Orientation, Emotional and Mental Health, and Expectations for Campus Involvement

The 2015 CIRP Freshman Survey has introduced several new items that aim to improve the instrument's inclusivity. For the first time, students can identify their sexual orientation and indicate if they are transgender. Additionally, we have made an important change to questions about students' parents. We decided to remove "mother" and "father" from the survey to be more inclusive of today's families; prior to answering questions about parents' education, careers, and religious affiliations, students are asked to mark the sex for "parent/guardian 1" and "parent/guardian 2."

Of the students who provided an answer to the sexual orientation item ( $8.8 \%$ of respondents in the normed sample skipped this question), $93.2 \%$ of students identify as heterosexual/ straight. Distributions for the other categories are as follows: $3.2 \%$ identify as bisexual, $1.4 \%$ as "other," $1.1 \%$ as gay, $0.6 \%$ as lesbian, and $0.5 \%$ as queer. Of those who provided a response to the question about transgender identity, $0.3 \%$ identify as transgender. Additionally, $0.6 \%$ of respondents indicate having same-sex parents/ guardians. Below we provide some breakouts of the data by students' sexual orientation.

Students who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer, or "other" (LGBQ/other) more frequently have felt overwhelmed and depressed in the past year compared to their heterosexual/ straight classmates. Figure 13 shows the proportion of students who report having felt "frequently" overwhelmed by all they had to do and "frequently" depressed in the past year broken out by their sexual orientation identity. Students identifying as queer are the most likely
to have felt overwhelmed by all they had to do ( $63.5 \%$ frequently) and to have felt depressed ( $45.9 \%$ frequently) in the past year. Similarly, more than half of bisexual students have felt overwhelmed by all they had to do (54.9\% frequently) while about one-third of bisexual students have felt depressed ( $33.6 \%$ frequently) in the past year. By contrast, heterosexual/ straight students are far less likely to report "frequently" feeling overwhelmed or depressed ( $32.6 \%$ and $8 \%$, respectively) in the past year. Rates of "frequently" feeling overwhelmed for LGBQ/other students exceed those of heterosexual/straight students by 9.3 to 30.9 percentage points; the gaps for "frequently" feeling depressed range from 12 to 37.9 percentage points.

We see similar differences across sexual orientation identity with respect to students' self-rated emotional health. Although more than half (52.5\%) of all heterosexual/straight students rate their emotional health as either "above average" or in the "highest $10 \%$," less than one-quarter

Figure 13. Feeling Overwhelmed or Depressed, by Sexual Orientation (\% Indicating "Frequently")
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of LGBQ/other students (24.7\%) report the same. More than one-third of students identifying as gay rate their emotional health as at least above average ( $37 \%$ ) while just $15 \%$ of queer students do so. Just over one-quarter of lesbian students (26\%) and slightly less than one-quarter of bisexual students (23.5\%) rate their emotional health as "above average" or in the "highest $10 \%$." Given these numbers, perhaps it is not surprising that more than onequarter of students who identify as LGBQ/other (27\%) believe there is a "very good chance" they will seek personal counseling while in college compared to $12.9 \%$ of heterosexual/ straight students.

Considering high school experiences, students identifying as heterosexual/straight report spending substantially less time in student clubs/ groups compared to their LGBQ /other peers. Just over one-third of heterosexual/straight students (34.7\%) report spending three or more hours per week in student clubs/groups while in high school compared to $43.3 \%$ of students identifying as LGBQ/other.

These high school involvement patterns seem likely to persist into college based upon students' expectations for involvement. Roughly three in five LGBQ/other students ( $62.3 \%$ ) believe there is a "very good chance" they will participate in student clubs/groups in college. By contrast, just over half of heterosexual/straight students (53.4\%) expect the same. One interesting difference pertains to students' expectations of joining a social fraternity or sorority. About one in 10 heterosexual/straight students (11.3\%) rate their odds of joining a fraternity/sorority as "very good" compared to $6.5 \%$ of LGBQ/ other students.

Table 3. Percentage of Students Who Have Had Special Tutoring or Remedial Work in High School, 2013 and 2015

| Subject Area | 2013 | 2015 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| English | 9.6 | 8.5 |
| Reading | 8.3 | 7.0 |
| Mathematics | 17.9 | 16.6 |
| Social Studies | 6.0 | 4.9 |
| Science | 8.4 | 7.4 |
| Foreign Language | 7.6 | 6.3 |
| Writing | 7.7 | 6.6 |

## Pre-College Tutoring, Remediation Drop While Expectations for Remedial Work Hold Steady

With recent national mandates calling for students to be college- and career-ready by the time they graduate from high school (United States Department of Education, 2010), state and local education leaders have placed greater emphasis on ensuring that students are academically prepared to succeed in college. One effort to increase readiness has been to provide students with additional support, such as special tutoring or remedial work, while in high school to boost their academic skills before they enter college. The CIRP Freshman Survey asks students about their experiences with special tutoring or remedial work by subject during their high school years. As shown in Table 3, the percentage of students who have had special tutoring or remedial work in all subject areas (English, Reading, Mathematics, Social Studies, Science, Foreign Language, Writing) has decreased since 2013 when these items last appeared on the survey and achieved all-time highs.

Whether students have received special tutoring or remedial work appears to depend in part on the type of high school they attended. Students who attended public charter high schools were the most likely to indicate that they had special tutoring or remedial work in several subject areas. Specifically, among all charter school

students, $18.8 \%$ indicate having had special tutoring or remedial work in math compared to $15.6 \%$ of traditional public school students. Similarly, $8.7 \%$ of charter school students and $6.8 \%$ of traditional public school students indicated that they had additional support in science. Furthermore, $9 \%$ of charter school students report having had tutoring or remedial work in writing compared to $6.2 \%$ of traditional public school students.

Students also indicate on the survey whether they expect they will need remediation or special tutoring in various subjects. Despite the decrease in the percentage of students who have had special tutoring or remedial work in high school, the percentage of students who feel they will need special tutoring or remedial work in all subject areas has remained about the same since 2013; however, as shown in Figure 14, differences persist based upon the type of high schools students attended.

Students who attended charter schools are the most likely to anticipate needing special tutoring or remedial work in all subject areas compared
to students from all other types of schools (traditional public, public magnet, private parochial/ religious, private independent, home school). Specifically, more than one-third ( $34.6 \%$ ) of charter school students believe they will need special tutoring or remedial work in math, which exceeds the rates of students from other high school types by several percentage points.

## Summer Bridge Programs

Offer a Supportive Pathway for Incoming College Students
Summer bridge programs, a type of college transition intervention that occurs during the summer before a student's freshman year in college, are designed to provide support to prepare students to adjust and make a successful transition to the college environment (Sablan, 2013). Typically, first-generation, low-income, and underrepresented racial minority students tend to be overrepresented in summer bridge programs (Kezar, 2000). A new question on the 2015 CIRP Freshman Survey asks students about their participation in a summer bridge
program prior to enrolling at their current institution.

While only a small percentage of students indicate that they participated in summer bridge programs (5.6\%), rates of participation vary by high school GPA, parental income, and intended major. Of the students who have participated in a summer bridge program, about half (49.9\%) of them report strong GPAs, earning an A - or better in their high school coursework. Additionally, just over two-thirds of these students ( $68.6 \%$ ) come from families whose annual income was less than $\$ 100,000$. Moreover, about half (49.9\%) of these students indicate intentions to major in a STEM discipline (i.e., biological and life sciences, engineering, health professions, mathematics or computer science, physical science).

A large percentage of students who report having participated in summer bridge programs identify as White (37.2\%), with additional participation from students who identify as Latino (21.4\%), Black (16.5\%), Asian (9.3\%), Native American ( $0.5 \%$ ), two or more race/ethnicities (13.6\%), and other (1.4\%). Comparing these figures to the overall racial/ethnic composition of firsttime, full-time students this fall, it is clear that students enrolling in summer bridge programs are less likely to identify as White and more likely to identify as Latino, Black, or multiracial. This point becomes clearer when considering the within-group representation. Among African American/Black students, 10.8\% have participated in a summer bridge program. Similarly, $12.5 \%$ of Latino students and $9.4 \%$ of Native American students report participating in a summer bridge program. By contrast, 5.2\% of Asian/Pacific Islander and 3.6\% of White students report participating in a summer bridge program.

## Reconsidering Students' Religious Preference: Two New Choices Added

The report on the 2014 CIRP Freshman Survey highlights the fact that more students than ever (27.5\%) selected "none" as their religious preference, a 2.9 percentage point increase from 2013, and an increase of more than 12 percentage points from when the question was first asked in 1971 (Eagan et al., 2014 ). The 2015 version of this question includes two new response options: Agnostic and Atheist. Overall, 29.5\% of incoming freshmen selected Agnostic (8.3\%), Atheist (5.9\%), or "none" ( $15.4 \%$ ), bringing the percentage of students identifying with a specific religion down to $70.5 \%$.

Figure 15 shows the distribution of students who identify as Agnostic, Atheist, or "none" by race/ethnicity. Asian students are least likely to affiliate with a particular religion (60.5\%) and most likely to select "none" (23.6\%). Students who select two or more races/ethnicities are more likely to report being Agnostic (10\%) than students from any other racial/ethnic background. While seven out of 10 White students affiliate with a specific religion, White students are also most likely to report being Atheist (6.8\%). Black students (85.8\%) are by far the most likely of any racial/ethnic group to identify with a particular religion-at least 10 percentage points higher than any other group.

As we reported earlier, the 2015 instrument includes an item asking students to report their sexual orientation, and Figure 16 shows differences in religious preference by students' sexual orientation. Nearly three-quarters (72.7\%) of heterosexual students indicate an affiliation with a particular religion, which more than doubled the same proportion for students identifying as queer (36.1\%). Queer students are more likely than their peers to select Agnostic (25.1\%) or


Atheist (18.4\%), while more than one-quarter of students who identify as lesbian (26.5\%) selected "none," more than any of their peers.

Students' religious preferences also differ across institutional types. Students at public universities ( $64.7 \%$ ) and private nonsectarian four-year colleges ( $66.2 \%$ ) are among the least likely to affiliate with a specific religion. By contrast, $83.2 \%$ of students at Catholic colleges and $79.9 \%$ of students at other religious four-year colleges identify with a particular religion. In

2014, the proportion of students at Catholic colleges not identifying with any religion increased to $14.9 \%$. Similarly, the proportion of students selecting "none" as their religious preference at other religious colleges rose to $17.4 \%$. These figures continue to climb in 2015, with $16.7 \%$ of students at Catholic colleges selecting either Agnostic (4.7\%), Atheist (2.5\%), or none (9.5\%). At other religious colleges, $21.1 \%$ of students do not identify with a particular religion with $3.2 \%$ of incoming students selecting


Atheist, 5.5\% choosing Agnostic, and 11.4\% marking "none" as their religious preference.

## Incoming Freshmen Continue Drifting Left Politically

The CIRP Freshman Survey provides several data points that might be instructive as we approach the 2016 election. Since 1970 we have asked students to rate their political orientation on a five-point scale, from "far right" to "far left." For the past several years, greater proportions of students have identified as either "liberal" or "far left." Roughly one-third of the students (33.5\%) who entered a four-year institution in the fall of 2015 identify as "liberal" or "far left," 1.8 percentage points higher than in 2014 and 3.9 points higher than in 2012. This figure represents the highest proportion of left-leaning students since $36.4 \%$ of students identified as liberal or far left in 1973. About one in five students ( $21.6 \%$ ) identify as "conservative" or "far right," which was similar to 2014 when $21 \%$ of students did the same.

In addition to students' political orientations, their political views seem increasingly aligned with progressive or liberal platforms. As shown in Figure 17, more than half of incoming freshmen (52.3\%) agree that students from disadvantaged social backgrounds should be given preferential treatment in the college admissions process, which is up 3.4 percentage points over 2014 and 10.4 percentage points above the level reported in 2012-before the Supreme Court initially weighed in on the first iteration of the Fisher v. University of Texas case.

The statement that women should receive the same salary and opportunities for advancement as men in comparable positions has near universal support with $95.4 \%$ of incoming freshmen endorsing this view. Support for the legalization of marijuana has also garnered greater favor with this year's entering cohort, as $56.4 \%$ of students support legalizing marijuana. Support for legalizing marijuana has jumped 7.3 percentage points since we last asked it on the 2011 instrument. Since 2011, four states (Washington, Colorado, Oregon and Alaska)

Figure 17. Examining Students' Political Views
and the District of Columbia have legalized recreational use.

Nearly two-thirds of respondents (63.5\%) believe that abortion should be legal. Support for the continued legality of abortion has increased by 2.5 percentage points since it last appeared on the survey in 2012. Additionally, this year represents the greatest level of support for maintaining the legal status of abortions since 1992 when $67.2 \%$ of students either "agreed" or "agreed strongly."

Finally, a relatively new item on the survey asks students to rate the likelihood that they will
vote in a local, state, or national election while in college. In 2014, just over half (50.3\%) of students reported their chances of voting in a local, state, or national election were "very good." This year, $59.8 \%$ of students think that they are very likely to vote in an election while in college. As we have noted in the introduction, students who entered four-year colleges for the first time in 2015 are sending signals that they expect to be incredibly committed to political and civic engagement, and findings pertaining to students' expectations to participate in elections further underscore that point.
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# 2015 National Norms 

## All First-Time, Full-Time Freshmen by Institutional Type

Kəлuns uemusəat dyוכ Sloz
Weighted National Norms-All Respondents

| All Respondents | All Bacc Institutions | Baccalaureate Institutions |  | 4-year Colleges |  |  |  |  | Universities |  | Black Colleges and Universities |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 4-yr Coll | Universities | Public | Private | Nonsec | Catholic | Oth Relig | Public | Private | All HBCU | Public | Private |
| First-time Full-time Freshmen | 141,189 | 79,741 | 61,448 | 20,404 | 59,337 | 26,548 | 16,708 | 16,081 | 40,430 | 21,018 | 5,504 | 2,813 | 2,691 |
| How old will you be on December 31 of this year? <br> 17 or younger <br> 18 <br> 19 <br> 20 or older | $\begin{array}{r} 1.8 \\ 68.2 \\ 28.0 \\ 2.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.7 \\ 66.6 \\ 28.8 \\ 2.9 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.9 \\ 70.0 \\ 27.0 \\ 1.1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.8 \\ 67.4 \\ 27.3 \\ 3.6 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.6 \\ 65.7 \\ 30.7 \\ 2.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.8 \\ 67.4 \\ 28.7 \\ 2.1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.6 \\ 70.9 \\ 26.4 \\ 1.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.3 \\ 61.3 \\ 34.9 \\ 2.4 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.9 \\ 70.4 \\ 26.8 \\ 1.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2.0 \\ 68.5 \\ 28.1 \\ 1.4 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2.7 \\ 70.7 \\ 23.4 \\ 3.2 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2.2 \\ 69.6 \\ 24.4 \\ 3.9 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3.7 \\ 72.7 \\ 21.6 \\ 2.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Is English your native language? Yes No | $\begin{aligned} & 89.5 \\ & 10.5 \end{aligned}$ | 89.8 10.2 | 89.1 10.9 | 88.6 11.4 | 91.2 8.8 | 89.9 10.1 |  | 92.8 7.2 | 89.8 10.2 | $\begin{aligned} & 86.7 \\ & 13.3 \end{aligned}$ | 97.4 2.6 | 97.9 2.1 | $\begin{array}{r} 96.7 \\ 3.3 \end{array}$ |
| In what year did you graduate from high school? $2015$ <br> 2014 <br> 2013 or earlier <br> Passed G.E.D./Never completed high school | $\begin{array}{r} 96.9 \\ 2.2 \\ 0.8 \\ 0.1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 95.5 \\ 3.2 \\ 1.1 \\ 0.1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 98.4 \\ 1.2 \\ 0.4 \\ 0.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 94.0 \\ 4.4 \\ 1.5 \\ 0.1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 97.4 \\ 1.8 \\ 0.7 \\ 0.1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 96.9 \\ 2.2 \\ 0.7 \\ 0.1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 99.1 \\ 0.6 \\ 0.2 \\ 0.1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 97.1 \\ 2.0 \\ 0.8 \\ 0.1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 98.5 \\ 1.1 \\ 0.4 \\ 0.1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 98.0 \\ 1.6 \\ 0.4 \\ 0.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 96.5 \\ 2.5 \\ 1.0 \\ 0.1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 96.5 \\ 2.3 \\ 1.1 \\ 0.1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 96.5 \\ 2.7 \\ 0.8 \\ 0.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Are you enrolled (or enrolling) as a: Full-time student Part-time student | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 0.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 0.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 0.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 0.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 0.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 0.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 0.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 0.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 0.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 0.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 0.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 0.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 0.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| How many miles is this college from your permanent home? <br> 5 or less <br> 6 to 10 <br> 11 to 50 <br> 51 to 100 <br> 101 to 500 <br> Over 500 | $\begin{array}{r} 5.2 \\ 6.1 \\ 24.1 \\ 14.5 \\ 29.4 \\ 20.6 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6.5 \\ 7.5 \\ 24.9 \\ 15.9 \\ 25.1 \\ 20.2 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3.7 \\ 4.7 \\ 23.4 \\ 13.1 \\ 34.1 \\ 21.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8.4 \\ 9.8 \\ 27.7 \\ 13.4 \\ 20.8 \\ 19.8 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4.2 \\ 4.8 \\ 21.5 \\ 18.8 \\ 30.1 \\ 20.7 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3.6 \\ 3.5 \\ 19.3 \\ 17.3 \\ 28.8 \\ 27.5 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6.8 \\ 8.6 \\ 30.2 \\ 16.6 \\ 25.1 \\ 12.7 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3.6 \\ 4.1 \\ 19.3 \\ 21.4 \\ 34.1 \\ 17.5 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3.9 \\ 4.9 \\ 24.2 \\ 14.2 \\ 36.4 \\ 16.5 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3.2 \\ 3.9 \\ 20.1 \\ 8.9 \\ 25.3 \\ 38.6 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5.2 \\ 4.6 \\ 19.9 \\ 16.8 \\ 29.8 \\ 23.6 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6.0 \\ 5.0 \\ 22.1 \\ 22.7 \\ 31.5 \\ 12.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3.9 \\ 4.0 \\ 16.0 \\ 6.6 \\ 26.6 \\ 42.8 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| What was your average grade in high school? $\mathrm{A} \text { or } \mathrm{A}+$ <br> A- <br> B+ <br> B <br> B- <br> C+ <br> C <br> D | $\begin{array}{r} 31.2 \\ 27.5 \\ 18.2 \\ 15.4 \\ 4.9 \\ 2.1 \\ 0.7 \\ 0.0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 23.2 \\ 24.5 \\ 21.1 \\ 20.0 \\ 6.9 \\ 3.1 \\ 1.1 \\ 0.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 39.9 \\ 30.7 \\ 15.0 \\ 10.4 \\ 2.7 \\ 1.0 \\ 0.3 \\ 0.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 21.8 \\ 22.7 \\ 20.9 \\ 22.4 \\ 7.8 \\ 3.3 \\ 1.1 \\ 0.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 24.9 \\ 26.6 \\ 21.4 \\ 17.1 \\ 5.8 \\ 2.9 \\ 1.2 \\ 0.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 24.6 \\ 27.6 \\ 21.5 \\ 17.7 \\ 5.7 \\ 2.4 \\ 0.8 \\ 0.0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 24.4 \\ 28.8 \\ 23.2 \\ 15.9 \\ 4.8 \\ 2.4 \\ 0.6 \\ 0.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 25.5 \\ 24.9 \\ 20.5 \\ 17.1 \\ 6.4 \\ 3.7 \\ 1.8 \\ 0.1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 39.8 \\ 30.3 \\ 15.0 \\ 10.7 \\ 2.8 \\ 1.1 \\ 0.3 \\ 0.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 40.0 \\ 32.0 \\ 15.3 \\ 9.2 \\ 2.3 \\ 0.8 \\ 0.3 \\ 0.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 11.8 \\ 14.3 \\ 23.0 \\ 24.6 \\ 14.3 \\ 8.8 \\ 3.1 \\ 0.1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 9.5 \\ 12.4 \\ 22.1 \\ 24.9 \\ 16.4 \\ 11.0 \\ 3.7 \\ 0.1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15.7 \\ 17.7 \\ 24.6 \\ 24.2 \\ 10.6 \\ 4.9 \\ 2.2 \\ 0.1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| From what kind of high school did you graduate? <br> Public school (not charter or magnet) <br> Public charter school <br> Public magnet school <br> Private religious/parochial school <br> Private independent college-prep school <br> Home school | $\begin{array}{r} 73.9 \\ 4.1 \\ 4.0 \\ 10.2 \\ 7.0 \\ 0.0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 74.2 \\ 5.1 \\ 4.1 \\ 9.8 \\ 5.8 \\ 1.0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 73.7 \\ 3.0 \\ 3.8 \\ 10.7 \\ 8.3 \\ 0.5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 77.2 \\ 6.7 \\ 5.3 \\ 7.1 \\ 2.8 \\ 0.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 70.5 \\ 3.1 \\ 2.6 \\ 13.0 \\ 9.4 \\ 1.3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 69.8 \\ 3.0 \\ 3.1 \\ 10.8 \\ 12.6 \\ 0.7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 59.9 \\ 3.7 \\ 2.5 \\ 24.5 \\ 9.0 \\ 0.4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 76.6 \\ 2.9 \\ 2.2 \\ 9.5 \\ 6.3 \\ 2.4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 77.4 \\ 3.2 \\ 3.9 \\ 8.6 \\ 6.5 \\ 0.4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 58.9 \\ 2.3 \\ 3.5 \\ 19.0 \\ 15.4 \\ 0.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 77.0 \\ 6.2 \\ 8.2 \\ 5.3 \\ 3.0 \\ 0.4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 83.1 \\ 5.9 \\ 7.4 \\ 2.3 \\ 1.1 \\ 0.2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 66.2 \\ 6.7 \\ 9.5 \\ 10.7 \\ 6.3 \\ 0.6 \end{array}$ |
| Prior to this term, have you ever taken courses for credit at this institution? <br> Yes <br> No | $\begin{array}{r} 5.7 \\ 94.3 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6.5 \\ 93.5 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4.7 \\ 95.3 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7.8 \\ 92.2 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5.0 \\ 95.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4.9 \\ 95.1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6.4 \\ 93.6 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4.5 \\ 95.5 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4.9 \\ 95.1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4.1 \\ 95.9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8.9 \\ 91.1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.0 \\ & 90.0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6.8 \\ 93.2 \end{array}$ |


Kəлıns uemusəad dyIכ SLOZ
Weighted National Norms－All Respondents

|  |  | － <br>  ○ボゥデ「ご | ب० <br>  <br>  <br>  |  <br>  |  <br>  <br>  <br>  |  <br>  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  ザํํํㅇㅇㅇ |  ○○タのベべへ | No |  |  |
|  |  | $\overleftarrow{\infty}$ <br> nnounor－ <br>  |  |  <br>  <br>  <br>  |  <br>  <br>  <br>  | OㅇNN． oin mio o <br>  <br>  |
|  | －iNo No <br>  <br> Nૂn mi웅 |  <br>  운우 <br>  $\bigcirc \infty$ ㅅN |  <br> $\forall 0.0$ mon e $\underset{\sim}{\dot{\circ}} \dot{\sim}$ <br>  <br>  |  <br> $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim} \underset{\sim}{\sim} \underset{\sim}{\sim} \underset{\sim}{\infty} \underset{\sim}{\infty} \sim$ | ningorin <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> ヘ～～～～～ロー・ |  Nignioo <br>  <br> ○MホNへす <br>  |
|  | no 0 ㄴnN <br>  <br>  ロinmー |  $\therefore \sigma$ Oio 000 $\stackrel{\infty}{\circ} \underset{\sim}{n} \stackrel{n}{\infty} \stackrel{n}{n} \uparrow$ <br>  |  ற゙ヘ | n n nooroon o <br> ベがํ゙。 <br>  |  <br>  | ナーナmヲm <br>  <br>  ベデテNOO |
|  |  <br> nion on <br> ふiNio | $\stackrel{\infty}{\circ} \dot{\sim}$ <br>  |  $\infty ナ \mathfrak{N}$ mす゚ーさ <br>  $\underset{\sim}{\text { miNin№ }}$ |  <br>  <br>  |  <br>  <br>  <br>  | nへ～mのন <br>  <br> Nig iñino |
|  |  | no ono |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


2015 CIRP Freshman Survey
Weighted National Norms-All Respondents

| All Respondents | All Bacc Institutions | Baccalaureate Institutions |  | 4-year Colleges |  |  |  |  | Universities |  | Black Colleges and Universities |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 4-yr Coll | Universities | Public | Private | Nonsec | Catholic | Oth Relig | Public | Private | All HBCU | Public | Private |
| Your intended major (continued): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Biology (general) | 7.4 | 6.4 | 8.5 | 5.2 | 7.9 | 6.9 | 10.9 | 7.4 | 8.4 | 8.9 | 11.0 | 8.9 | 14.8 |
| Animal Biology (zoology) | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.4 |
| Ecology \& Evolutionary Biology | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Marine Biology | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Microbiology | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Molecular, Cellular, \& Developmental Biology | 0.7 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Neurobiology/Neuroscience | 1.5 | 0.8 | 2.2 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 0.9 | 1.4 | 2.1 | 3.0 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.5 |
| Plant Biology (botany) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.4 |
| Agriculture/Natural Resources | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.6 |
| Biochemistry/Biophysics | 1.6 | 1.1 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 1.3 | 2.1 | 1.7 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.6 |
| Environmental Science | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 0.5 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Other Biological Science | 0.8 | 0.5 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.4 |
| Business |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Accounting | 1.8 | 2.1 | 1.5 | 1.8 | 2.3 | 1.7 | 3.7 | 2.3 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.7 |
| Business Administration (general) | 2.4 | 2.8 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 3.9 | 3.6 | 3.4 | 4.4 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 2.9 | 3.3 | 2.4 |
| Entrepreneurship | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Finance | 2.2 | 1.5 | 3.1 | 0.9 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 4.3 | 1.2 | 2.5 | 5.4 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 2.3 |
| Hospitality/Tourism | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.0 |
| Human Resources Management | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| International Business | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 1.2 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 1.7 | 1.0 | 0.2 | 2.5 |
| Marketing | 2.0 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 1.4 | 2.5 | 2.1 | 4.5 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.7 | 2.3 | 1.7 | 3.3 |
| Management | 2.1 | 2.9 | 1.3 | 3.4 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 2.0 | 2.6 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 4.4 | 5.0 | 3.4 |
| Computer/Management Information Systems | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.2 |
| Real Estate | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Other Business | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Elementary Education | 1.6 | 2.2 | 1.0 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 1.3 | 2.1 | 3.6 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.6 | 2.0 | 0.9 |
| MusidArt Education | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.4 |
| Physical Education/Recreation | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 1.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 1.4 | 2.1 | 0.3 |
| Secondary Education | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.4 |
| Special Education | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.3 |
| Other Education | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.2 |
| Engineering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aerospace/Aeronautical/Astronautical Engineering | 1.2 | 1.4 | 1.0 | 2.5 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.4 |
| Biological/Agricultural Engineering | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.2 |
| Biomedical Engineering | 1.2 | 0.4 | 2.1 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 2.2 | 1.7 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| Chemical Engineering | 1.1 | 0.5 | 1.8 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 1.9 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 1.3 |
| Civil Engineering | 1.3 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 2.5 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.9 |
| Computer Engineering | 1.4 | 1.0 | 1.7 | 1.4 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 1.9 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 2.1 |
| Electrical/Electronic Communications Engineering | 1.1 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 1.4 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 1.1 |
| Engineering Science/Engineering Physics | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.6 |
| Environmental/Environmental Health Engineering | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.0 |
| Industria//Manufacturing Engineering | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 1.2 | 0.1 |
| Materials Engineering | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Mechanical Engineering | 3.5 | 3.2 | 3.8 | 4.9 | 1.3 | 1.1 | 1.5 | 1.3 | 4.2 | 2.4 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 2.5 |
| Other Engineering | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 |


| All Respondents | Weighted National Norms-All Respondents |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All Bacc Institutions | Baccalaureate Institutions |  | 4-year Colleges |  |  |  |  | Universities |  | Black Colleges and Universities |  |  |
|  |  | 4-yr Coll | Universities | Public | Private | Nonsec | Catholic | Oth Relig | Public | Private | All HBCU | Public | Private |
| Your intended major (continued): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Health Professions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clinical Laboratory Science | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Health Care Administration/Studies | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.4 |
| Health Technology | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Kinesiology | 1.4 | 1.9 | 0.8 | 2.7 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 1.5 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 1.8 | 2.3 | 0.9 |
| Nursing | 4.3 | 5.0 | 3.7 | 5.2 | 4.7 | 4.0 | 7.7 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 2.7 | 8.5 | 12.2 | 2.0 |
| Pharmacy | 0.8 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 2.3 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 2.6 |
| Therapy (occupational, physical, speech) | 2.1 | 2.3 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 3.3 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 4.1 | 1.7 | 2.1 | 2.9 | 3.8 | 1.3 |
| Other Health Profession | 2.2 | 2.6 | 1.9 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.0 | 2.8 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.5 | 1.1 | 2.1 |
| Math and Computer Science |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Computer Science | 3.8 | 3.2 | 4.4 | 4.0 | 2.3 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 4.7 | 3.6 | 3.1 | 2.8 | 3.6 |
| Mathematics/Statistics | 1.1 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 |
| Other Math and Computer Science | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Physical Science |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Astronomy \& Astrophysics | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Atmospheric Science | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Chemistry | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.0 | 2.3 |
| Earth \& Planetary Sciences | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Marine Sciences | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Physics | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| Other Physical Science | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Social Science |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Anthropology | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Economics | 1.4 | 0.9 | 1.8 | 0.6 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 1.5 | 3.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| Ethnic/Cultural Studies | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Geography | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Political Science (gov't., international relations) | 3.1 | 3.2 | 2.9 | 3.7 | 2.8 | 3.2 | 2.8 | 2.3 | 2.6 | 4.3 | 1.9 | 1.5 | 2.5 |
| Psychology | 4.2 | 4.7 | 3.7 | 4.5 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 5.4 | 5.3 | 3.6 | 4.1 | 6.5 | 6.6 | 6.2 |
| Public Policy | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Social Work | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 2.3 | 3.2 | 0.8 |
| Sociology | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 1.0 |
| Women's/Gender Studies | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other Social Science | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Other Majors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Architecture/Urban Planning | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.6 |
| Criminal Justice | 1.9 | 2.9 | 0.9 | 3.4 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 5.6 | 7.5 | 2.2 |
| Library Science | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Security \& Protective Services | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Military Sciences/Technology/Operations | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 2.4 | 2.9 | 1.8 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 1.3 | 3.6 | 1.9 | 1.5 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 1.6 |
| Undecided | 8.9 | 8.5 | 9.2 | 8.1 | 9.0 | 10.2 | 8.5 | 8.0 | 9.4 | 8.5 | 2.8 | 2.6 | 3.2 |

Kəлıns uemusəad dyiכ sloz

| All Respondents | All Bacc Institutions | Baccalaureate Institutions |  | 4-year Colleges |  |  |  |  | Universities |  | Black Colleges and Universities |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 4-yr Coll | Universities | Public | Private | Nonsec | Catholic | Oth Relig | Public | Private | All HBCU | Public | Private |
| How much of your first year's educational expenses (room, board, tuition, and fees) do you expect to cover from each of the sources listed below? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Family resources (parents, relatives, spouse, etc.) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 29.2 | 36.5 | 21.3 | 46.9 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 21.4 | 25.3 | 22.8 | 15.4 | 41.3 | 44.4 | 35.8 |
| \$1 to \$2,999 | 16.5 | 19.4 | 13.5 | 22.7 | 15.4 | 13.2 | 14.5 | 18.2 | 14.3 | 10.2 | 27.6 | 31.2 | 21.2 |
| \$3,000 to \$5,999 | 10.7 | 11.1 | 10.2 | 10.7 | 11.6 | 10.2 | 11.4 | 13.1 | 10.7 | 8.0 | 13.3 | 12.4 | 14.8 |
| \$6,000 to \$9,999 | 8.0 | 7.6 | 8.4 | 6.2 | 9.4 | 8.6 | 8.8 | 10.4 | 8.7 | 7.3 | 5.9 | 5.3 | 6.8 |
| \$10,000 to \$14,999 | 8.8 | 7.6 | 10.0 | 5.0 | 10.6 | 10.1 | 10.0 | 11.4 | 10.3 | 9.0 | 4.6 | 3.4 | 6.9 |
| \$15,000 or more | 26.9 | 17.8 | 36.6 | 8.5 | 29.0 | 33.8 | 33.8 | 21.5 | 33.2 | 50.1 | 7.3 | 3.3 | 14.5 |
| My own resources (savings from work, workstudy, other income) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 46.6 | 48.7 | 44.3 | 53.5 | 42.9 | 45.7 | 43.1 | 39.9 | 43.6 | 47.2 | 55.9 | 55.6 | 56.3 |
| \$1 to \$2,999 | 36.9 | 35.7 | 38.1 | 34.3 | 37.4 | 36.0 | 37.0 | 39.2 | 38.7 | 35.4 | 33.0 | 34.0 | 31.1 |
| \$3,000 to \$5,999 | 10.1 | 9.3 | 11.0 | 7.6 | 11.3 | 10.4 | 11.5 | 12.0 | 11.2 | 10.2 | 6.9 | 6.5 | 7.6 |
| \$6,000 to \$9,999 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 2.4 | 3.8 | 3.4 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 |
| \$10,000 to \$14,999 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 1.8 | 2.1 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 1.0 |
| \$15,000 or more | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 1.6 | 2.5 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 2.0 |
| Aid which need not be repaid (grants, scholarships, military funding, etc.) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 31.0 | 27.1 | 35.3 | 31.3 | 22.0 | 25.6 | 22.5 | 17.9 | 36.9 | 28.7 | 29.1 | 30.6 | 26.4 |
| \$1 to \$2,999 | 12.4 | 10.9 | 14.0 | 14.4 | 6.6 | 6.0 | 6.5 | 7.3 | 16.0 | 6.0 | 15.0 | 16.9 | 11.7 |
| \$3,000 to \$5,999 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 11.4 | 14.5 | 8.0 | 7.2 | 8.1 | 8.8 | 12.8 | 5.9 | 18.6 | 21.4 | 13.7 |
| \$6,000 to \$9,999 | 8.8 | 8.7 | 9.0 | 10.0 | 7.1 | 6.1 | 7.2 | 8.2 | 9.9 | 5.3 | 12.0 | 13.9 | 8.6 |
| \$10,000 to \$14,999 | 10.4 | 10.8 | 9.9 | 9.0 | 13.0 | 11.4 | 13.2 | 14.6 | 9.9 | 9.9 | 8.8 | 7.6 | 11.0 |
| \$15,000 or more | 25.9 | 31.0 | 20.4 | 20.8 | 43.3 | 43.6 | 42.5 | 43.3 | 14.5 | 44.2 | 16.4 | 9.6 | 28.7 |
| Aid which must be repaid (loans, etc.) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 55.6 | 54.5 | 56.8 | 64.3 | 42.9 | 46.9 | 41.9 | 39.1 | 57.5 | 53.8 | 38.8 | 39.0 | 38.6 |
| \$1 to \$2,999 | 8.2 | 8.5 | 7.8 | 8.5 | 8.5 | 7.8 | 8.7 | 9.0 | 8.0 | 6.9 | 13.7 | 16.6 | 8.5 |
| \$3,000 to \$5,999 | 14.8 | 14.9 | 14.7 | 12.6 | 17.8 | 16.3 | 18.9 | 18.8 | 14.8 | 14.3 | 17.7 | 20.3 | 13.0 |
| \$6,000 to \$9,999 | 7.7 | 7.9 | 7.6 | 5.5 | 10.7 | 8.9 | 10.7 | 12.7 | 7.7 | 7.1 | 10.4 | 11.9 | 7.7 |
| \$10,000 to \$14,999 | 5.8 | 6.2 | 5.3 | 4.0 | 8.9 | 8.0 | 8.2 | 10.3 | 5.1 | 6.2 | 7.4 | 6.4 | 9.2 |
| \$15,000 or more | 7.8 | 7.9 | 7.8 | 5.1 | 11.2 | 12.1 | 11.6 | 10.1 | 6.8 | 11.8 | 12.0 | 5.8 | 23.0 |
| Other than above |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 94.4 | 93.8 | 94.9 | 94.5 | 93.0 | 93.7 | 92.6 | 92.5 | 95.1 | 94.3 | 91.8 | 91.8 | 91.8 |
| \$1 to \$2,999 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 2.3 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 2.4 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 3.4 | 3.7 | 3.0 |
| \$3,000 to \$5,999 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 1.4 |
| \$6,000 to \$9,999 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.0 |
| \$10,000 to \$14,999 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.7 |
| \$15,000 or more | 1.0 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 0.5 | 2.1 |

Kəлıns uewusəat dyIכ Sloz

| All Respondents | All Bacc Institutions | Baccalaureate Institutions |  | 4-year Colleges |  |  |  |  | Universities |  | Black Colleges and Universities |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 4-yr Coll | Universities | Public | Private | Nonsec | Catholic | Oth Relig | Public | Private | All HBCU | Public | Private |
| Did you receive any of the following forms of financial aid? <br> Military grants <br> Yes <br> No | $\begin{array}{r} 3.2 \\ 96.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4.6 \\ 95.4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.8 \\ 98.2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6.7 \\ 93.3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.9 \\ 98.1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.7 \\ 98.3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.5 \\ 98.5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2.4 \\ 97.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.8 \\ 98.2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.6 \\ 98.4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3.5 \\ 96.5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3.1 \\ 96.9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4.2 \\ 95.8 \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Work-study } \\ & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20.9 \\ & 79.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21.4 \\ & 78.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 20.4 \\ 79.6 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.4 \\ & 89.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 34.5 \\ 65.5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 34.9 \\ 65.1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32.4 \\ & 67.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35.3 \\ & 64.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18.4 \\ & 81.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28.0 \\ & 72.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15.1 \\ & 84.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17.7 \\ & 82.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.8 \\ & 89.2 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Pell Grant } \\ & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26.6 \\ & 73.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30.5 \\ & 69.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 22.5 \\ 77.5 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30.5 \\ & 69.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30.6 \\ & 69.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27.8 \\ & 72.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29.4 \\ & 70.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 34.1 \\ 65.9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22.7 \\ & 77.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21.7 \\ & 78.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58.1 \\ & 41.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 61.8 \\ & 28 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51.4 \\ & 48.6 \end{aligned}$ |
| Need-based grants or scholarships Yes No | $\begin{aligned} & 36.6 \\ & 63.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37.9 \\ & 62.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35.3 \\ & 64.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27.6 \\ & 72.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 50.0 \\ 50.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50.2 \\ & 49.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 47.7 \\ 52.3 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50.9 \\ & 49.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 33.5 \\ 66.5 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 42.3 \\ & 57.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 43.3 \\ 56.7 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44.3 \\ & 55.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41.4 \\ & 58.6 \end{aligned}$ |
| Merit-based grants or scholarships Yes No | $\begin{aligned} & 51.6 \\ & 48.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51.2 \\ & 48.8 \end{aligned}$ | 52.1 47.9 | 31.8 68.2 | $\begin{array}{r} 73.3 \\ 26.7 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 72.4 27.6 | 72.3 27.7 | $\begin{aligned} & 74.9 \\ & 25.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 49.6 \\ 50.4 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 61.6 \\ & 38.4 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 38.3 \\ 61.7 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 30.1 \\ 69.9 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 51.5 48.5 |
| What is your best estimate of your parents'/ guardians' total income last year? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less than \$10,000 | 3.5 | 4.6 | 2.3 | 5.3 | 3.9 | 3.4 | 3.9 | 4.3 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 14.5 | 17.7 | 8.9 |
| \$10,000 to \$14,999 | 2.9 | 3.7 | 1.9 | 4.6 | 2.7 | 2.3 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 2.0 | 1.8 | 7.9 | 9.8 | 4.6 |
| \$15,000 to \$19,999 | 2.5 | 3.1 | 1.7 | 3.6 | 2.5 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.9 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 5.9 | 6.8 | 4.2 |
| \$20,000 to \$24,999 | 3.5 | 4.2 | 2.8 | 4.8 | 3.5 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 3.9 | 2.9 | 2.3 | 6.9 | 7.7 | 5.7 |
| \$25,000 to \$29,999 | 2.7 | 3.3 | 2.1 | 3.6 | 2.9 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 3.1 | 2.2 | 2.0 | 5.7 | 6.4 | 4.6 |
| \$30,000 to \$39,999 | 5.4 | 6.4 | 4.3 | 6.8 | 5.8 | 5.3 | 5.2 | 6.7 | 4.4 | 3.9 | 9.2 | 9.7 | 8.4 |
| \$40,000 to \$49,999 | 6.5 | 7.6 | 5.3 | 8.0 | 7.2 | 6.8 | 6.3 | 8.1 | 5.4 | 5.1 | 9.5 | 9.1 | 10.2 |
| \$50,000 to \$59,999 | 7.4 | 8.4 | 6.4 | 8.6 | 8.1 | 7.9 | 6.6 | 9.1 | 6.7 | 5.6 | 9.2 | 8.8 | 10.0 |
| \$60,000 to \$74,999 | 9.3 | 10.2 | 8.3 | 10.1 | 10.4 | 10.2 | 9.0 | 11.3 | 8.5 | 7.4 | 8.6 | 8.2 | 9.3 |
| \$75,000 to \$99,999 | 12.4 | 12.6 | 12.1 | 12.4 | 12.9 | 13.0 | 11.5 | 13.6 | 12.4 | 10.7 | 8.6 | 7.8 | 10.1 |
| \$100,000 to \$149,999 | 18.4 | 16.6 | 20.4 | 16.1 | 17.1 | 17.4 | 17.4 | 16.7 | 20.9 | 18.6 | 7.9 | 5.0 | 13.1 |
| \$150,000 to \$199,999 | 9.6 | 8.2 | 11.2 | 7.9 | 8.6 | 9.2 | 9.8 | 7.4 | 11.2 | 10.8 | 3.2 | 1.6 | 6.0 |
| \$200,000 to \$249,999 | 5.8 | 4.4 | 7.3 | 3.8 | 5.2 | 5.8 | 6.6 | 4.0 | 7.1 | 8.1 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 1.9 |
| \$250,000 or more | 10.1 | 6.5 | 13.9 | 4.3 | 9.3 | 10.8 | 12.1 | 6.1 | 12.4 | 19.7 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 3.0 |
| Do you have any concern about your ability to finance your college education? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None (I am confident that I will have sufficient funds) | 35.3 | 35.9 | 34.8 | 40.3 | 30.6 | 32.4 | 30.6 | 28.8 | 34.1 | 37.1 | 24.4 | 24.8 | 23.7 |
| Major (not sure I will have enough funds to complete college) | 12.0 | 12.7 | 11.3 | 12.1 | 13.5 | 13.2 | 13.8 | 13.8 | 11.3 | 11.2 | 22.7 | 21.1 | 25.4 |

Kəлıns uemusəad dyiכ sloz
Weighted National Norms-All Respondents
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Kəлıns uemusəay dyiכ sloz
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2015 CIRP Freshman Survey
Weighted National Norms-All Respondents

| All Respondents | All Bacc Institutions | Baccalaureate Institutions |  | 4-year Colleges |  |  |  |  | Universities |  | Black Colleges and Universities |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 4-yr Coll | Universities | Public | Private | Nonsec | Catholic | Oth Relig | Public | Private | All HBCU | Public | Private |
| For the activities below, indicate which ones you "Frequently" or "Occasionally" did during the past year: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attended a religious service | 69.5 | 70.9 | 67.9 | 69.0 | 73.2 | 64.2 | 80.6 | 78.8 | 66.2 | 74.4 | 84.8 | 83.6 | 86.8 |
| Was bored in class* | 34.1 | 33.3 | 35.0 | 34.1 | 32.3 | 33.7 | 29.0 | 32.5 | 35.6 | 32.5 | 35.3 | 38.1 | 30.2 |
| Demonstrated for a cause (e.g., boycott, rally, protest) | 20.8 | 19.6 | 22.2 | 17.9 | 21.8 | 23.5 | 23.3 | 19.2 | 21.2 | 25.9 | 28.6 | 24.4 | 35.9 |
| Tutored another student | 61.1 | 56.2 | 66.6 | 57.7 | 54.3 | 53.6 | 59.4 | 52.3 | 66.1 | 68.5 | 55.8 | 51.7 | 62.9 |
| Studied with other students | 88.7 | 87.0 | 90.4 | 86.2 | 88.0 | 88.1 | 90.3 | 86.7 | 90.1 | 91.8 | 86.3 | 84.8 | 88.8 |
| Smoked cigarettes* | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 1.7 | 1.5 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 0.5 |
| Drank beer* | 4.7 | 4.0 | 5.4 | 3.2 | 5.0 | 6.3 | 5.4 | 3.5 | 5.1 | 6.5 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.9 |
| Drank wine or liquor | 5.0 | 4.2 | 5.8 | 3.4 | 5.2 | 6.3 | 5.3 | 4.0 | 5.5 | 7.1 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Felt overwhelmed by all I had to do* | 34.1 | 34.2 | 34.0 | 32.2 | 36.7 | 37.1 | 35.8 | 36.8 | 33.9 | 34.6 | 33.7 | 32.8 | 35.3 |
| Felt depressed* | 9.5 | 10.2 | 8.8 | 9.7 | 10.9 | 11.6 | 8.9 | 11.2 | 8.7 | 8.9 | 11.4 | 11.5 | 11.1 |
| Performed volunteer work | 87.9 | 85.6 | 90.4 | 84.0 | 87.5 | 86.7 | 91.0 | 86.6 | 90.0 | 92.0 | 82.1 | 78.8 | 88.0 |
| Asked a teacher for advice after class | 85.3 | 84.7 | 86.1 | 82.7 | 87.0 | 87.1 | 88.1 | 86.3 | 85.6 | 87.7 | 82.3 | 81.0 | 84.4 |
| Voted in a student election | 68.0 | 65.2 | 71.1 | 65.0 | 65.4 | 65.6 | 70.9 | 62.4 | 70.9 | 72.2 | 69.1 | 67.4 | 72.2 |
| Socialized with someone of another racial/ethnic group | 96.4 | 95.9 | 96.9 | 95.6 | 96.3 | 96.2 | 97.2 | 96.0 | 96.9 | 97.2 | 92.7 | 91.3 | 95.3 |
| Came late to class* | 6.8 | 6.4 | 7.3 | 6.6 | 6.1 | 6.4 | 5.5 | 6.0 | 7.4 | 6.7 | 7.9 | 8.6 | 6.8 |
| Performed community service as a part of a class | 56.1 | 55.8 | 56.5 | 53.6 | 58.3 | 56.9 | 65.3 | 56.4 | 55.6 | 59.6 | 59.8 | 56.7 | 65.5 |
| Discussed religion | 80.2 | 78.5 | 82.1 | 76.2 | 81.3 | 78.6 | 82.6 | 83.5 | 81.1 | 85.6 | 80.3 | 78.2 | 84.1 |
| Discussed politics | 82.1 | 79.8 | 84.7 | 78.8 | 81.0 | 81.4 | 82.1 | 80.0 | 84.0 | 87.3 | 72.1 | 67.7 | 79.8 |
| Worked on a local, state, or national political campaign | 8.6 | 8.7 | 8.6 | 8.9 | 8.4 | 8.4 | 8.4 | 8.4 | 8.2 | 10.3 | 13.2 | 12.6 | 14.2 |
| Skipped school/class* ${ }^{*}$ | 2.1 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 2.2 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 2.1 | 2.2 | 1.8 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 2.5 |
| Publicly communicated my opinion about a cause (e.g., blog, email, petition) | 44.8 | 43.2 | 46.5 | 41.4 | 45.4 | 47.0 | 44.4 | 44.1 | 46.0 | 48.7 | 53.8 | 51.2 | 58.7 |
| Helped raise money for a cause or campaign | 52.0 | 51.4 | 52.7 | 49.7 | 53.4 | 52.3 | 57.6 | 52.3 | 52.0 | 55.2 | 55.1 | 56.6 | 52.4 |
| Fell asleep in class* | 5.3 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 5.4 | 5.1 | 4.9 | 4.3 | 5.7 | 5.4 | 4.7 | 8.8 | 10.1 | 6.4 |
| Failed to complete homework on time* | 4.6 | 4.8 | 4.4 | 5.0 | 4.6 | 4.9 | 3.5 | 4.8 | 4.5 | 3.9 | 5.2 | 5.6 | 4.3 |
| Used an online instructional website (e.g., Khan Academy, Coursera) as assigned for a class | 56.0 | 55.9 | 56.2 | 57.2 | 54.3 | 54.7 | 54.9 | 53.6 | 56.0 | 56.9 | 63.0 | 62.8 | 63.4 |
| Used an online instructional website (e.g., Khan Academy, Coursera) to learn something on your own | 83.1 | 83.9 | 82.2 | 86.5 | 80.8 | 82.6 | 76.0 | 81.4 | 82.1 | 82.4 | 93.1 | 93.6 | 92.1 |
| *responses for "Frequently" only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students rated as "A Major Strength" or "Somewhat Strong" in the following areas: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ability to see the world from someone else's perspective | 76.7 | 73.4 | 80.3 | 72.6 | 74.4 | 76.4 | 76.8 | 71.2 | 80.1 | 80.9 | 71.4 | 67.2 | 79.0 |
| Tolerance of others with different beliefs | 80.6 | 77.3 | 84.2 | 77.1 | 77.5 | 79.8 | 80.2 | 73.8 | 84.0 | 84.7 | 71.4 | 66.9 | 79.5 |
| Openness to having my own views challenged | 63.7 | 62.1 | 65.4 | 62.0 | 62.2 | 64.1 | 63.8 | 59.4 | 65.0 | 66.7 | 67.1 | 65.0 | 71.0 |
| Ability to discuss and negotiate controversial issues | 70.8 | 68.4 | 73.4 | 68.8 | 68.0 | 70.5 | 69.6 | 64.5 | 73.0 | 74.9 | 70.8 | 67.0 | 77.6 |
| Ability to work cooperatively with diverse people | 85.8 | 84.6 | 87.1 | 85.1 | 84.1 | 85.0 | 86.6 | 81.9 | 86.9 | 87.8 | 83.4 | 80.4 | 89.0 |
| Critical thinking skills | 76.3 | 72.3 | 80.8 | 72.4 | 72.2 | 73.8 | 74.4 | 69.2 | 80.6 | 81.5 | 73.2 | 70.4 | 78.2 |
| Ability to manage your time effectively | 51.8 | 50.9 | 52.9 | 50.8 | 51.1 | 49.9 | 54.1 | 50.8 | 52.7 | 53.6 | 54.6 | 55.5 | 53.0 |
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|  |  <br>  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  <br>  <br> $\stackrel{\text { ñ }}{\substack{0}}$ <br>  <br>  <br>  |
|  |  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  |
|  |  <br>  <br>  Noó -Nor-onooonoo <br>  |
|  |  <br>  <br>  <br>  |
|  |  <br>  |
|  |  |
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Кəлıns uemusəad dyIכ SLOZ
Weighted National Norms－All Respondents

|  |  <br>  <br>  | $\begin{aligned} & \hat{\infty}_{\infty}^{\circ} \stackrel{\sim}{\infty} \stackrel{\infty}{n} \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\infty} \underset{\sim}{\infty} \stackrel{\infty}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{n} \stackrel{n}{i} \stackrel{n}{\circ}$ |
|  |  <br>  <br> － | Nூ 9 <br> m $\underset{\sigma}{\circ} \mathrm{m}$ 86 m |  |
|  | O． <br> No <br>  | M N <br>  $\infty \infty$ <br> がべヘ $\infty$ | $\underset{\sim}{\infty} \underset{\sim}{n} \underset{\sim}{\sigma}$ <br> $\stackrel{6}{\dot{+}} \underset{\sim}{\circ}$ in <br> $+60$ <br> 추눙 |
|  |  <br>  | ONㅜㄴ $0 \stackrel{n}{\infty} \underset{\infty}{\infty} \underset{m}{m}$ |  |
|  |  <br> －ーMーーONOOONOOMーOOーOONOO甘さー <br> © © $\simeq{ }^{-}$ |  |  |
|  | Noṇ | $\underset{\infty}{m} \sim \underset{\sim}{m}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Kəлıns uemusəat dyוכ Sloz

| All Respondents | All Bacc Institutions | Baccalaureate Institutions |  | 4-year Colleges |  |  |  |  | Universities |  | Black Colleges and Universities |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 4-yr Coll | Universities | Public | Private | Nonsec | Catholic | Oth Relig | Public | Private | All HBCU | Public | Private |
| Race/Ethnicity-mark all that apply (total may add to more than $100 \%$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| American Indian/Alaska Native | 2.8 | 3.5 | 1.9 | 4.3 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 3.3 | 2.0 | 1.6 | 5.0 | 5.3 | 4.4 |
| East Asian (e.g., Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Taiwanese) | 7.4 | 5.0 | 10.0 | 5.4 | 4.5 | 6.1 | 3.6 | 3.3 | 9.9 | 10.5 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Southeast Asian (e.g., Cambodian, Vietnamese, Hmong, Filipino) | 4.1 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 5.7 | 2.5 | 2.3 | 3.9 | 1.8 | 4.2 | 3.3 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 2.0 |
| South Asian (e.g., Indian, Pakistani, Nepalese, Sri Lankan) | 2.6 | 1.3 | 4.1 | 1.0 | 1.5 | 2.1 | 1.6 | 0.9 | 3.9 | 4.8 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 1.1 |
| Other Asian | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | 0.9 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 1.4 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.3 |
| African American/Black | 11.6 | 15.0 | 7.9 | 14.9 | 15.1 | 13.8 | 13.9 | 17.0 | 6.6 | 12.7 | 94.7 | 94.6 | 94.9 |
| Mexican American/Chicano | 8.3 | 10.7 | 5.6 | 15.4 | 5.0 | 3.3 | 8.1 | 5.3 | 5.8 | 4.6 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 0.5 |
| Puerto Rican | 1.9 | 2.3 | 1.4 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 3.2 | 3.1 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 2.2 | 1.7 |
| Other Latino | 6.3 | 7.0 | 5.4 | 8.6 | 5.2 | 5.8 | 6.8 | 3.8 | 5.0 | 6.8 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.8 |
| White/Caucasian | 68.2 | 65.2 | 71.7 | 59.4 | 72.1 | 72.0 | 68.0 | 74.2 | 73.2 | 65.8 | 6.3 | 7.1 | 4.7 |
| Other | 2.9 | 3.2 | 2.6 | 3.5 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 3.8 |
| Students "Agree Strongly" or "Agree Somewhat": |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Racial discrimination is no longer a major problem in America | 18.6 | 19.5 | 17.5 | 20.2 | 18.6 | 17.4 | 19.4 | 19.5 | 18.0 | 15.9 | 10.5 | 12.3 | 7.3 |
| Abortion should be legal | 63.6 | 58.5 | 69.3 | 58.6 | 58.4 | 68.3 | 55.7 | 49.4 | 70.2 | 66.0 | 52.8 | 48.0 | 61.3 |
| Colleges have the right to ban extreme speakers from campus | 43.2 | 43.8 | 42.5 | 44.4 | 43.2 | 41.8 | 44.0 | 44.2 | 42.0 | 44.1 | 33.6 | 32.1 | 36.1 |
| Realistically, an individual can do little to bring about changes in our society | 26.3 | 29.1 | 23.1 | 30.3 | 27.6 | 27.2 | 26.3 | 28.7 | 23.3 | 22.5 | 36.5 | 41.2 | 28.2 |
| Marijuana should be legalized | 56.4 | 52.8 | 60.5 | 51.3 | 54.6 | 60.9 | 51.6 | 49.4 | 61.3 | 57.9 | 64.2 | 62.5 | 67.2 |
| Dissent is a critical component of the political process | 63.9 | 59.6 | 68.8 | 59.1 | 60.3 | 62.0 | 62.1 | 57.5 | 68.1 | 71.2 | 54.8 | 52.3 | 59.1 |
| Colleges should prohibit racist/sexist speech on campus | 70.9 | 70.5 | 71.2 | 70.2 | 71.0 | 72.0 | 71.4 | 69.7 | 70.7 | 73.1 | 61.1 | 58.9 | 65.2 |
| Women should receive the same salary and opportunities for advancement as men in comparable positions | 95.4 | 94.5 | 96.4 | 94.7 | 94.3 | 94.7 | 95.1 | 93.4 | 96.4 | 96.5 | 89.0 | 87.0 | 92.6 |
| The United States should intervene in the wars of other countries | 28.6 | 28.9 | 28.2 | 30.5 | 27.1 | 25.3 | 28.3 | 28.3 | 27.9 | 29.4 | 22.9 | 24.2 | 20.5 |
| Same-sex couples should have the right to legal marital status | 81.1 | 77.3 | 85.5 | 77.6 | 76.8 | 83.9 | 82.4 | 66.6 | 86.0 | 83.6 | 66.7 | 62.6 | 73.9 |
| Students from disadvantaged social backgrounds should be given preferential treatment in college admissions | 52.3 | 54.2 | 50.2 | 53.8 | 54.6 | 56.6 | 52.1 | 53.9 | 50.0 | 51.0 | 64.7 | 62.9 | 68.0 |
| How would you characterize your political views? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Far left | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.5 | 4.3 | 5.7 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 3.9 | 4.1 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 5.9 |
| Liberal | 29.6 | 25.9 | 33.7 | 25.0 | 27.0 | 32.1 | 25.4 | 22.6 | 33.5 | 34.6 | 28.8 | 23.3 | 38.2 |
| Middle-of-the-road | 44.9 | 46.3 | 43.4 | 47.1 | 45.3 | 43.5 | 47.8 | 46.0 | 44.0 | 40.9 | 47.6 | 50.1 | 43.4 |
| Conservative | 19.8 | 21.6 | 17.8 | 21.9 | 21.2 | 16.8 | 21.9 | 25.5 | 17.4 | 19.1 | 13.9 | 15.8 | 10.6 |
| Far right | 1.8 | 2.3 | 1.2 | 2.4 | 2.1 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 2.5 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 3.1 | 3.8 | 2.0 |
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|  | $\bullet$－$ナ$ miñ <br>  <br>  ふぁin in min in |  |  －ヘざざざざさ <br>  <br>  |  <br>  <br>  <br>  |  <br> $\sigma=\stackrel{\infty}{\circ} \dot{\sim}$ <br>  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ \text { 足 } \\ \overline{<} \end{array}$ | ก mo $0 \rightarrow \infty \infty$ <br>  |  <br>  |  |  <br>  |  <br>  |
|  | $0000 \infty m \sigma$ <br>  <br>  <br>  |  <br> $-ナ \underset{\text {－}}{\text { ベ }}$ <br>  <br>  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\circ} \infty \times \infty$ <br>  <br>  |  <br>  <br> No No incomm <br> $\infty \infty \times \sim$ niono | $00000 \infty \times 10$ <br>  <br>  <br>  |
|  | NMon Mon No <br>  <br> のOOMnーの めiNuñiog <br> O－o．0m～ ભninioxin |  <br> $\checkmark \infty \bullet-\sigma \varphi \overbrace{0}$ <br> $-ஸ \underset{\sim}{\circ} \underset{\sim}{\sim}$ <br>  <br> $\stackrel{-\infty}{\sim}$ | NMNGTOON －NO～N゙べか <br> ベゥのオのペルナ $\circ$ Noin Mo © ○ |  <br>  <br>  <br> － <br>  |  <br> $\checkmark 60 \operatorname{\sigma } \omega \infty \infty$ <br>  <br> のヘのヘラのペ <br>  |
|  | － $0 \times \infty \times \sim$ <br>  <br> мптм๐о－ <br>  |  <br>  <br>  <br>  |  <br>  <br>  ○MNへべベー |  <br>  <br>  <br>  |  <br>  |
|  |  <br>  <br>  <br>  |  <br>  |  <br>  <br>  |  <br> のonorーno のinm minnoo |  <br>  <br> かのホべががー |
|  |  <br>  |  |  <br>  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
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|  | $\bar{\sim}$ <br>  |  <br> 000000 R． <br>  |  <br>  <br>  |  <br>  |  <br>  <br>  <br>  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  <br>  |  | $\bar{m}$ <br>  |
|  |  <br>  タミミジーがo |  <br>  <br>  |  <br>  <br>  |  <br>  |  <br> ざミボざざポーテ <br>  <br>  |
|  |  <br>  <br>  $\underset{m}{\infty} \underset{\sim}{\infty} \underset{\sim}{\infty} \underset{\sim}{c}$ <br> $\infty$ ナナ <br>  |  <br>  <br>  <br>  |  <br>  <br>  <br>  |  <br>  <br> OTOOONOT N M <br> $\stackrel{\text { No }}{\sim}$ <br>  |  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  |
|  |  <br>  <br>  <br>  |  <br>  <br>  デチペべが |  <br>  <br>  |  <br>  <br>  <br>  |  |
|  |  テベンジーが <br> $\bigoplus \infty 0 \times \operatorname{n} \cap \infty$ <br>  |  Jinin $\dot{f}=0 \infty$ <br> ONOオNへんロ <br>  |  <br>  <br>  $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim} \underset{\sim}{\infty}$ ヘin |  <br>  <br>  <br> ジッポべヘース |  <br>  |
|  |  <br>  | O. |  <br>  | Nin గn <br>  | $\infty \infty 0$ ㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇ <br>  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
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|  |  $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |  <br>  |  $\underset{y}{\text { yi n }}$ |  nion |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  <br>  |  <br>  |  | nirion in on or on |
|  |  <br>  $\underset{\sim}{n} \underset{\sim}{n} \underset{m}{n} \underset{\sim}{\circ} \underset{\sim}{+}$ |  <br>  |  <br>  <br>  <br>  | Nペーナ $\quad$ m m $\infty$ <br>  <br>  <br>  |
|  |  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  |  <br>  |  <br>  <br>  |  <br> mmonmonn <br>  <br> ナN mo oomo <br>  |
|  |  <br>  |  <br>  <br>  <br>  | oonninomo <br>  <br>  <br>  |  <br>  <br>  <br>  |
|  | ก $0000 \infty m n_{n}^{\infty}$ Nベゥーナーか。 <br>  <br>  |  <br>  <br>  |  <br>  |  <br>  <br>  |
|  |  <br>  |  <br>  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
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| All Respondents | All Bacc Institutions | Baccalaureate Institutions |  | 4-year Colleges |  |  |  |  | Universities |  | Black Colleges and Universities |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 4-yr Coll | Universities | Public | Private | Nonsec | Catholic | Oth Relig | Public | Private | All HBCU | Public | Private |
| Military Status: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 92.7 | 87.4 | 99.0 | 77.6 | 99.0 | 99.2 | 98.7 | 98.9 | 99.0 | 99.0 | 97.4 | 97.5 | 97.0 |
| ROTC, cadet, or midshipman at a service academy | 6.9 | 12.0 | 0.8 | 21.4 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 2.2 | 2.0 | 2.5 |
| In Active Duty, Reserves, or National Guard | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| A discharged veteran NOT serving in Active Duty, Reserves, or National Guard | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| How would you describe the racial composition of the high school you last attended? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mostly White | 47.2 | 44.9 | 49.9 | 39.7 | 51.2 | 51.4 | 51.2 | 51.0 | 49.5 | 51.2 | 22.0 | 18.3 | 28.6 |
| Roughly half non-White | 24.5 | 24.7 | 24.4 | 25.0 | 24.4 | 23.9 | 21.1 | 26.6 | 24.9 | 22.4 | 27.6 | 30.2 | 22.9 |
| Mostly non-White | 17.2 | 18.8 | 15.3 | 23.2 | 13.5 | 13.2 | 16.1 | 12.5 | 15.6 | 14.3 | 33.9 | 36.0 | 30.2 |
| Completely non-White | 4.8 | 5.8 | 3.6 | 7.3 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.8 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 4.9 | 14.4 | 14.0 | 15.1 |
| How would you describe the racial composition of the neighborhood where you grew up? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Completely White | 15.7 | 15.0 | 16.6 | 12.6 | 17.7 | 17.7 | 17.8 | 17.7 | 16.8 | 15.8 | 3.6 | 3.1 | 4.5 |
| Mostly White | 47.9 | 44.9 | 51.5 | 41.0 | 49.4 | 49.3 | 46.1 | 51.3 | 52.1 | 49.5 | 18.4 | 16.7 | 21.3 |
| Roughly half non-White | 14.5 | 15.0 | 13.9 | 15.9 | 14.0 | 13.8 | 13.7 | 14.4 | 13.9 | 14.2 | 19.4 | 20.7 | 17.2 |
| Mostly non-White | 14.6 | 16.3 | 12.6 | 19.8 | 12.1 | 11.9 | 14.9 | 10.9 | 12.5 | 13.1 | 34.2 | 34.4 | 33.8 |
| Completely non-White | 7.3 | 8.9 | 5.3 | 10.7 | 6.7 | 7.3 | 7.5 | 5.7 | 4.7 | 7.4 | 24.3 | 25.0 | 23.2 |
| How many years do you expect it will take you to graduate from this college? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 边 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.1 |
| 2 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 2.0 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 0.6 |
| 3 | 2.7 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.4 | 1.5 | 4.3 | 3.1 | 2.0 | 3.5 | 3.2 | 4.0 |
| 4 | 85.5 | 86.2 | 84.7 | 84.1 | 88.7 | 88.8 | 88.5 | 88.8 | 84.8 | 84.5 | 86.7 | 88.2 | 84.1 |
| 5 | 7.8 | 7.0 | 8.8 | 9.2 | 4.3 | 3.9 | 6.4 | 3.5 | 8.4 | 10.1 | 5.1 | 4.3 | 6.3 |
| 6 or more | 2.1 | 1.7 | 2.5 | 1.2 | 2.4 | 3.6 | 2.5 | 1.1 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 2.4 | 1.5 | 4.0 |
| Do not plan to graduate from this college | 1.0 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 1.7 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 0.9 |
| What is your sexual orientation? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Heterosexual/Straight | 93.2 | 93.0 | 93.5 | 93.5 | 92.4 | 90.5 | 95.0 | 93.0 | 93.4 | 93.7 | 92.5 | 92.2 | 93.1 |
| Gay | 1.1 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.2 |
| Lesbian | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 1.7 | 0.6 |
| Bisexual | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 3.5 | 4.4 | 2.3 | 3.3 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.3 |
| Queer | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.6 |
| Other | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 2.1 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.1 |
| Do you identify as transgender? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| No | 99.7 | 99.6 | 99.7 | 99.7 | 99.6 | 99.5 | 99.8 | 99.6 | 99.7 | 99.8 | 99.8 | 99.8 | 99.8 |
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|  |  <br>  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  <br>  |
|  |  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> ベィ mio <br> Noo or <br> Nio mio |
|  |  <br> мпー0m＠ <br>  |
|  |  <br>  |
|  | 썬 |
|  |  |

2015 CIRP Freshman Survey
Weighted National Norms-All Respondents

| All Respondents | All Bacc Institutions | Baccalaureate Institutions |  | 4-year Colleges |  |  |  |  | Universities |  | Black Colleges and Universities |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 4-yr Coll | Universities | Public | Private | Nonsec | Catholic | Oth Relig | Public | Private | All HBCU | Public | Private |
| CIRP Construct: Habits of Mind |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| High | 26.3 | 23.5 | 29.5 | 22.8 | 24.3 | 25.9 | 27.8 | 20.8 | 28.4 | 33.5 | 28.8 | 25.1 | 35.5 |
| Average | 44.2 | 43.0 | 45.6 | 43.1 | 42.8 | 43.9 | 42.3 | 42.1 | 45.7 | 45.3 | 39.7 | 38.9 | 41.0 |
| Low | 29.5 | 33.5 | 24.9 | 34.1 | 32.9 | 30.3 | 30.0 | 37.1 | 25.9 | 21.2 | 31.5 | 36.0 | 23.5 |
| Mean | 49.66 | 48.81 | 50.61 | -48.60 | 49.06 | 49.57 | 49.91 | 48.08 | 50.33 | 51.65 | 49.69 | 48.63 | 51.58 |
| CIRP Construct: Academic Self-Concept |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| High | 26.4 | 21.0 | 32.6 | 21.6 | 20.3 | 20.6 | 20.5 | 19.9 | 31.7 | 35.6 | 23.6 | 22.8 | 25.0 |
| Average | 49.7 | 48.5 | 51.1 | 47.4 | 49.8 | 50.3 | 51.2 | 48.7 | 51.5 | 49.3 | 46.5 | 44.8 | 49.6 |
| Low | 23.9 | 30.5 | 16.4 | 31.1 | 29.9 | 29.2 | 28.3 | 31.4 | 16.7 | 15.2 | 29.9 | 32.4 | 25.4 |
| Mean | 51.10 | 49.68 | 52.71 | 49.77 | 49.58 | 49.66 | 49.96 | 49.30 | 52.59 | 53.18 | 50.16 | 49.80 | 50.78 |
| CIRP Construct: Social Self-Concept |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| High | 25.6 | 25.3 | 26.0 | 25.1 | 25.6 | 25.0 | 27.3 | 25.4 | 25.1 | 29.2 | 35.8 | 34.5 | 38.0 |
| Average | 55.4 | 54.9 | 56.1 | 55.2 | 54.6 | 54.9 | 54.9 | 54.1 | 56.4 | 54.9 | 51.7 | 52.2 | 50.7 |
| Low | 18.9 | 19.8 | 18.0 | 19.7 | 19.8 | 20.1 | 17.8 | 20.5 | 18.5 | 15.9 | 12.5 | 13.3 | 11.3 |
| Mean | 50.89 | 50.73 | 51.06 | 50.72 | 50.74 | 50.62 | 51.15 | 50.66 | 50.91 | 51.63 | 52.59 | 52.32 | 53.05 |
| CIRP Construct: Pluralistic Orientation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| High | 28.4 | 26.9 | 30.1 | 26.9 | 26.8 | 28.3 | 29.2 | 24.0 | 29.6 | 32.0 | 33.8 | 30.3 | 40.1 |
| Average | 44.1 | 42.6 | 45.8 | 42.7 | 42.5 | 43.9 | 42.5 | 41.0 | 45.8 | 45.6 | 37.2 | 35.9 | 39.7 |
| Low | 27.5 | 30.5 | 24.1 | 30.3 | 30.7 | 27.8 | 28.3 | 35.1 | 24.5 | 22.4 | 29.0 | 33.8 | 20.2 |
| Mean | 49.84 | 49.24 | 50.51 | 49.26 | 49.22 | 49.75 | 49.91 | 48.32 | 50.40 | 50.93 | 50.22 | 49.15 | 52.16 |
| CIRP Construct: Social Agency |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| High | 28.4 | 27.9 | 29.1 | 26.6 | 29.3 | 29.8 | 32.9 | 26.9 | 27.3 | 35.3 | 49.1 | 45.1 | 56.1 |
| Average | 45.9 | 45.8 | 46.1 | 45.8 | 45.9 | 45.2 | 45.5 | 46.8 | 46.6 | 44.6 | 38.2 | 40.8 | 33.8 |
| Low | 25.6 | 26.3 | 24.7 | 27.6 | 24.8 | 25.0 | 21.7 | 26.3 | 26.2 | 20.1 | 12.7 | 14.1 | 10.2 |
| Mean | 50.34 | 50.18 | 50.53 | 49.84 | 50.59 | 50.63 | 51.53 | 50.07 | 50.09 | 51.99 | 55.09 | 54.19 | 56.65 |
| CIRP Construct: Civic Engagement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| High | 23.4 | 22.0 | 25.0 | 20.6 | 23.7 | 24.7 | 26.4 | 21.3 | 23.7 | 30.1 | 34.4 | 30.6 | 41.1 |
| Average | 47.7 | 47.9 | 47.5 | 47.5 | 48.4 | 47.4 | 48.8 | 49.3 | 47.6 | 47.0 | 43.9 | 45.7 | 40.7 |
| Low | 28.9 | 30.1 | 27.5 | 31.9 | 27.9 | 27.9 | 24.8 | 29.4 | 28.7 | 22.9 | 21.7 | 23.6 | 18.2 |
| Mean | 49.69 | 49.36 | 50.05 | 48.95 | 49.85 | 49.98 | 50.53 | 49.36 | 49.75 | 51.21 | 51.96 | 51.16 | 53.38 |
| CIRP Construct: College Reputation Orientation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| High | 57.2 | 55.4 | 59.3 | 54.0 | 57.2 | 56.1 | 67.1 | 53.3 | 57.4 | 66.0 | 56.5 | 49.8 | 68.6 |
| Average | 34.2 | 35.2 | 33.0 | 35.9 | 34.3 | 35.4 | 27.2 | 36.8 | 34.4 | 28.1 | 33.3 | 37.7 | 25.3 |
| Low | 8.6 | 9.4 | 7.7 | 10.1 | 8.5 | 8.5 | 5.7 | 9.9 | 8.2 | 5.8 | 10.2 | 12.5 | 6.1 |
| Mean | 54.73 | 54.34 | 55.19 | 54.09 | 54.64 | 54.60 | 56.01 | 53.99 | 54.94 | 56.07 | 54.47 | 53.34 | 56.46 |
| CIRP Construct: Likelihood of College Involvement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| High | 27.3 | 23.3 | 32.2 | 19.0 | 28.2 | 31.0 | 32.8 | 23.0 | 30.0 | 39.2 | 25.7 | 21.3 | 33.3 |
| Average | 36.5 | 36.1 | 36.9 | 36.0 | 36.2 | 36.2 | 36.5 | 35.9 | 37.2 | 36.1 | 36.5 | 36.1 | 37.3 |
| Low | 36.3 | 40.7 | 30.9 | 45.0 | 35.6 | 32.8 | 30.7 | 41.1 | 32.8 | 24.6 | 37.8 | 42.7 | 29.4 |
| Mean | 48.48 | 47.48 | 49.70 | -46.52 | $48.62^{-1}$ | 49.22 | 49.83 | 47.37 | 49.23 | 51.23 | 48.08 | 46.93 | 50.07 |

## APPENDIX A

## Research Methodology

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The data reported here have been weighted to provide a normative picture of the American college first-year student population for persons engaged in policy analysis, human resource planning, campus administration, educational research, and guidance and counseling, as well as for the general community of students and parents. This Appendix provides a brief overview of the CIRP methodology and describes the procedures used to weight the annual freshman survey results to produce the national normative estimates.

## Historical Overview

From 1966 to 1970, approximately 15 percent of the nation's institutions of higher education were selected by sampling procedures and invited to participate in the program. As the academic community became aware of the value of program participation, additional institutions asked to participate. Beginning in 1971, all institutions that had entering first-year classes and that responded to the U.S. Department of Education's Higher Education General Information Survey were invited to participate. A minimal charge plus a unit rate based on the number of forms processed helps to defray the direct costs of the survey.

## The National Population for 2015

For the purposes of the 2015 CIRP Freshman Survey, the population has been defined as all institutions of higher education admitting first-time first-year students and granting a baccalaureate-level degree or higher listed in the U.S. Department of Education's Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). An institution is considered eligible if it was operating at the time of the IPEDS survey and had a first-time, full-time freshman class of at least 25 students. In addition, a small number of institutions or their branches are included even though their separate enrollments were not available from the IPEDS files. In 2015, the national population included 1,574 institutions. It should be noted that the population reflects institutions of "higher education," rather than "postsecondary education." Most proprietary, special vocational, or semiprofessional institutions are not currently included in the population.

## Institutional Stratification Design

The institutions identified as part of the national population are divided into 26 stratification groups based on type (four-year college, university), control (public, private nonsectarian, Roman Catholic, other religious), institutional race (predominantly non-Black, predominantly Black), and the "selectivity level" of the institution. Selectivity, defined as the median SAT Verbal and Math scores of the entering class (or ACT composite score), was made an integral part of the stratification design in 1968. Table A1 shows the distribution of institutions across the stratification cells. The dividing lines between low, medium and high selectivity levels are different for different types of institutions and should not be used as a measure of institutional or program quality.

A comprehensive restratification of the national population was undertaken in 2008 and is updated every few years, reviewing not only institutions' selectivity scores but also their control and religious affiliation (if any) as reported to IPEDS. In 2015, "university" is defined by 2010 Basic Carnegie Classification as "research universities" or "doctoral/research universities." Appendix C lists the current stratification cell assignment of institutions that participated in the 2015 CIRP Freshman Survey.

Having defined the population in terms of the stratification cell scheme, the IPEDS file is used to compute the male and female first-time, fulltime (FTFT) population in each cell. These population counts form the target counts of the weighting procedure.

## Identifying the Norms Sample

Generally speaking, an institution is included in the national norms sample if it provided a representative sample of its FTFT population. The minimum percentage required of a sample is 65 percent. Institutions whose sample proportions were less than but close to these cutoffs are included if the method used to administer the survey showed no systematic biases in first-year class coverage.

Information about the FTFT population and the method of survey administration is obtained from participating institutions at the time they return their completed surveys. In the event an institution did not return FTFT information, counts from the most recent IPEDS survey are used. This procedure, although not optimal, is adequate unless the institution experienced a substantial change in its FTFT population since the last IPEDS survey.

## The 2015 Data

Although 202,205 respondents at 311 two- and four-year colleges and universities returned their forms in time for their data to be included in the 2015 norms, the normative data presented here are based on responses from 141,189 FTFT freshmen entering 199 baccalaureate institutions.

The normative data presented here were collected by administering the 2015 CIRP Freshman Survey during registration, freshman orientation, or the first few weeks of classes (i.e., before the students have had any substantial experience with college life). The survey is designed to elicit a wide range of biographic and demographic data, as well as data on the students' high school background, career plans, educational aspirations, financial arrangements, high school activities, and current attitudes.
Table A1. 2015 CIRP Freshman Survey National Norms Sample and Population

Note:
-The broad categories of Institution Control (i.e., public, private, and religious affiliation) are defined by data submitted to Integrated Postsecondary Educational Data System (IPEDS). - Selivity is based on median SAT Verbal + Math scores and/r ACT composite scores of the entering class as reported to IPEDS. Other comparable sources (e.g., Common Data Set) are -Selectivity is based on median SAT Verbal + Math scores and/or ACT composite scores of the entering class as reported to IPEDS. Other comparable sources (e.g., Common Data Set) are
used for institutions not reporting SAT/ACT scores to IPEDS. Institutions with unknown selectivity are grouped with the low-selectivity institutions when computing National Norms. The stratification design presented here is used to group schools to develop population weights and should not be used as a measure of institutional or program quality. sample colleges.
-Two-year colleges are not included in the norms sample.

In addition to standard biographic and demographic items that have been administered annually to each entering class, the survey also contains other research-oriented items that may have been modified from previous years. The inclusion of modified items permits a more thorough coverage of student characteristics but also represents a compromise between two mutually exclusive objectives: (1) comparability of information from year to year which is required for assessing trends; and (2) flexibility in item content to meet changing information and research needs.

The survey, reproduced as Appendix B, has been developed in collaboration with students, professional associations, participating institutions, government agencies, educational researchers, administrators, and policy makers. The survey content is reviewed annually by the research directors at the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at UCLA as well as others interested in the annual freshman survey program.

First-time, full-time freshmen enrolled at institutions meeting minimal quality requirements for inclusion in the norms are differentially weighted to represent the national FTFT population. Part-time students and those who are not first-time college students (i.e., transfers and former enrollees) are excluded from the normative sample.

## Weighting the Sample

Those institutions identified as being part of the norms sample are weighted by a two-step procedure. The first weight is designed to adjust for response bias within institutions. Counts of the male and female FTFT population for each institution are divided by that institution's male and female FTFT respondent count. The resulting weights, when applied to each respondent, bring the male and female respondent counts up to the corresponding counts for the population at that institution.

The second weight is designed to compensate for nonparticipating institutions within each stratification cell. The weighted male and female counts for all participating institutions in each stratification cell are first summed and then are divided into the national male and female FTFT counts for all institutions in that stratification cell, producing a second set of cell weights.

To bring the racial composition of the weighted sample more in line with the data reported by IPEDS, we applied an adjusted second weight to several stratification cells for two racial/ ethnic groups. For these stratification cells, we computed separate second weights for Asian/ Pacific Islander students (compared to nonAsian/Pacific Islander students) and for Hispanic students (compared to those who did not identify as Hispanic). These separate second weights were combined with the first weight (weighting within institutions) as described in the next paragraph.

The final weight is simply the product of the first and second weights. Weighting each response in the norms sample using the final weight brings the male and female counts up to the national number of first-time full-time freshmen in each stratification cell (see Table A1).

The weighted data are combined separately to form various comparison groups. Comparison groups are hierarchically organized, allowing participating institutions to compare their results by type (four-year college versus university), control (public, private nonsectarian, Roman Catholic, other religious), race (Historically Black Colleges and Universities versus nonHBCUs), and selectivity level.

## CIRP Constructs

CIRP Constructs represent sets of related survey items that measure an underlying trait or aspect of a student's life. Item Response Theory (IRT), a modern psychometric method that has several advantages over methods used in more traditional factor analysis, is used to create a construct score for each respondent. Computing an individual's
construct score in IRT involves deriving a maximum likelihood score estimate based on the pattern of the person's responses to the entire set of survey items for that construct (or to a sub-set of the items that were answered). Items that tap into the trait more effectively are given greater weight in the estimation process (see Table A2). A respondent's construct score is thus not a simple arithmetic mean or weighted sum, but rather the estimated score that is most likely, given how the student answered the set of items. CIRP Constructs are scored on a Z-score metric and rescaled for a mean of approximately fifty and standard deviation of ten.

The low, average, and high construct score group percentages and the mean for the construct are reported here. Low scores represent students who are one-half standard deviation below the mean or lower. Average scores represent students whose scores are within one-half standard deviation of the mean. High scores represent students who are one-half standard deviation or more above the mean. Please visit HERI's website for more detailed information about CIRP Constructs.
Table A2. List of CIRP Freshman Survey Constructs (including survey items and estimation 'weights')

Table A2 (continued)

| College Reputation Orientation measures the degree to which students value academic reputation and |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| future career potential as a reason for choosing this college. |  |
| How important was each reason in your decision to come here? |  |
| - This college's graduates get good jobs (6.11)  <br> - This college's graduates gain admission to top graduate/professional schools (2.50)  <br> Likelihood of College Involvement is a unified measure of students' expectations about their involvement  <br> in college life generally.  <br> What is your best guess as to the chances that you will:  <br> - Participate in student clubs/groups (3.25)  <br> - Participate in a volunteer or community service work (1.58) - Participate in a study abroad program (1.24) <br> - Socialize with someone of another racial/ethnic group (1.28) - Participate in student government (0.96)  |  |

## APPENDIX B

## The 2015 CIRP <br> Freshman Survey Instrument

PLEASE PRINT IN ALL CAPS YOUR NAME AND PERMANENT/HOME ADDRESS (one letter or number per box).


When were you born?

ADDRESS:



STUDENT ID\# (as instructed): $\quad$ EMAIL (print letters carefully):

3. Is English your native language? $\bigcirc$ Yes $\bigcirc$ No
4. In what year did you graduate from high school? (Mark one)

| $2015 \ldots . . . . . .$. | Did not graduate but |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2014 \ldots \ldots . . . .$. | passed G.E.D. test. |
| $2013 \ldots \ldots . . .$. | Never completed |
| 2012 or earlier | high school.......... |

5. Are you enrolled (or enrolling) as a: (Mark one)

Full-time student. $\qquad$
Part-time student.......
6. How many miles is this college from your permanent home? (Mark one)
5 or less $\bigcirc$ 11-50 $\bigcirc$ 101-500 $\bigcirc$

$$
6-10 \bigcirc 51-100 \bigcirc \text { Over } 500
$$

7. What was your average grade in high school? (Mark one)

| A or $A+\bigcirc$ | $B$ | $C$ |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| $A-\bigcirc$ | $B-\bigcirc$ | $D$ |
| $B+\bigcirc$ | $C+\bigcirc$ |  |

8. What were your scores on the SAT I and/or ACT?

SAT Critical Reading. $\qquad$


SAT Mathematics $\qquad$


SAT Writing $\qquad$


ACT Composite $\qquad$

9. From what kind of high school did you graduate? (Mark one)
Public school (not charter or magnet)Public charter school
Public magnet schoolPrivate religious/parochial school
Private independent college-prep school Home school
10. Prior to this term, have you ever taken courses for credit at this institution? $\bigcirc$ Yes
$\bigcirc$ No
11. Since leaving high school, have you ever taken courses, whether for credit or not for credit, at any other institution (university, 4- or 2-year college, technical, vocational, or business school)?
Y Yes
$\bigcirc$ No
12. Where do you plan to live during the fall term? (Mark one)
With my family or other relatives. $\qquad$ $\bigcirc$
Other private home, apartment, or room .
College residence hall.
Fraternity or sorority house
Other campus student housing $\qquad$ .... Other $\qquad$
13. To how many colleges other than this one did you apply for admission this year?

| None | 1 | $\bigcirc$ | 4 | $\bigcirc$ | $7-8$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\bigcirc$ | 2 | $\bigcirc$ | 5 | $\bigcirc$ | $9-10$ | $\bigcirc$ |
|  | 3 | $\bigcirc$ | 6 | $\bigcirc$ | 11 or more | $\bigcirc$ |

14. Were you accepted by your first choice college? - Yes No
15. Is this college your: (Mark one) First choice. $\qquad$ $\bigcirc$ Less than third
Second choice.. . choice ............ Third choice $\qquad$
16. Citizenship status: (Mark one)
U.S. citizen

P Permanent resident (green card)
International student ( $\mathrm{F}-1$ or $\mathrm{M}-1$ visa)
None of the above
17. Please mark which of the following courses you have completed:
(V) (N) Algebra II
(V) (N) Pre-calculus/Trigonometry
(V) (N) Probability \& Statistics
(1) (N) Calculus
(V) (N) AP Probability \& Statistics
© (N) AP Calculus
18. How many weeks this summer did you participate in a bridge program at this institution?
0
3-4
7+ 1-2
5-6
19. Have you had, or do you feel you will need, any special tutoring or remedial work in any of the following subjects? (Mark all that apply)

20. How many Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate courses or exams did you take in high school? (Mark one for each row)

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| AP Courses | $\bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc 000$ |
| AP Exams... | -00000 |
| IB Courses... | -00000 |
| IB Exams.... | $\bigcirc 00000$ |

21. At this institution, which course placement tests have you taken in the following subject areas:
(v) (N) English
(V) (N) Reading
(ע) (N) Mathematics
() (N) Writing
22. Please mark the sex of your parent(s) or guardian(s).
Parent/Guardian 1

23. Are your parents: (Mark one)

Both alive and living with each other
Both alive, divorced or living apart
One or both deceased.
24. Do you consider yourself:
(Mark Yes or No for each item)
Pre-Med $\qquad$
Pre-Law $\qquad$

25. Please indicate your intended major using the codes provided on the attached fold out.
26. Please indicate your intended career as well as the careers of your parents/ guardians, using the codes provided

29. Did you receive any of the following forms of financial aid? (Mark Yes or No for each item)

| Military grants .................................. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Work-study ........................................ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Pell Grant ........................................ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Need-based grants or scholarships.. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Merit-based grants or scholarships.. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |

30. What is your best estimate of your parents'/ guardians' total income last year? Consider income from all sources before taxes. (Mark one)

| $\bigcirc$ | Less than $\$ 10,000$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\$ 50,000-59,999$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\bigcirc$ | $\$ 10,000-14,999$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\$ 60,000-74,999$ |
| $\bigcirc \$ 15,000-19,999$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\$ 75,000-99,999$ |  |
| $\bigcirc \$ 20,000-24,999$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\$ 100,000-149,999$ |  |
| $\bigcirc \$ 25,000-29,999$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\$ 150,000-199,999$ |  |
| $\bigcirc \$ 30,000-39,999$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\$ 200,000-249,999$ |  |
| $\bigcirc \$ 40,000-49,999$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\$ 250,000$ or more |  |

31. Do you have any concern about your ability to finance your college education? (Mark one)

None (I am confident that I will have sufficient funds).
Some (but I probably will have enough funds)..
Major (not sure I will have enough funds to complete college)
32. Current religious preference: (Mark one in each column)

34. Continued. For the activities below, indicate which ones you did during the past year. (Mark one for each item)


Voted in a student election... (F) (O) ©
Socialized with someone of another racial/ethnic group . (F) (O) (N)
Came late to class................ (F) (O) (N)
Performed community
service as a part of a class. (F) (O) (N)
Discussed religion ................ (F) (O) (N)
Discussed politics................. (F) © (N)
Worked on a local, state, or
national political campaign. © (O) (N)
Skipped school/class............ (F) (O) (N)
Publicly communicated my
opinion about a cause (e.g.
blog, email, petition)........... (F) © (N)
Helped raise money for a
cause or campaign..
(F) (O)

Fell asleep in class....
(F) (O)

Failed to complete homework
on time ................................
Used an online instructional
website (e.g., Khan
Academy, Coursera)
As assigned for a class.... © © ©
To learn something on
your own .........................(F) © (N)
35. How would you rate yourself in the following areas:
(Mark one for each item)
Ability to see the world from someone else's perspective.
33. What is the highest academic
degree that you intend to
obtain?
(Mark one in each column)

None.
Vocational certificate
Associate (A.A. or equivalent)...
Bachelor's degree (B.A., B.S., etc.)
Master's degree (M.A., M.S., etc.).
Ph.D. or Ed.D
M.D., D.O., D.D.S., or D.V.M.
J.D. (Law)
B.D. or M.DIV. (Divinity)

Other.
34. For the activities below, indicate which ones you did during the past year. If you engaged in an activity frequently, mark $\oplus$ If you engaged in an activity one or more times, but not frequently, mark © (Occasionally). Mark © (Not at all) if you have not performed the activity during the past
year. (Mark one for each item)

Tolerance of others with different beliefs .
Openness to having my own views challenged................ ○○○○○
Ability to discuss and negotiate controversial issues.
Ability to work
cooperatively with diverse people.


Critical thinking skills ..
Ability to manage your time effectively $\qquad$

36. What is the highest level of formal education obtained by your parents/ guardians?(Mark one in each column)
Parent/
Junior high/Middle
school or less .............

Guardian 1 | Parent/ |
| :---: |
| Guardian 2 |

| 37. How often in the past year did you? <br> (Mark one for each item) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ask questions in class. | (0) | (0) |
| Support your opinions with a logical argument. | (F) | (0) |
| Seek solutions to problems and explain them to others. | (F) | (0) (1) |
| Revise your papers to improve your writing | (F) | (0) (N) |
| Evaluate the quality or reliability of information you received..... | (F) | (0) |
| Take a risk because you feel you have more to gain | (F) | (0) |
| Seek alternative solutions to a problem $\qquad$ | (F) | © (1) |
| Look up scientific research articles and resources....... | (F) | (0) (1) |
| Explore topics on your own, even though it was not required for a class $\qquad$ | (F) | (0) (N) |
| Accept mistakes as part of the learning process. |  | (0) |
| Seek feedback on your academic work $\qquad$ | (F) | (0) (1) |
| 38. Are you: (Mark all that apply) |  |  |
| White/Caucasian |  | $\bigcirc$ |
| African American/Black |  | $\bigcirc$ |
| American Indian/Alaska Native |  | . |
| East Asian (e.g., Chinese, Japanese Korean, Taiwanese) |  |  |
| Southeast Asian (e.g., Cambodian, Vietnamese, Hmong, Filipino) |  | . |
| South Asian (e.g., Indian, Pakistani, Nepalese, Sri Lankan). |  | . |
| Other Asian |  | . $\bigcirc$ |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander |  | . |
| Mexican American/Chicano. |  | . |
| Puerto Rican |  | . |
| Other Latino |  | , |
| Other. |  | $\bigcirc$ |
| 39. How would you characterize your political views? <br> (Mark one) |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ Far left |  |  |
| - Liberal |  |  |
| Middle-of-the-road |  |  |
| Conservative |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ Far right |  |  |
| 40. In deciding to go to college, how important to you was each of the following reasons? <br> (Mark one answer for each possible reason) |  |  |
| To be able to get a better job......... |  | (S) (N) |
| To gain a general education and appreciation of ideas. | (v) | (S) (N) |
| To make me a more cultured person $\qquad$ | (v) | (S) (N) |
| To be able to make more money ..... | (v) | (S) (N) |
| To learn more about things that interest me $\qquad$ |  | (s) (N) |
| To get training for a specific career . | (v) | (S) (N) |
| To prepare myself for graduate or professional school |  | (S) (N) |

41. Rate yourself on each of the following traits as compared with the average person your age. We want the most accurate estimate of how you see yourself. (Mark one in each row)
Academic ability
Artistic ability
Competitiveness
Computer skills.
Cooperativeness.
Creativity.
Drive to achieve.

## Emotional health

Leadership ability
Mathematical ability.
Physical health
Public speaking ability
Risk-taking.
Self-confidence (intellectual)
Self-confidence (social)
Self-understanding
Spirituality.
Understanding of others .......................... $\bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc$
(1) Disagree Strongly
(2) Disagree Somewhat
(3) Agree Somewhat
(4) Agree Strongly

## 42. Mark one in each row:



Racial discrimination is no longer a major problem in America ................................... (4) (3) (2) (1)
Abortion should be legal............................................................................................ (4) (3) (2) (1)
Colleges have the right to ban extreme speakers from campus (4) (3) (2) (1)

Realistically, an individual can do little to bring about changes in our society ............. (4) (3) (2) (1)
Marijuana should be legalized.
(4) (3) (2) (1)

Dissent is a critical component of the political process. (4) (3) (2) (1)

Colleges should prohibit racist/sexist speech on campus.
(4) (3) (2) (1)

Women should receive the same salary and opportunities for advancement as men in comparable positions.
(4) (3) (2) (1)

The United States should intervene in the wars of other countries ............................. (4) (3) (2) (1)
Same-sex couples should have the right to legal marital status
(4) (3) (2) (1)

Students from disadvantaged social backgrounds should be given preferential treatment in college admissions.
(4) (3) (2) (1)
43. Below are some reasons that might have influenced your decision to attend this particular college. How important was each reason in your decision to come here? (Mark one answer for each possible reason)


My parents/relatives wanted me to come here
(v) (s) (N)

My teacher advised me
(v) (S) (N)

This college has a very good academic reputation
(v) (S) (N)

This college has a good reputation for its social activities................................... (V) (S) (N)
I was offered financial assistance ....................................................................... (V) (S) (N)
The cost of attending this college ...................................................................... (V) (S) (N)
High school counselor advised me ..................................................................... (v) (s) (N)
Private college counselor advised me....................................................................... (v) (S) (1)
I wanted to live near home............................................................................... (V) (S) (N)
Not offered aid by first choice ............................................................................. (V) (S) (N)
Could not afford first choice .............................................................................. (V) (S) (N)
This college's graduates gain admission to top graduate/professional schools ... (V) (S) (N)
This college's graduates get good jobs
I was attracted by the religious affiliation/orientation of this college ..................... (V) (S) (N)
I wanted to go to a school about the size of this college..................................... (V) (S) (N)
Rankings in national magazines ....................................................................... (v) (S) (N)
I was admitted through an Early Action or Early Decision program ..................... (V) (S) (N)
The athletic department recruited me ............................................................... (v) (s) (N)
A visit to this campus ......................................................................................... (V) (S) (N)
The percentage of students that graduate from this college................................ (V) (S) (N)

50. Please indicate the importance to you

51. What is your best guess as to the chances that you will:
(Mark one for each item)

Change major field ..............................................................................(5) (L) (N)
Change career choice ........................................................... (1) (5) (1) (1)
Participate in student government............................................ (1) (5) (ㄴ) (1)
Get a job to help pay for college expenses.............................. (1) (5) (ㄴ) (1)
Work full-time while attending college....................................... (1) (5) (L) (1)
Join a social fraternity or sorority ........................................... (1) (5) (ㄴ) (1)
Play club, intramural, or recreational sports.............................. (1) (5) (1) (1)
Play intercollegiate athletics (e.g., NCAA or NAIA-sponsored)... (1) (s) (ㄴ) (®)
Make at least a " $B$ " average................................................... (1) (S) (L) (1)
Participate in student protests or demonstrations..................... (1) (S) (ㄴ) (1)
Transfer to another college before graduating........................... (1) (S) (L) (1)
Be satisfied with your college.................................................. (1) (S) (ㄴ) (1)
Participate in volunteer or community service work................... (1) (5) (L) (®)
Seek personal counseling ...................................................... (1) (5) (ㄴ) (1)
Communicate regularly with your professors............................ (1) (S) (L) (1)
Socialize with someone of another racial/ethnic group.............. (1) (5) (ㄴ) (1)
Participate in student clubs/groups ........................................ (1) (5) (1) (1)
Participate in a study abroad program .................................... (1) (5) (ㄴ) (1)
Have a roommate of a different race/ethnicity .......................... (1) (5) (ㄴ) (1)
Discuss course content with students outside of class.............. (1) (S) (ㄴ) (1)
Work on a professor's research project .................................. (1) (5) (1) (1)
Take courses from more than one college simultaneously........ (1) (s) (ㄴ) (1)
Take a leave of absence from this college temporarily.............. (1) (S) (L) (1)
Take a course exclusively online:
At this institution...........
At a different institution (1) (s) (ㄴ) (1)

At a different institution (1) (S) (L) (1)
Vote in a local, state, or national election ................................ (1) (5) (1) (1)

The remaining ovals are provided for questions specifically designed by your college rather than the Higher Education Research Institute. If your college has chosen to use the ovals, please observe carefully the supplemental directions given to you.
52. (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
56. (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
60. (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
64. (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
68. (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
53. (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
57. (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
61. (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
65. (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
69. (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
54. (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
58. (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
62. (A) (B) (C) (D)
66. (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
70. (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
55. (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
59. (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
63. (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
67. (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
71. (A) (B) (C) (D) (E)

## THANK YOU!

[^0]of California, Los Angeles, California 90095-1521
25. Below is a list of different undergraduate major fields grouped into general categories. (Fill in appropriate two-digit code on your survey)

| ARTS AND HUMANITIES | HEALTH PROFESSIONS |
| :---: | :---: |
| 01 Art, fine and applied | 55 Clinical Laboratory Science |
| 02 English (language and literature) | 56 Health Care Administration/ |
| 03 History | Studies |
| 04 Journalism/Communication | 57 Health Technology |
| 05 Classical and Modern | 58 Kinesiology |
| Languages and Literature | 59 Nursing |
| 06 Media/Film Studies | 60 Pharmacy |
| 07 Music | 61 Therapy (occupational, |
| 08 Philosophy | physical, speech) |
| 09 Theatre/Drama | 62 Other Health Profession |
| 10 Theology/Religion | MATH AND COMPUTER |
| 11 Other Arts and Humanities | SCIENCE |
| BIOLOGICAL \& LIFE | 63 Computer Science |
| SCIENCES | 64 Mathematics/Statistics |
| 12 Biology (general) | 65 Other Math and Computer |
| 13 Animal Biology (zoology) | Science |
| 14 Ecology \& Evolutionary | PHYSICAL SCIENCE |
| Biology | 66 Astronomy \& Astrophysics |
| 15 Marine Biology | 67 Atmospheric Sciences |
| 16 Microbiology | 68 Chemistry |
| 17 Molecular, Cellular, \& | 69 Earth \& Planetary Sciences |
| Developmental Biology | 70 Marine Sciences |
| 18 Neurobiology/Neuroscience | 71 Physics |
| 19 Plant Biology (botany) | 72 Other Physical Science |
| 20 Agriculture/Natural Resources | SOCIAL SCIENCE |
| 21 Biochemistry/Biophysics | SOCIAL SCIENCE |
| 22 Environmental Science | 73 Anthropology |
| 23 Other Biological Science | 74 Economics |
|  | 75 Ethnic/Cultural Studies |
| BUSINESS | 76 Geography |
| 24 Accounting | 77 Political Science (gov't., |
| 25 Business Admin. (general) | international relations) |
| 26 Entrepreneurship | 78 Psychology |
| 27 Finance | 79 Public Policy |
| 28 Hospitality/Tourism | 80 Social Work |
| 29 Human Resources Management | 81 Sociology |
| 30 International Business | 82 Women's/Gender Studies |
| 31 Marketing | 83 Other Social Science |
| 32 Management |  |
| 33 Computer/Management | OTHER MAJORS |
| Information Systems | 84 Architecture/Urban Planning |
| 34 Real Estate | 85 Criminal Justice |
| 35 Other Business | 86 Library Science |
|  | 87 Security \& Protective |
| EDUCATION | Services |
| 36 Elementary Education | 88 Military Sciences/ |
| 37 Music/Art Education | Technology/Operations |
| 38 Physical Education/Recreation | Temmogh Oprat |
| 39 Secondary Education | 89 OTHER |
| 40 Special Education | 90 UNDECIDED |
| 41 Other Education |  |
| ENGINEERING |  |
| 42 Aerospace/Aeronautical/ |  |
| Astronautical Engineering |  |
| 43 Biological/Agricultural |  |
| Engineering |  |
| 44 Biomedical Engineering |  |
| 45 Chemical Engineering |  |
| 46 Civil Engineering |  |
| 47 Computer Engineering |  |
| 48 Electrical/Electronic |  |
| Communications Engineering |  |
| 49 Engineering Science/ |  |
| Engineering Physics |  |
| 50 Environmental/Environmental |  |
| Health Engineering |  |
| 51 Industrial/Manufacturing |  |
| Engineering |  |
| 52 Materials Engineering |  |
| 53 Mechanical Engineering |  |
| 54 Other Engineering |  |

26. Below is a list of different careers grouped into general categories. (Fill in appropriate two-digit codes on your survey)

## ARTS

01 Actor or Entertainer
02 Artist
03 Graphic Designer
04 Musician
05 Writer/Producer/Director
AGRICULTURE
06 Farmer or Forester
07 Natural Resource Specialist/Environmentalist
BUSINESS
08 Accountant
09 Administrative Assistant
10 Business Manager/Executive
11 Business Owner/Entrepreneur
12 Retail Sales
13 Sales/Marketing
14 Human Resources
15 Finance (e.g., Actuary,
Banking, Loan Officer, Planner)
16 Management Consultant
17 Real Estate Agent/Realtor/
Appraiser/Developer
18 Sports Management
COMMUNICATIONS
19 Journalist
20 Public/Media Relations
21 Advertising
EDUCATION
22 College Administrator/Staff
23 College Faculty
24 Early Childcare Provider
25 Elementary School Teacher
26 Secondary School Teacher
27 Librarian
28 Teacher's Assistant/
Paraprofessional
29 K-12 Administrator
30 Other K-12 Professional

## GOVERNMENT

31 Military
32 Federal/State/Local
Government Official
33 Protective Services
(e.g., Homeland Security,

Law Enforcement, Firefighter)
34 Postal Worker
HEALTHCARE SUPPORT
35 Dietician/Nutritionist
36 Home Health Worker
37 Medical/Dental Assistant
(e.g., Hygienist, Lab Tech,

Nursing Asst.)
38 Registered Nurse
39 Therapist (e.g., Physical,
Occupational, Speech)

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
40 Computer Programmer/Developer
41 Computer/Systems Analyst
42 Web Designer
LAW
43 Lawyer/Judge
44 Paralegal
MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS
45 Clinical Psychologist
46 Dentist/Orthodontist
47 Medical Doctor/Surgeon
48 Optometrist
49 Pharmacist
50 Veterinarian
SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING
51 Engineer
52 Research Scientist (e.g., Biologist,
Chemist, Physicist)
53 Urban Planner/Architect
SERVICE INDUSTRY
54 Custodian/Janitor/Housekeeper 55 Food Service (e.g., Chef/Cook, Server)
56 Hair Stylist/Aesthetician/
Manicurist
57 Interior Designer
58 Skilled Trades (e.g., Plumber,
Electrician, Construction)
59 Social/Non-Profit Services
60 CLERGY
61 HOMEMAKER/STAY AT HOME PARENT
62 OTHER 63 UNDECIDED

Carefully detach this section after answering Questions 25 and 26

Turn over for Question 26

## APPENDIX C

## Institutions Participating in the 2015 CIRP Freshman Survey

Institutions Participating in the 2015 CIRP Freshman Survey

| ACE | Institution | City | State | Stratification Cell | Included in National Norms |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1243 | Adrian College | Adrian | MI | 21 | Yes |
| 1 | Alabama A \& M University | Normal | AL | 34 | No |
| 354 | Albertus Magnus College | New Haven | CT | 16 | No |
| 1244 | Albion College | Albion | MI | 23 | Yes |
| 2232 | Albright College | Reading | PA | 22 | Yes |
| 2233 | Allegheny College | Meadville | PA | 23 | No |
| 1245 | Alma College | Alma | MI | 23 | Yes |
| 414 | American University | Washington | DC | 5 | No |
| 1135 | Amherst College | Amherst | MA | 14 | Yes |
| 2432 | Anderson University | Anderson | SC | 22 | Yes |
| 2046 | Antioch College | Yellow Springs | OH | 11 | No |
| 2235 | Arcadia University | Glenside | PA | 23 | No |
| 125 | Art Center College of Design | Pasadena | CA | 12 | No |
| 1322 | Augsburg College | Minneapolis | MN | 22 | Yes |
| 599 | Aurora University | Aurora | IL | 12 | No |
| 1141 | Babson College | Wellesley | MA | 14 | Yes |
| 454 | Barry University | Miami | FL | 4 | No |
| 1042 | Bates College | Lewiston | ME | 14 | Yes |
| 5275 | Bay Path College | Longmeadow | MA | 11 | No |
| 2519 | Belmont University | Nashville | TN | 23 | No |
| 2931 | Beloit College | Beloit | WI | 14 | Yes |
| 7072 | Benedictine College | Atchison | KS | 18 | No |
| 692 | Benedictine University | Lisle | IL | 4 | Yes |
| 1934 | Bennett College for Women | Greensboro | NC | 38 | No |
| 503 | Berry College | Mount Berry | GA | 13 | Yes |
| 5349 | Bethany Lutheran College | Mankato | MN | 23 | Yes |
| 5753 | Biola University | La Mirada | CA | 4 | Yes |
| 1641 | Bloomfield College | Bloomfield | NJ | 20 | No |
| 2049 | Bluffton University | Bluffton | OH | 21 | Yes |
| 1142 | Boston College | Chestnut Hill | MA | 5 | Yes |
| 1193 | Bridgewater State University | Bridgewater | MA | 8 | Yes |
| 2404 | Brown University | Providence | RI | 6 | No |
| 5622 | Bryant University | Smithfield | RI | 13 | No |
| 2236 | Bryn Mawr College | Bryn Mawr | PA | 14 | No |
| 131 | California Baptist University | Riverside | CA | 20 | No |
| 4893 | California State University-Channel Islands | Camarillo | CA | 7 | No |
| 142 | California State University-Chico | Chico | CA | 9 | No |
| 5010 | California State University-Long Beach | Long Beach | CA | 8 | Yes |
| 230 | California State University-Northridge | Northridge | CA | 7 | Yes |
| 4851 | California State University-San Marcos | San Marcos | CA | 7 | No |
| 1327 | Carleton College | Northfield | MN | 14 | Yes |
| 606 | Carthage College | Kenosha | WI | 23 | Yes |
| 1938 | Catawba College | Salisbury | NC | 11 | Yes |
| 416 | Catholic University of America | Washington | DC | 4 | No |
| 1745 | Cazenovia College | Cazenovia | NY | 11 | Yes |
| 2054 | Central State University | Wilberforce | OH | 34 | Yes |
| 141 | Chapman University | Orange | CA | 23 | Yes |
| 2240 | Chatham University | Pittsburgh | PA | 13 | Yes |
| 2322 | Cheyney University of Pennsylvania | Cheyney | PA | 34 | No |
| 1941 | Chowan University | Murfreesboro | NC | 20 | Yes |
| 2523 | Christian Brothers University | Memphis | TN | 18 | No |
| 2435 | Citadel Military College of South Carolina | Charleston | SC | 9 | Yes |
| 507 | Clark Atlanta University | Atlanta | GA | 41 | Yes |
| 1151 | Clark University | Worcester | MA | 5 | Yes |

Institutions Participating in the 2015 CIRP Freshman Survey

| ACE | Institution | City | State | Stratification Cell | Included in National Norms |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1044 | Colby College | Waterville | ME | 14 | Yes |
| 1752 | College of Mount Saint Vincent | Bronx | NY | 16 | No |
| 1152 | College of the Holy Cross | Worcester | MA | 18 | Yes |
| 7402 | Colorado Christian University | Lakewood | CO | 22 | Yes |
| 319 | Colorado College | Colorado Springs | CO | 14 | Yes |
| 321 | Colorado School of Mines | Golden | CO | 3 | No |
| 318 | Colorado State University-Fort Collins | Fort Collins | CO | 2 | No |
| 359 | Connecticut College | New London | CT | 14 | No |
| 1763 | Cornell University | Ithaca | NY | 6 | No |
| 5821 | Covenant College | Lookout Mountain | GA | 23 | No |
| 1573 | Creighton University | Omaha | NE | 18 | Yes |
| 6430 | CUNY Lehman College | Bronx | NY | 8 | Yes |
| 7254 | CUNY Medgar Evers College | Brooklyn | NY | 7 | No |
| 6166 | Dalton State College | Dalton | GA | 7 | No |
| 2244 | Delaware Valley College | Doylestown | PA | 12 | Yes |
| 5882 | DeSales University | Center Valley | PA | 17 | No |
| 2247 | Dickinson College | Carlisle | PA | 14 | Yes |
| 1005 | Dillard University | New Orleans | LA | 38 | No |
| 687 | Dominican University | River Forest | IL | 17 | Yes |
| 1943 | Duke University | Durham | NC | 6 | No |
| 753 | Earlham College | Richmond | IN | 23 | Yes |
| 2845 | Eastern Washington University | Cheney | WA | 7 | No |
| 464 | Eckerd College | Saint Petersburg | FL | 23 | Yes |
| 5105 | Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University-Daytona Beach | Daytona Beach | FL | 13 | No |
| 1158 | Emmanuel College | Boston | MA | 17 | Yes |
| 2787 | Emory \& Henry College | Emory | VA | 20 | Yes |
| 511 | Emory University | Atlanta | GA | 6 | Yes |
| 362 | Fairfield University | Fairfield | CT | 18 | Yes |
| 6529 | Fairleigh Dickinson University-College at Florham | Madison | NJ | 12 | Yes |
| 2788 | Ferrum College | Ferrum | VA | 20 | No |
| 463 | Florida State University | Tallahassee | FL | 2 | Yes |
| 1773 | Fordham University | Bronx | NY | 5 | Yes |
| 5414 | Franklin Pierce University | Rindge | NH | 11 | Yes |
| 897 | Friends University | Wichita | KS | 12 | Yes |
| 2446 | Furman University | Greenville | SC | 14 | Yes |
| 961 | Georgetown College | Georgetown | KY | 23 | Yes |
| 421 | Georgetown University | Washington | DC | 6 | No |
| 515 | Georgia Institute of Technology-Main Campus | Atlanta | GA | 3 | Yes |
| 519 | Georgia Southern University | Statesboro | GA | 2 | No |
| 2263 | Gettysburg College | Gettysburg | PA | 14 | Yes |
| 5199 | Grace College and Theological Seminary | Winona Lake | IN | 21 | Yes |
| 1006 | Grambling State University | Grambling | LA | 34 | Yes |
| 641 | Greenville College | Greenville | IL | 21 | No |
| 834 | Grinnell College | Grinnell | IA | 14 | Yes |
| 1953 | Guilford College | Greensboro | NC | 22 | Yes |
| 1338 | Gustavus Adolphus College | Saint Peter | MN | 23 | Yes |
| 1776 | Hamilton College | Clinton | NY | 14 | No |
| 7022 | Hampshire College | Amherst | MA | 14 | No |
| 9107 | Harrisburg University of Science and Technology | Harrisburg | PA | 11 | No |
| 1777 | Hartwick College | Oneonta | NY | 13 | Yes |
| 180 | Harvey Mudd College | Claremont | CA | 14 | Yes |

Institutions Participating in the 2015 CIRP Freshman Survey

| ACE | Institution | City | State | Stratification Cell | Included in National Norms |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2267 | Haverford College | Haverford | PA | 14 | Yes |
| 2072 | Hiram College | Hiram | OH | 12 | Yes |
| 1755 | Hobart William Smith Colleges | Geneva | NY | 14 | Yes |
| 2794 | Hollins University | Roanoke | VA | 13 | Yes |
| 152 | Holy Names University | Oakland | CA | 16 | Yes |
| 424 | Howard University | Washington | DC | 41 | Yes |
| 8 | Huntingdon College | Montgomery | AL | 20 | Yes |
| 762 | Huntington University | Huntington | IN | 22 | No |
| 642 | Illinois College | Jacksonville | IL | 22 | Yes |
| 7813 | Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture | Santa Fe | NM | 7 | Yes |
| 1785 | Iona College | New Rochelle | NY | 16 | Yes |
| 91 | John Brown University | Siloam Springs | AR | 14 | Yes |
| 1956 | Johnson C. Smith University | Charlotte | NC | 35 | Yes |
| 2272 | Juniata College | Huntingdon | PA | 13 | No |
| 1272 | Kalamazoo College | Kalamazoo | MI | 14 | Yes |
| 1617 | Keene State College | Keene | NH | 8 | Yes |
| 652 | Knox College | Galesburg | IL | 14 | Yes |
| 523 | LaGrange College | Lagrange | GA | 21 | Yes |
| 653 | Lake Forest College | Lake Forest | IL | 14 | No |
| 2947 | Lawrence University | Appleton | WI | 14 | Yes |
| 1794 | Le Moyne College | Syracuse | NY | 17 | Yes |
| 2277 | Lebanon Valley College | Annville | PA | 22 | Yes |
| 2194 | Lewis \& Clark College | Portland | OR | 14 | Yes |
| 7448 | LIM College | New York | NY | 11 | Yes |
| 2539 | Lincoln Memorial University | Harrogate | TN | 13 | Yes |
| 2279 | Lincoln University of Pennsylvania | Lincoln University | PA | 34 | Yes |
| 2195 | Linfield College-McMinnville Campus | McMinnville | OR | 23 | No |
| 2796 | Longwood University | Farmville | VA | 8 | No |
| 1961 | Louisburg College | Lousiburg | NC | 31 | No |
| 657 | Loyola University Chicago | Chicago | IL | 5 | Yes |
| 1086 | Loyola University Maryland | Baltimore | MD | 18 | Yes |
| 841 | Luther College | Decorah | IA | 23 | Yes |
| 2283 | Lycoming College | Williamsport | PA | 22 | Yes |
| 1344 | Macalester College | Saint Paul | MN | 23 | Yes |
| 769 | Manchester University | North Manchester | IN | 21 | No |
| 1796 | Manhattan College | Riverdale | NY | 18 | Yes |
| 2801 | Mary Baldwin College | Staunton | VA | 20 | No |
| 1275 | Marygrove College | Detroit | MI | 16 | Yes |
| 2543 | Maryville College | Maryville | TN | 23 | Yes |
| 1496 | Maryville University of Saint Louis | Saint Louis | MO | 4 | Yes |
| 1963 | Meredith College | Raleigh | NC | 12 | Yes |
| 2290 | Messiah College | Mechanicsburg | PA | 23 | Yes |
| 1278 | Michigan Technological University | Houghton | Ml | 3 | No |
| 2633 | Midwestern State University | Wichita Falls | TX | 8 | Yes |
| 199 | Mills College | Oakland | CA | 13 | Yes |
| 1412 | Millsaps College | Jackson | MS | 23 | Yes |
| 2289 | Moravian College and Moravian Theological Seminary | Bethlehem | PA | 22 | Yes |
| 5796 | Morehouse College | Atlanta | GA | 35 | Yes |
| 1094 | Morgan State University | Baltimore | MD | 40 | No |
| 844 | Morningside College | Sioux City | IA | 23 | Yes |
| 1096 | Mount St. Mary's University | Emmitsburg | MD | 17 | Yes |

Institutions Participating in the $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ CIRP Freshman Survey

| ACE | Institution | City | State | Stratification Cell | Included in National Norms |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 203 | Mount St. Mary's College | Los Angeles | CA | 16 | Yes |
| 6542 | Mount Vernon Nazarene University | Mount Vernon | OH | 22 | Yes |
| 2293 | Muhlenberg College | Allentown | PA | 23 | Yes |
| 471 | New College of Florida | Sarasota | FL | 9 | Yes |
| 1927 | North Carolina A \& T State University | Greensboro | NC | 40 | No |
| 1965 | North Carolina Central University | Durham | NC | 34 | Yes |
| 674 | North Central College | Naperville | IL | 23 | No |
| 2157 | Northeastern State University | Tahlequah | OK | 7 | Yes |
| 1184 | Northeastern University | Boston | MA | 6 | Yes |
| 1286 | Oakland University | Rochester Hills | MI | 1 | Yes |
| 2084 | Oberlin College | Oberlin | OH | 14 | No |
| 207 | Occidental College | Los Angeles | CA | 14 | Yes |
| 531 | Oglethorpe University | Atlanta | GA | 13 | No |
| 2163 | Oklahoma City University | Oklahoma City | OK | 23 | Yes |
| 5566 | Oklahoma Wesleyan University | Bartlesville | OK | 21 | Yes |
| 2802 | Old Dominion University | Norfolk | VA | 1 | No |
| 4892 | Oxford College of Emory University | Oxford | GA | 26 | No |
| 214 | Pacific Union College | Angwin | CA | 21 | No |
| 9106 | Patrick Henry College | Purcellville | VA | 21 | Yes |
| 5890 | Pennsylvania College of Technology | Williamsport | PA | 7 | Yes |
| 218 | Point Loma Nazarene University | San Diego | CA | 23 | No |
| 2210 | Portland State University | Portland | OR | 1 | No |
| 1827 | Pratt Institute-Main | Brooklyn | NY | 13 | No |
| 683 | Principia College | Elsah | IL | 13 | Yes |
| 2409 | Providence College | Providence | RI | 18 | Yes |
| 373 | Quinnipiac University | Hamden | CT | 13 | Yes |
| 2805 | Randolph College | Lynchburg | VA | 22 | Yes |
| 2209 | Reed College | Portland | OR | 14 | No |
| 1187 | Regis College | Weston | MA | 16 | Yes |
| 2413 | Rhode Island School of Design | Providence | RI | 14 | Yes |
| 2554 | Rhodes College | Memphis | TN | 23 | No |
| 2969 | Ripon College | Ripon | WI | 13 | Yes |
| 685 | Rockford University | Rockford | IL | 12 | Yes |
| 468 | Rollins College | Winter Park | FL | 13 | No |
| 2309 | Rosemont College | Rosemont | PA | 16 | Yes |
| 1672 | Rutgers University-Camden | Camden | NJ | 9 | No |
| 1668 | Rutgers University-New Brunswick | New Brunswick | NJ | 3 | No |
| 1673 | Rutgers University-Newark | Newark | NJ | 1 | No |
| 5082 | Sacred Heart University | Fairfield | CT | 18 | No |
| 976 | Saint Catharine College | Saint Catharine | KY | 14 | No |
| 2313 | Saint Francis University | Loretto | PA | 17 | Yes |
| 2314 | Saint Joseph's University | Philadelphia | PA | 18 | Yes |
| 781 | Saint Mary's College | Notre Dame | IN | 18 | Yes |
| 227 | Saint Mary's College of California | Moraga | CA | 18 | Yes |
| 2974 | Saint Norbert College | De Pere | WI | 18 | Yes |
| 1675 | Saint Peter's University | Jersey City | NJ | 16 | Yes |
| 248 | San Francisco Conservatory of Music | San Francisco | CA | 13 | Yes |
| 236 | San Francisco State University | San Francisco | CA | 8 | No |
| 267 | Santa Clara University | Santa Clara | CA | 18 | Yes |
| 535 | Savannah State University | Savannah | GA | 34 | No |

Institutions Participating in the 2015 CIRP Freshman Survey

|  |  |  | Stratification | Included in |  |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| ACE |  |  | City | State | Cell | National Norms

Institutions Participating in the 2015 CIRP Freshman Survey

|  |  |  | Stratification | Included in |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| ACE |  | City | State | Cell | National Norms

## APPENDIX D

The Precision of the Normative Data and Their Comparisons

## THE PRECISION OF THE NORMATIVE DATA AND THEIR COMPARISONS

A common question asked about sample surveys relates to the precision of the data, which is typically reported as the accuracy of a percentage "plus or minus x percentage points." This figure, which is known as a confidence interval, can be estimated for items of interest if one knows the response percentage and its standard error.

Given the CIRP's large normative sample, the calculated standard error associated with any particular response percentage will be small (as will its confidence interval). It is important to note, however, that traditional methods of calculating standard error assume conditions which, (as is the case with most real sample survey data), do not apply here. Moreover, there are other possible sources of error which should be considered in comparing data across normative groups, across related item categories, and over time. In reference to the precision of the CIRP data, these concerns include:

1) Traditional methods of calculating standard error assume that the individuals were selected through simple random sampling. Given the complex stratified design of the CIRP, where whole institutions participate, it is likely that the actual standard errors will be somewhat larger than the standard error estimates produced through traditional computational methods. In addition, while every effort has been made to maximize the comparability of the institutional sample from year to year (repeat participation runs
about 90 percent), comparability is reduced by non-repeat participation and year-to-year variation in the quality of data collected by continuing institutional participants. While the CIRP stratification and weighting procedures are designed to minimize this institutional form of "response bias," an unknown amount of non-random variation is introduced into the results.
2) The wording of some questions in the survey instrument, the text and number of response options, and their order of presentation have changed over the years. We have found that even small changes can produce large order and context effects. Given this, the exact wording and order of items on the survey instrument (see Appendix B) should be examined carefully prior to making comparisons across survey years.
3) Substantial changes in the institutional stratification scheme were made in 1968, 1971, 1975, 2001, and 2009. These changes resulted in a revision of the weights applied to individual institutions. Stratification cell assignments of a few institutions may also change from time to time, but the scale of these changes and their effect on the national normative results are likely to be small in comparison to other sources of bias.

Since it is impractical to report statistical indicators for every percentage in every CIRP comparison group, it is important for those who
are interested to be able to estimate the precision of the data. Toward this end, Table D1 provides estimates of standard errors for comparison groups of various sizes and for different percentages ${ }^{1}$ which can be used to derive confidence interval estimates.

For example, suppose the item we are interested in has a response percentage of 15.7 percent among students at all nonsectarian four-year colleges (a normative group that is 28,272 in size). First, we choose the column that is closest to the observed percentage 15.7 -in this case " $15 \%$ ". ${ }^{2}$ Next, we select the row closest to the unweighted sample size of 28,272 -in this case "20,000." Consulting Table D1, we find the estimated standard error would be .252 .

To calculate the confidence interval at the 95\% probability level, we multiply the estimated standard error by the critical value of $t$ for the unweighted sample size (which, for all CIRP comparison groups, will be equal to 1.96 at the .05 level of probability). ${ }^{3}$ In this example, we would multiply the estimated standard error of .252 by 1.96 , which yields .494 . If we round this figure to a single decimal point we would then estimate our confidence interval to be $15.7 \pm .5$. In practical terms, this confidence interval means that if we were to replicate this survey using the same size sample, we would expect that the resulting percentage would fall between 15.2 percent and 16.1 percent 95 times out of 100 .

Table D1. Estimated Standard Errors of Percentages for Comparison Groups of Various Sizes

| Unweighted size of <br> comparison groups |  | $\mathbf{1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 5 \%}$ |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ Percentage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 500 | .445 | .975 | 1.342 | 1.597 | 1.789 | 1.936 | 2.049 | 2.133 | 2.191 | 2.225 | 2.236 |
| 1,000 | .315 | .689 | .949 | 1.129 | 1.265 | 1.369 | 1.449 | 1.508 | 1.549 | 1.573 | 1.581 |
| 5,000 | .141 | .308 | .424 | .505 | .566 | .612 | .648 | .675 | .693 | .704 | .707 |
| 10,000 | .099 | .218 | .300 | .357 | .400 | .433 | .458 | .477 | .490 | .497 | .500 |
| 20,000 | .070 | .154 | .212 | .252 | .283 | .306 | .324 | .337 | .346 | .352 | .354 |
| 40,000 | .050 | .109 | .150 | .179 | .200 | .217 | .229 | .238 | .245 | .249 | .250 |
| 55,000 | .042 | .093 | .128 | .152 | .171 | .185 | .195 | .203 | .209 | .212 | .213 |
| 70,000 | .038 | .082 | .113 | .135 | .151 | .164 | .173 | .180 | .185 | .188 | .189 |
| 90,000 | .033 | .073 | .100 | .119 | .133 | .144 | .153 | .159 | .163 | .166 | .167 |
| 110,000 | .030 | .066 | .090 | .108 | .121 | .131 | .138 | .144 | .148 | .150 | .151 |
| 130,000 | .028 | .060 | .083 | .099 | .111 | .120 | .127 | .132 | .136 | .138 | .139 |
| 240,000 | .020 | .044 | .061 | .073 | .082 | .088 | .094 | .097 | .100 | .102 | .102 |

Note: Assumes simple random sampling.

[^1]
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First-generation college students are receiving increasing attention from researchers, practitioners, and policymakers with the aim of better understanding their college decisionmaking process and supporting their progress in higher education. This report explores the changing dynamic between first-generation college students and their non firstgeneration peers by utilizing longitudinal trends data collected through the CIRP Freshman Survey (1971-2005).
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[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by $\sqrt{\frac{\mathrm{x} \%(100-\mathrm{x} \%)}{\mathrm{N}}}$ where x is the percentage of interest and N is the population count from Table A1.
    ${ }^{2}$ Since the distribution of the standard errors is symmetrical around the 50 percent mid-point, for percentages over 50 simply subtract the percentage from 100 and use the result to select the appropriate column. For example, if the percentage we were interested in was $59,100-59$ percent yields 41 , so we would use the column labeled ' $40 \%$.'
    ${ }^{3}$ To calculate the confidence interval at the $99 \%$ probability level the critical t value is 2.56 .

