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"My man has got it made, he's gone far beyond the pain, and we who must remain go on laughing just the same."

From "My Man"
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ABSTRACT

This study is a master's thesis. The main focus involves the examination of factors associated with undergraduate students in sociology at William and Mary who go on to graduate or professional school. The relationships among gender, academic integration, graduate school preparation, graduation cohort, and presence or absence of children, the independent variables, and level of postbaccalaureate educational attainment, the dependent variable, are explored. This research is based on the scholarly works of Hearn (1987), Ethington and Smart (1986), and Pascarella (1984). Their published works examine the relationship between academic and social integration at the undergraduate level and postgraduate educational pursuits. Causal modeling is employed as the primary analytical tool in this research. The data for this research comes from the William and Mary 1989 sociology department alumni survey. The survey was designed to be an integral part of the institutional assessment program at the university.

Several indices are developed. They are: academic integration, graduate school preparation, and level of postbaccalaureate educational attainment. The variable academic integration, has two analytical parts: academic integration - theoretical and academic integration - methodological. These indices measure the relative theoretical or methodological orientation of the undergraduate student. Graduate preparation is a composite variable that measures the perceived adequacy of preparation for postgraduate level education. These variables, combined with the other independent variables, demonstrate causality in persistence to postbaccalaureate education.

The major findings are that graduate school preparation and graduation cohort have strong positive relationships with level of postbaccalaureate educational attainment. In regards to gender, men tend to gravitate toward sociology postgraduate training and women gravitate toward social work postgraduate training. Academic integration - methodological has a strong relationship with preparation for graduate or professional school, suggesting that research and analytical skills are important for graduate school preparation.
FACTORS INFLUENCING POSTBACCALAUREATE EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT
INTRODUCTION

This research attempts to respond to the call for institutional and departmental assessment at The College of William and Mary as it pertains to influences on postbaccalaureate educational attainment of sociology alumni. I will explain the assessment strategy, how it relates to the department of sociology, and give an overview of the students at William and Mary within a national context. Data for this study are drawn from a survey of 612 sociology alumni for the years 1968 to 1988, inclusively. The survey comprised a part of the 1989 departmental and institutional assessment.

The research questions I address have been inspired partly by the works of Hearn (1987), Ethington and Smart (1986) and Pascarella (1984). I will utilize their works as a foundation to develop a quasi-exploratory study of the rates and patterns of postbaccalaureate educational attainment as well as to develop a causal model to explain the relative influence among selected variables.
Many institutions of higher education, particularly state institutions, are being held accountable for the quality of education students receive. The College of William and Mary, in response to a state mandate and under the direction of the State Council for Higher Education in Virginia, submitted its plan for student assessment in June of 1987.

As a liberal arts institution, the College of William and Mary offered three main goals in its assessment plan:

1) to evaluate effectiveness of undergraduate education;
2) to evaluate effectiveness of specialization and concentration programs; and
3) to examine the role of out-of-class programs and experiences.

This study may be seen as part of the second goal, the evaluation of the effectiveness of concentration programs. The strategy for assessment in sociology consisted of an outside reviewer, senior papers to demonstrate knowledge gained, and an alumni survey. The current work draws upon alumni survey information which included occupations, postbaccalaureate educational attainment, personal development, academic
outcomes, and assessed strengths and weaknesses of the sociology concentration. This study focuses on postbaccalaureate educational attainments.

The following section describes undergraduate and postbaccalaureate education; first on a national scale, then at William and Mary.

NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

Nationwide, colleges and universities accept about 75% of the applicants to their undergraduate programs, and about 50 colleges considered highly selective institutions accept 50% or less of the applicants (Boyer, 1987: p.26). This would place William and Mary in the top 1% of selective institutions using Boyer's definition of "selective". From such perspective, one can presume that for most admitted applicants William and Mary was their first choice. Students who attend the elite liberal arts colleges and those at research universities are most likely to pursue postbaccalaureate education (Boyer, 1987: p. 272). Generally, students choose to go to college for the vocational benefits. College is viewed as a path to a better job. Liberal arts majors, in contrast, are more apt to pursue postgraduate study than those in vocational fields such as business, technical fields, engineering, and health sciences (Boyer, 1987: p. 272).

More women than men are attending undergraduate institutions and have only recently surpassed them. Since the sample for this study includes graduates from 1968 to 1988, it
will be interesting to see if a pattern emerges that demonstrates changes in the rate at which women pursue graduate level study.

In order to provide national scope and context to this study it is necessary to present information about the national trends in post baccalaureate educational attainment. The major source of national data on higher education is from the American Council on Higher Education. Data are compiled and published in reference text form as The Fact Book on Higher Education. The following tables are extracted from the 1989 edition.

For the purposes of this study it is interesting to examine graduate enrollment by gender (table 1). Rossi and Calderwood (1973) wrote "the transition from undergraduate to graduate student typically is a step from a world in which a woman is equally represented with men in the student body, to a world in which she is part of an increasing smaller minority" (p. 256). A close examination of the statistics today reveal a different scenario. Table 1 demonstrates that women have moved from a 42% representation in graduate programs in 1973 to 52% in 1987. Table 2 provides an overview of women in sociology graduate programs.

In the past twenty years one can see a significant change in the distribution of men and women enrolled in graduate work. An accepted explanation is the implications of the 1960s social and political awareness on educational attainment. The
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th>PERCENT DISTRIBUTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>697,000</td>
<td>465,000</td>
<td>232,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>955,000</td>
<td>590,000</td>
<td>366,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1,031,000</td>
<td>632,000</td>
<td>399,000</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1,012,000</td>
<td>615,000</td>
<td>397,000</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1,066,000</td>
<td>627,000</td>
<td>439,000</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1,123,000</td>
<td>647,000</td>
<td>476,000</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1,190,000</td>
<td>663,000</td>
<td>527,000</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1,263,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>563,000</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1,333,000</td>
<td>714,000</td>
<td>619,000</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1,318,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>617,000</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1,319,000</td>
<td>688,000</td>
<td>632,000</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1,309,000</td>
<td>669,000</td>
<td>640,000</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1,099,562</td>
<td>571,617</td>
<td>528,035</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1,101,272</td>
<td>571,360</td>
<td>529,912</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1,089,962</td>
<td>570,606</td>
<td>519,356</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1,104,808</td>
<td>577,488</td>
<td>527,360</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1,114,184</td>
<td>576,609</td>
<td>537,575</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1,129,538</td>
<td>577,224</td>
<td>552,314</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1,433,962</td>
<td>693,487</td>
<td>740,375</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1,377,000 est.</td>
<td>662,000</td>
<td>715,000</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

increased awareness of women's issues as well as involvement of women in national politics and political issues resulted in emphasis on equality. Emphasis on equality in education has also been an important outcome of the women's movement. From 1968 to 1984 graduate enrollment among women rose 10% from 38% to 48%. It will be interesting to discover if this trend is applicable to William and Mary students. The date of graduation will give one a clue to the approximate time period in which graduate work was pursued. Similarly, a possible finding may reflect the four year dip in graduate enrollment between 1980 and 1984. Boyer's (1987) writings reflect this trend. About 20% of recent graduates have plans for graduate school. This varies greatly from the attitude of students in the early 1970s when about 50% of college graduates planned to get a master's degree, and close to one-third a doctoral or professional degree (Boyer, 1987: p. 271).

At selective liberal arts institutions like William and Mary one generally finds a somewhat higher proportion of students bound for graduate school. For example, Duke University has on average 80% of graduates going on for professional degrees (Land, 1989).

In table 2 one can see that earned bachelor's degrees in sociology peaked in the early 1970s. As mentioned earlier, the atmosphere of the 1960s could be a possible explanation for this occurrence. Women holding a sociology bachelor degree have outnumbered the men since the 1950s. Currently the gap is
TABLE 2
EARNED DEGREES IN SOCIOLOGY, SELECTED YEARS, 1967-68 - 1985-86

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th>MASTER'S</th>
<th>DOCTORATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967-68</td>
<td>22,062</td>
<td>8,577</td>
<td>13,485</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>30,848</td>
<td>12,445</td>
<td>18,403</td>
<td>1,716</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>33,662</td>
<td>13,703</td>
<td>19,959</td>
<td>1,809</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>35,626</td>
<td>15,332</td>
<td>20,294</td>
<td>1,945</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>35,994</td>
<td>15,745</td>
<td>20,249</td>
<td>1,923</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>35,896</td>
<td>15,314</td>
<td>20,582</td>
<td>2,196</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td>31,817</td>
<td>13,330</td>
<td>18,487</td>
<td>2,112</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>27,970</td>
<td>11,379</td>
<td>16,591</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>24,989</td>
<td>9,802</td>
<td>15,187</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>22,991</td>
<td>8,423</td>
<td>14,568</td>
<td>1,611</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>20,545</td>
<td>7,155</td>
<td>13,390</td>
<td>1,415</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td>18,881</td>
<td>6,270</td>
<td>12,611</td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>17,272</td>
<td>5,247</td>
<td>12,025</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82</td>
<td>16,042</td>
<td>4,771</td>
<td>11,271</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-83</td>
<td>14,105</td>
<td>4,273</td>
<td>9,832</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84</td>
<td>13,145</td>
<td>4,218</td>
<td>8,927</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85</td>
<td>11,968</td>
<td>3,701</td>
<td>8,267</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>12,271</td>
<td>3,811</td>
<td>8,460</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

growing larger. The early 1980s show women two to one over men in the number of degrees.

Table 3 highlights selected years of women in sociology graduate programs. It is evident that women are moving toward numerical parity in the discipline. This will be compared to the degree attainment by William and Mary female sociology graduates.

Graph 1 (Ottinger, 1984) shows the number of master's degrees awarded to men and women from 1972 to 1987 and projections beyond 1988 in all fields. What is most interesting and supports my discussion earlier is that men have had a rather consistent number of master's degrees awarded while women have experienced an increase in the volume of total master's degrees. With a smaller variation in projections, women are predicted to be more stable in attainment of master's degrees where men display a more erratic trend line.

Graph 2 (Ottinger, 1984) takes one to the doctorate level for examination. Clearly, the number of doctor's degrees awarded to men has experienced a steady decline since 1973. With current marketability of Ph.D.'s and low perceived return on investment, it is not surprising to see projections from status quo to continued decline. On the other hand, women are continuing to gain ground and the projections seem certain to predict increased volume of women doctorates.

Graph 3 (Ottinger, 1984) examines the professional degree
### TABLE 3

PERCENTAGE OF FEMALES IN GRADUATE PROGRAMS BY YEAR AND DEGREE SOUGHT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>MA PROGRAMS</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF FEMALES IN:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PHD PROGRAMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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attainment for men and women. Men seem to be relatively stable in the attainment and in projected attainment of professional degrees. A dramatic increase in professional degrees awarded to women appears to be a trend that will continue.¹

These graphs give general descriptions of what is occurring nationally in regard to postbaccalaureate degree attainment. It is within this framework I hope examine the pattern and distribution of degree attainment beyond the bachelor's for William and Mary sociology graduates. It will be interesting to see if William and Mary sociology graduates mirror somewhat the national norms or if they vary above or below the national averages.

INSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVE

The College of William and Mary is a highly selective institution accepting 25% of the undergraduate applicants. Although 65% of the students are from all areas of the state of Virginia, William and Mary is diverse with students from over 45 states and 55 foreign countries, representing an undergraduate population of slightly over 5000 students (Undergraduate Program Catalog, 1988-89: p. 202). The university is composed of the undergraduate student body, law school (531 students), and graduate programs (M.A. and Ph.D., 1167 students). William and Mary, chartered in 1693, is a residential university that prides itself on historical

¹The increase in master's and doctoral degrees for women is not a direct function of the increase in women obtaining the bachelor's degree.
tradition, small student-faculty ratio, and quality liberal arts programs.

Upon graduation, 71% of the students go directly into full time positions, 24% enter graduate and professional programs (Assessment Plan, 1987). Although the 24% is higher than the national average of about 10%, this may be explained partly by the nature of a more selective institution and the students who attend it. Recent trends suggest that students see a strong link between postbaccalaureate professional programs and advancing vocational interest (Riesman, 1980; Boyer, 1987). This is due partly to student perceptions of uncertainty in the job marketplace. This explanation gives insight to the decline in the number of students continuing for the Ph.D. The Ph.D. is seen as an investment with low economic return. Contrary to this is the notion that baccalaureate graduates in specialized fields such as accounting, engineering, management information systems, as well as professional degrees such as Masters of Business Administration and Juris Doctor, have an above average economic return with projected growth through the 1990s. In this one can see that aspiration and attainment of postbaccalaureate education, whether in master's, doctorate, or professional programs, can be viewed as "playing from strength," says Riesman (Scully, 1981), in order to enrich job opportunities and job attainment. But the actual decision to pursue may have roots in the academic department from which
the student graduated. The undergraduate experiences seem to have implication for pursuit of postbaccalaureate education (Jencks and Riesman, 1969; Ethington and Smart, 1986; Hearn, 1987).
CHAPTER II.
THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Postbaccalaureate educational attainment has been viewed by some primarily from the standard model of mobility, descriptive in nature focusing on socioeconomic status and other background characteristics. Hearn has identified the pioneering studies of Thistlewaite (1960) and Astin and Panos (1969) as works focusing on subenvironments' influences on graduate and professional school aspirations and attendance. The recent works of Pascarella summarize the major conclusions:

First, college students' freshman-year characteristics seemed to influence their aspirations outcomes much more than the organizational or environmental characteristics of their undergraduate institution. Second, students' actual engagement in their college environments, and their own individual perception of their environments, were more influential than the organized or structural characteristics of their institutions as a whole. (in Hearn, 1987: p. 120)

Unlike the works of Pascarella and Hearn focusing on aspirations and plans, I will to focus on the subenvironment implications for graduate degree attainment. Within the subenvironment (sociology department) at William and Mary, I will explore the causal factor of academic integration on
postbaccalaureate educational attainment.

The findings of Hearn suggest that academic performance, parental supportiveness, faculty-student interaction, and academic department context as the most influential factors in aspirations and plans for graduate work. Hearn develops a theoretical model of seven components. The components include: freshmen year background characteristics, major department context, parental support of career plans, academic involvement, and academic satisfaction as they affect senior year educational aspirations and senior year educational plans. Although Hearn focuses on academic and social integration, I will use only his concept of "academic involvement" and will alter it to fit academic integration.

In "academic involvement" Hearn suggests that the outcomes are a result of faculty-student interaction. I concur but will concentrate on the student assessed outcomes of the major (sociology). The interaction is of unique quality for this study because it has implications for academic outcome. In other words, I want to examine the academic outcomes of majoring in sociology analytically separate from faculty-student interaction (social integration).

Ethington and Smart (1986) found that background variables had little or no influence as a student progressed through the educational process to graduate work. Background variables were only influential in the initial choice of the
undergraduate institution attended. In this study all of the students are William and Mary graduates. Therefore, one can assume that the background characteristics are somewhat similar.

The major findings of Ethington and Smart demonstrate that social and academic integration, particularly, have strong influence on graduate school attendance. Building on Tinto's (1975) examination of persistence through college to undergraduate degree attainment, Ethington and Smart develop a causal model centering on academic and social integration as the strongest factors for persistence to graduate level schooling and background measures as indirect influences. Academic integration in their study is indicated by grade point average and social integration is seen in terms of involvement with faculty, peers, and student organizations. I suggest that my conceptualization of academic integration will overcome the problems associated with using only grade point average. Using only grade point average carries with it problems of inconsistency in grading procedures and overlooks what the student perceptions are of the substance learned.

Pascarella (1984) argues that the works of Astin and later Thistlewaite in the 1960s had methodological problems with multicollinearity. Multicollinearity gave unstable measures of influences on dependent variables because of exogenous variables. Variables such as institutional
selectivity and academic performance cause inaccurate correlations because they overlap and falsely strengthen the effects of environmental influences on academic performance. At this point I do not anticipate multicollinearity because my model holds background variables constant. Pascarella also points out problems with the extremely large samples previously used and problematic identification of indirect influences. With the large samples used in previous studies only direct influences were of significance.

In Pascarella's (1984) study the main thrust is to explain educational aspirations as a result of college. Pascarella examines 100 colleges of differing selectivity and control. The findings suggest that outside of precollege educational aspirations, the college environment and a cumulative measure of academic achievement (G.P.A.) were strong factors in aspirations to attend graduate school. It is suggested also that within the college environment faculty-student interaction has positive influences on student integration and achievement. Most interesting for me is the relationship of gender and college environment at selective institutions. It was found that for males at selective institutions, "academic competition" has significant influence on postgraduate educational attainment. Women were found to be negatively influenced by "conformist" student behaviors and inaccessibility to faculty. Conformist student behaviors are defined as involvement in traditional collegiate activities,
social clubs, "partying" etc. This suggests that men who pursue postbaccalaureate education are more likely to have high academic integration at the undergraduate level and women to have higher social integration. Due to limits in the data I do not have access to college activities at the undergraduate level, therefore I will examine only academic integration in this study. I think that analytically academic integration will bear more on the decision to pursue graduate level education because of the general view that graduate programs are more academically taxing than undergraduate programs.
CHAPTER III.

RESEARCH QUESTION AND INTRODUCTION OF THE VARIABLES

There is a growing literature on the interaction of students and their academic departments as a nexus for persistence to graduate school. Most accounts are largely descriptive as observed by Hearn (1987). The sociology alumni survey is designed to address the issues of student perceptions of the department, social and academic integration, and occupational and intellectual outcomes. This allows for contribution to the scholarly literature by examining not only college experiences but postcollege ones as well.

Within these broad categories, I have identified six variables. The variables will be used to develop a causal model to help answer questions about the impact of gender and undergraduate and postgraduate experiences on postbaccalaureate educational attainment. As James Hearn (1987) explains in his work, "Impacts of Undergraduate Experiences on Aspirations and Plans for Graduate and Professional Education," only recently has research centered on causal explanation of graduate plans and aspirations. The evaluation of the department will, in part, reflect the
academic integration of the students.

Ethington and Smart found the effects of academic integration in the undergraduate experience to be more strongly related to the decision to enroll in graduate school, than did background variables. Background variables were found to be indirectly related to the decision to attend graduate school as intervening variables. Academic integration is the level at which a student evaluates skills gained. Beyond academic integration I will examine academic integration - theoretical orientation and academic integration - methodological orientation as subsets of academic integration. Academic integration is hypothesized to be critical for formulation of further educational aspirations and plans.

This conceptualization of academic integration is different from previous works. Hearn's (1987) conception of academic integration centers on student-faculty interaction as having positive effects for educational plans, aspirations and attainment. Ethington and Smart (1986) conceptualize academic integration as grade point average. Analytically, I see student-faculty interaction as more socially oriented. This is consistent with Ethington and Smart's (1986) interpretation. Yet, as Ethington and Smart (1986) comment on academic integration they ignore the student's perception of skills gained in lieu of grade point average. I think that the student's perception of the skills gained gives a more complete evaluation of the level of academic integration.
The level of academic integration experienced can be more theoretically based or more methodologically based. For example, some of the respondents may have enjoyed the theoretical side of sociology at the undergraduate level while others enjoyed the research related coursework. This preference may have implications for pursuing graduate work, and more, specifically the academic discipline in which the graduate work is done. Theoretically-oriented students may lean more towards disciplines such as theology or sociology and methodologically-oriented students may choose demography or applied statistics.

Gender may have implications for the level of academic integration as found in Pascarella (1984). As mentioned earlier, assessment of social involvement or activities while at William and Mary is not addressed in the data. Therefore it is not possible to compare the results of social integration, as Pascarella found, to be influential on females with regard to postbaccalaureate educational attainment.

A pivotal factor is the graduation cohort. As discussed earlier, the rates and patterns of persistence to graduate study have changed over the past 20 years. Once students have graduated they often reflect on their undergraduate education and the implications it has on their lives. They may consider how the curriculum prepared them for graduate study, the quality of the faculty, and how these affect the evaluation of the sociology program. I suggest that analytically there may
be differences between individuals that give the sociology program a high rating versus a low rating. One who has made the choice to attend graduate school can reflect on her undergraduate experience and decide, for example, that she was well-prepared for graduate level work. One could expect that such an individual would give the program a high rating.

A liberal arts concentration such as sociology has no specific vocational focus. Rather it provides broad skills that are applicable a wide range of occupational tasks. Graduates may find these broad skills to be beneficial or they may have no impact on their current job. If skills they obtain from the undergraduate sociology program are insufficient for current occupational demands, they may pursue postgraduate study to gain skills needed.

Children may have impact on the decision to pursue postbaccalaureate education. The presence of children in the home or financial responsibility for children could be a deterrent.

With regard to the departmental assessment, my main focus is on the rates and patterns of postbaccalaureate educational attainment. My question: How are the rates and patterns of post baccalaureate educational attainment influenced by students' evaluation of the sociology department? Specifically, does academic integration influence a student's choice to pursue postgraduate study? And, if so, what are the directions of the relationships among the independent
variables and the dependent variables.
CHAPTER IV.
CAUSAL MODEL AND INDEX CONSTRUCTION

The causal model will show the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable, level of postbaccalaureate educational attainment (EDUC). The dependent variable is a composite measure and is defined as the pursuit or completion of graduate coursework, master's degree, professional degree, or doctorate. The boundaries or academic disciplines include: sociology, social work, law, business, education, public administration, urban planning, and other postgraduate work.

Respondents were provided the opportunity to select the appropriate field of pursuit or to write in another area not listed (other postgraduate work). A response to any category, coursework through terminal degree, has been identified as a positive response, indicating varying levels of graduate and/or professional educational exposure. It is important to note that the level of attainment does not represent an unambiguous hierarchical arrangement. Many individuals may

---

2 The variable "level of educational attainment" is an index constructed and refined by my colleagues in the sociology department. I would like to express my appreciation for allowing me to use it in this study.
reach a terminal degree point. In certain areas, social work, for example, a M.S.W. is considered a terminal degree. Another example would be a high frequency of artist and scholars who may completed the M.F.A. level.

The elements within the proposed model, the independent variables, are hypothesized to have causality, directly or indirectly, on all elements following them sequentially (figure 1). The first element is gender (G). The gender of the respondent is expected to have effects throughout the causal model. Secondly, this study introduces two measures of academic integration. Six items measure outcomes of the sociology concentration which reflect two analytically separable aspects of academic integration. They are academic integration - theoretical (AIT) and academic integration - methodological (AIM). As new constructs, they will hopefully prove to be useful contributions to the academic integration research literature. The specific items for each index are provided below.
Model with Hypothesized Causal Relationship

Figure 1. This model gives the chronological and causal order. It proceeds from left to right. Each of the elements is hypothesized to, either directly or indirectly, affect each subsequent element in causal order and all elements to affect level of postbaccalaureate educational attainment (EDUC).

G ..........GENDER
AIT ......ACADEMIC INTEGRATION - THEORETICAL
AIM ......ACADEMIC INTEGRATION - METHODOLOGICAL
GP ........GRADUATE PREPARATION
GR ........GRADUATION COHORT
CH ........PRESENCE OF CHILDREN
EDUC ......LEVEL OF POSTBACCALAUREATE EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT
Academic Integration

(AIT) Learned how to address issues sociologically
(AIT) Gained better understanding of human societies
(AIT) Could evaluate competing sociological theories

(AIM) Improved research and data analysis skills
(AIM) Completed a piece of sociological research
(AIM) Increased analytical and interpretive skills

The third element, graduate school preparation (GP) is an index measure incorporating two items that address the respondent's perception of graduate school preparation. One of the items is drawn from the outcomes section of the survey. The second item is drawn from the strength and weakness section of the survey and is recorded as a "strength," "weakness" or "uncertain". The items are listed below. Outcomes are indicated by an "O" and the strength and weakness item is indicated by "S&W".

Graduate School Preparation

Prepared for graduate or professional school (O)
Preparation for graduate school (S&W)

\(^3\)AIT denotes academic integration - theoretical
AIM denotes academic integration - methodological
The fourth element is graduation cohort (GR). It is the year the alumnus graduated from William and Mary. Children (CH), especially for women, may interfere with or prevent pursuit of postgraduate work. This can be a possible explanation for the proportion discrepancy between the total men and women Ph.D. holders.

Having presented the causal model and its components, I will next proceed to a discussion of the methodology for construction of the indices and then turn to an overview of the indices presented.

INDEX CONSTRUCTION

The dependent variable, level of postbaccalaureate educational attainment (EDUC), has an acceptable distribution and is scored 0=no graduate training (n=68), 1=coursework (n=82), 2=graduate degree, M.A. (n=101), and 3=highest degree, Ph.D. (n=36). As separate dependent variables, sociology postgraduate study (n=47), social work postgraduate (n=27), and business postgraduate (n=32) are treated as dummy variables scored 0=no graduate training, 1=some graduate training.

I originally set out to examine social and academic integration as core components of a model demonstrating a cause and effect relationship with postbaccalaureate educational attainment. In running Pearson's correlations to verify the composite index variables to be created, I discovered that the data did not lend themselves to the
creation of selected indices. Upon further analysis I discovered that one can examine analytically academic integration as having two distinct parts: theoretical orientation and methodological orientation. The variables that demonstrated unacceptable correlations were discarded. With this refined model, one is able to focus more clearly on elements of academic integration that have been frequently overlooked in previous research.

One cluster of strongly intercorrelated items are viewed here as measures of the orientation of the individual to the theoretical elements in sociology. These items are: 1) learned how to address issues sociologically (OADDRIS), 2) gained better understanding of human societies (OUNDSOCT), 3) could evaluate competing sociological theory (OSOCTH). The respondent rated on a scale of one (unimportant outcome) to five (very important outcome). It was decided to separate these items under one composite variable heading, academic integration - theoretical (AIT). Recoding several of the items was required by the frequency distributions. The items "learned how to address issues sociologically" (OADDRIS) and "gained better understanding of human societies" (OUNDSOCT) were recoded so that (2,3=1), (4=2), (5=3). The item "could evaluate competing sociological theories" (OSOCTH) has an acceptable distribution and was not recoded. The three items are summed to form the composite academic integration - theoretical (AIT).
Likewise other elements seemed to cluster but these items had a different "flavor". Yes, they are measures of academic integration but they hold value for a particular area within academic integration, a methodological orientation; thus academic integration - methodological (AIM) was formed. The elements that had a high correlation in this area are: 1) improved research and data analysis skills (ORESSK), 2) completed a piece of sociological research (OPCRSCH), 3) increased analytical and interpretive skills (OANLSK). The distribution for "improved research and data analysis skills" (ORESSK) and "completed a piece of sociological research" (OPCRSCH) are acceptable. The item "increased analytical and interpretive skills" (OANLSK) was recoded in the same fashion as the preceding items, (2,3=1), (4=2), (5=3). The three items are summed to form academic integration - methodological (AIM).

In construction of the preceding indices close attention was paid to the frequency distributions of the items composing each index. In the model to be constructed I am focusing on direction only without concern for prediction. Recoding was fashioned to produce acceptable frequency distributions for each item. Therefore each index conservatively and adequately demonstrates direction.

It was apparent that these two areas, academic integration - theoretical (AIT) and academic integration - methodological (AIM) are vital to academic integration and
serve as a more detailed analysis over previous research. In thinking about why students pursue postbaccalaureate education, and by examining previous research, one comes to the conclusion that academic integration plays a vital part in the decision to pursue and attain education beyond the undergraduate level. As discussed earlier this is demonstrated in the works of Hearn (1987), Ethington and Smart (1986), and Pascarella (1984). I have taken this a step further by examining the two elements of academic integration which are analytically separate.

Yet, academic integration would not be complete without the plans to go to graduate school and the students perceived preparation for graduate school. This is addressed by Hearn (1987) but his work focuses on plans to attend graduate or professional school without regard for the level of perceived preparation for graduate or professional school. Therefore, graduate preparation (GP) is a composite measure using two items from the survey that focus on perceived preparation for formalized education beyond the undergraduate level. The two items are: preparation of graduate or professional school (OGRADSCH), scaled 1=unimportant outcome to 5=very important outcome, and preparation for graduate school (EGRADPRP), recoded to reflect 1=weakness or uncertain and 2=strength. The graduation cohort (GR) data facilitated recoding into three groupings. The three groups are 1) 1968 to 1975 (50%), 2) 1976 to 1981 (25%), and 3) 1982 to 1988 (25%). Children (CH) is a
dummy variable scored (0=no children, 1=one or more children) to show only the presence or absence of children.

I would like to discuss an overview of the indices before proceeding to the more detailed discussion of index correlation.

OVERVIEW OF INDICES

The indices of academic integration - theoretical and academic integration - methodological were discovered initially during correlation examination of academic integration, as discussed earlier. Upon further examination it appears logical that learning how to address issues sociologically, gaining a better understanding of human societies and the ability to evaluate competing sociological theories, demonstrates academic integration. Each of these items address areas of theoretical orientation. Likewise the items that form academic integration - methodological logically cluster in the methodological arena. Improved research and data skills, completed a piece of sociological research, and increased analytical and interpretive skills all demonstrate methodological orientation. The relative level of integration of academic integration - theoretical and academic integration - methodological can be measured by these indices. It is logical that persons of high academic integration (academic integration - theoretical as well as academic integration - methodological) will be more likely to pursue postgraduate studies. Graduate preparation (GP) is an index
that demonstrates students' perception of undergraduate preparation for graduate or professional school. Level of educational attainment (EDUC) is an index that demonstrates the level of postbaccalaureate educational achievement. A single summary measure of academic integration which combined items from academic integration - theoretical and academic integration - methodological indices failed to improve upon the separate indices and was dropped from the statistical analysis.

**DISTRIBUTION OF OTHER VARIABLES IN THE MODEL**

With the indices constructed and other variables conceptualized and defined, let us proceed to look at the variables and how they perform upon testing in correlation matrices. Let us review the frequency distributions for the independent and dependent variables. Overall 219 (76.3%) of the 287 total respondents stated that they have pursued postgraduate education. For the purpose of this study I will focus not only on level of educational attainment but on postgraduate education in sociology, business, and social work. These graduate and professional education areas were selected for several reasons. The disciplines represent adequate marginals, a cross disciplinary nature with undergraduate sociology concentration, and their historical trend of selection by William and Mary sociology concentrators.

Within these four areas of choice, sociology graduate
programs with 16.4% (n=47) represents the largest selected graduate program. Business turns in an 11.1% (n=32) claim. Finally, social work represents 9.4% (n=27) of the graduate and professional programs selected by the respondents.

The frequency distribution for the variable children is 122 (42.5%) persons without children, and 165 (57.5%) with children. The number of male responses to the survey totaled 96 (33.4%). Female responses totaled 191 (66.6%). This reflects the historical trend of the predominance of women in the undergraduate concentration at William and Mary.

The frequency distribution of the graduation cohort reflects the relatively large size of the sociology concentration in the late 1960s and early 1970s. To balance the groupings, the data facilitated recoding into three divisions. The three groups are 1) 1968 to 1975, 49.1% (n=141), 2) 1976 to 1981, 26.1% (n=75), and 3) 1982 to 1988, 24.7% (n=71).

Upon first examination, academic integration elements to composite demonstrate accepted relationships (table 4). Further examination of the correlation matrix academic integration with its component parts (table 5) demonstrates the clustering of academic integration - theoretical, and academic integration - methodological items. Preliminary efforts to employ the six item composite index did not prove to be productive and, therefore, is not included in the
**TABLE 4**

**CORRELATION MATRIX: ACADEMIC INTEGRATION MEASURES TO COMPOSITE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OADDRRISS</th>
<th>OUNDSOCT</th>
<th>OSOCTH</th>
<th>ORESSK</th>
<th>OPCRSCH</th>
<th>OANLSK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>.6280</td>
<td>.5741</td>
<td>.7453</td>
<td>.6482</td>
<td>.7472</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+-----------------------------------------------+
AI ........ Academic Integration
OADDRRISS ... Learned How to Address Issues Sociologically
OUNDSOCT ... Gained Better Understanding of Human Societies
OSOCTH ...... Could Evaluate Competing Sociological Theories
ORESSK ...... Improved Research and Data Analysis Skills
OPCRSCH .... Completed a Piece of Sociological Research
OANLSK ..... Increased Analytical and Interpretive Skills
TABLE 5

CORRELATION MATRIX: ACADEMIC INTEGRATION ELEMENTS WITH ACADEMIC INTEGRATION - THEORETICAL (AIT), AND ACADEMIC INTEGRATION - METHODOLOGICAL (AIM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AIT</th>
<th>AIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OADDRSS</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUNDSOCT</td>
<td>.4004</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSOCTH</td>
<td>.5122</td>
<td>.4202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORESSK</td>
<td>.1549</td>
<td>.1794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPRSCH</td>
<td>.2986</td>
<td>.2255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OANLSK</td>
<td>.3265</td>
<td>.2668</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OADDRSS .... Learned How to Address Issues Sociologically
OUNDSOCT ... Gained Better Understanding of Human Societies
OSOCTH ..... Could Evaluate Competing Sociological Theories
ORESSK ..... Improved Research and Data Analysis Skills
OPRSCH .... Completed a Piece of Sociological Research
OANLSK ..... Increased Analytical and Interpretive Skills
Clearly, one can see the consistency in correlation among the academic integration - theoretical items. When academic integration - theoretical items are correlated with academic integration - methodological items, the independence of the two indices is apparent especially with OADDRISS to ORESSK (.1549), OUNDSOCT to ORESSK (.1794) and OUNDSOCT to OPCRSCH, (.2255).

The examination of academic integration - theoretical and academic integration - methodological composite correlations reinforces the analytical separation of these two indices.

Academic integration - theoretical (AIT), when separated, shows an item to composite correlation that is satisfactory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OADDRISS</th>
<th>OUNDSOCT</th>
<th>OSOCTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIT</td>
<td>.779</td>
<td>.725</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Academic Integration - Methodological (AIM) demonstrates much the same consistency in correlation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORESSK</th>
<th>OPCRSCH</th>
<th>OANLSK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIM</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>.830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduate preparation (GP) is composed of two items: "prepared
for graduate or professional school" (OGRADSCH) and "preparation for graduate school" (EGRADPRP). The items correlated .8045 and .9305 respectively to the composite. In the next section regression equations will be utilized to demonstrate the causal model.
CHAPTER V.

ANALYSIS

I will present two sections in this chapter. The first section will be a presentation of regression equations. The equations will be presented in table format (tables 6, 7, and 8). The second section will be a discussion of the findings.

REGRESSION EQUATIONS

As discussed previously, the causal model will be employed to assess the relationships among selected variables. The independent variables are hypothesized to have causality on the dependent variable. The regression models presented accomplish several things. First, they demonstrate the explanatory power of independent variables on the level of postbaccalaureate educational attainment. Second, they demonstrate the relationships among the independent variables for selected graduate level disciplines. Third, they give insight to relationships among the variables outside of the dependent variable. I will now proceed to analyze the relationships focusing mainly on variables that have strong explanatory power with statistically significant relationships.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
<th>SOCPOST</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>SOCWPOST</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEND (G)</td>
<td>-.165</td>
<td>-.155**</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.123*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIT</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIM</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.238**</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.267**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COHORT (GR)</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILD (CH)</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_R^2</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIG F</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p< .05
** p< .01
*** p< .001
**** p< .0001

GEND .....GENDER
AIT ......ACADEMIC INTEGRATION - THEORETICAL
AIM ......ACADEMIC INTEGRATION - METHODOLOGICAL
GP ......GRADUATE PREPARATION
COHORT ...GRADUATION COHORT
CHILD ....PRESENCE OF CHILDREN
SOCPOST ..SOCIOLOGY POSTGRADUATE
SOCWPOST .SOCIAL WORK POSTGRADUATE
### Table 7

**REGRESSION EQUATION: BUSINESS POSTGRADUATE AS DEPENDENT VARIABLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
<th>BUSPOST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEND (G)</td>
<td>-.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIT</td>
<td>-.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIM</td>
<td>-.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>-.1143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COHORT (GR)</td>
<td>-.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILD (CH)</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONSTANT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>.424</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- \( R^2 \)
  - .050

- SIG F
  - .0345

- N=
  - 269

* \( p < .05 \)
** \( p < .01 \)
*** \( p < .001 \)
**** \( p < .0001 \)

GEND ......GENDER
AIT ......ACADEMIC INTEGRATION - THEORETICAL
AIM ......ACADEMIC INTEGRATION - METHODOLOGICAL
GP ......GRADUATE PREPARATION
COHORT ...GRADUATION COHORT
CHILD ....PRESENCE OF CHILDREN
BUSPOST ..BUSINESS POSTGRADUATE
### TABLE 8

**REGRESSION EQUATION:** GRADUATE PREPARATION AND LEVEL OF POSTBACCALAUREATE EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT AS DEPENDENT VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
<th>GP</th>
<th>EDUC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEND (G)</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIT</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIM</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>.464****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COHORT (GR)</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILD (CH)</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONSTANT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GP</th>
<th>EDUC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.251</td>
<td>1.373</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| R²            | .253   | .351   |

| SIG F         | .0000  | .0000  |

| N=            | 269    | 269    |

* * p< .0001

**GEND .....GENDER**

**AIT .....ACADEMIC INTEGRATION - THEORETICAL**

**AIM .....ACADEMIC INTEGRATION - METHODOLOGICAL**

**GP .....GRADUATE PREPARATION**

**COHORT .....GRADUATION COHORT**

**CHILD .....PRESENCE OF CHILDREN**

**EDUC .....LEVEL OF POSTBACCALAUREATE EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT**
Gender (G)

Gender shows statistically significant relationships only in table 6. It is suggested that among the two postgraduate disciplines in this study that are continuous with undergraduate sociology, men seem to gravitate toward sociology (SOCPOST) and women to social work (SOCWPOST).

Academic Integration Measures

Table 8 shows that academic integration - methodological (AIM) has a positive and statistically significant relationship with graduate preparation (GP) (beta=.464, p<.0001). A statistically significant relationship is not present for academic integration - theoretical (AIT). The positive relationship with graduate preparation (GP) is the only statistically significant relationship among all of the dependent variables. It is interesting to note that academic integration - methodological has a positive statistically significant relationship with graduate preparation (GP) which in turn has a positive and statistically significant relationship with the level of postbaccalaureate educational attainment (EDUC). Therefore, academic integration - methodological (AIM) has an indirect relationship with the level of postbaccalaureate educational attainment (EDUC). The regression equations with graduate preparation (GP) and the level of postbaccalaureate educational attainment (EDUC) are strong equations as demonstrated by the F test significance level of <.0000.
It was hypothesized that academic integration—theoretical (AIT) along with academic integration—methodological (AIM) would have strong relationships with the level of postbaccalaureate educational attainment (EDUC) and other individual postgraduate programs. These relationships did not materialize in this study. Academic integration—theoretical (AIT) does not demonstrate any statistically significant relationships with the dependent variables.

Graduate Preparation (GP)

One might expect a liberal arts discipline such as sociology to adequately prepare students for a wide range of postbaccalaureate educational attainment. This is supported by these regression equations. Preparation for graduate work in disciplines continuous with sociology demonstrates a positive and statistically significant relationship: sociology postgraduate (SOCPOST) (beta=.238, p<.01) and social work postgraduate (SOCWPOST) (beta=.267, p<.01). Discriminant analysis was used to verify the independence of SOCPOST and SOCWPOST. Business postgraduate (BUSPOST) (beta=-.092, p<.05) demonstrates a statistically significant relationship in a negative direction. A statistically significant relationship does not develop between graduate preparation (GP) and level of postbaccalaureate educational attainment (EDUC). As demonstrated in table 6, the relationships between graduate preparation (GP) and sociology postgraduate (SOCPOST) and social work postgraduate (SOCWPOST) are positive and
statistically significant as expected. In contrast, table 7 shows a statistically significant negative relationship between graduate preparation (GP) and business postgraduate (BUSPOST). This may suggest that students are not easily recognizing the applicability of sociology to business. A suggestion might be to rename courses such as research to market research and demographics with emphasis on applying sociological skills in a variety of occupational settings.

Overall, graduate preparation (GP) demonstrates a positive statistically significant relationship with level of postbaccalaureate educational attainment (beta=.559, p< .0001). As mentioned previously, academic integration - methodological (AIM) has a strong positive relationship with graduate preparation (GP). This may suggest that those who continue beyond undergraduate studies, generally, view their methodological integration in the undergraduate department as very important to their graduate school preparation.

**Graduation Cohort (GR)**

Graduation cohort (GR) has a statistically significant negative relationship with level of postbaccalaureate educational attainment (EDUC) (beta=-.355, p< .0001) The relationships between graduation cohort (GR) and level of postbaccalaureate educational attainment (EDUC) is very interesting. It suggests that the older graduates have had possibly more time and/or resources to pursue graduate study. The R² value for this equation is .351 with a SIG F at the
.0000 level making this a very strong equation.

**Presence of Children (CH)**

The presence of children does not hold strong statistical significance in the relationship with level of postbaccalaureate educational attainment (EDUC) in any of the presented equations.

**DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS**

We can now alter the original regression model (figure 1) and replace it with figure 2. Presented in figure 2 is a conceptual summary of the relationships among the variables highlighting the significant linkages.

Academic integration – methodological (AIM) has a positive statistically significant relationship with graduate preparation (GP), which in turn has a positive statistically significant relationship with level of postbaccalaureate educational attainment (EDUC). Gender (G) has a negative relationship with level of postbaccalaureate educational attainment (EDUC) but is not statistically significant. Graduation cohort (GR) has a negative relationship with level of postbaccalaureate educational attainment (EDUC) at the p<.0001 level. Academic integration – methodological (AIM) has an insignificant direct relationship with level of postbaccalaureate educational attainment (EDUC), but has a statistically significant indirect relationship through graduate preparation (GP). Graduate preparation has a focused relationship with level of postgraduate educational.
Figure 2: This model demonstrates the causal relationships. It proceeds from left to right.

G ..........GENDER
AIT ........ACADEMIC INTEGRATION - THEORETICAL
AIM ........ACADEMIC INTEGRATION - METHODOLOGICAL
GP ..........GRADUATE PREPARATION
GR ..........GRADUATION COHORT
CH ..........PRESENCE OF CHILDREN
EDUC .......LEVEL OF POSTBACCALAUREATE EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT
attainment. One goal of the liberal arts is to build a broad base of skills to prepare students for graduate level work. The definitive relationship between graduate preparation (GP) and level of postbaccalaureate educational attainment (EDUC) proves that sociology concentrators are benefitting from a liberal arts base.

This model suggests that alumni with high scores on the academic integration - methodological composite index perceived their preparation for graduate or professional school to be an important outcome of their undergraduate experience.

As mentioned earlier, social work postgraduate is represented largely by women, while sociology postgraduate is represented largely by men. With regard to sociology postgraduate, men achieve more Ph.D.'s than women both numerically and proportionally. Women are more likely to obtain terminal M.S.W. degrees than men.

The breakdown of men and women across all postbaccalaureate disciplines with regard to level of attainment mirrors somewhat the national norms presented earlier. You may want to refer to the graphs presented earlier. Among those who have attained the highest graduate degree (Ph.D or professional degree), 18.8% (n=18) are men and 9.4% (n=18) are women. This two to one relationship resembles the current population of Ph.D.s (graph 2). Women are outpacing men at the master's level. Of the women, 38.7%
(n=74) have attained a master's degree while only 28.1% (n=27) of the men have. This is not only consistent with national norms of master's degree attainment (graph 1) but gives support to the projections of women in Ph.D. programs through the end of the 1990s (graph 2); that is, the proportion of women earning the Ph.D. degree should continue at an increasing rate.

At William and Mary, it is not surprising that gender is negatively related to the composite variable postbaccalaureate educational attainment. Overall, 81.3% (n=78) of men responded affirmatively to attainment of at least postgraduate coursework, while 73.8% (n=141) of women claimed the same. Since the data span two decades the variation in the year graduated, as demonstrated by the model, is significant. Those who graduated in the late 1960s and early 1970s certainly have had more opportunity, with regard to time and most likely financial resources, to attain postbaccalaureate education. Further, I think that traditional gender roles with regard to educational attainment prevailed during that early period.
Conclusion

This thesis represents adequate conceptualization and development of three central composite measures, academic integration - theoretical (AIT), academic integration - methodological (AIM), and preparation for graduate or professional school (GP). Preparation for graduate or professional school (GP) surfaced as the measure having the strongest relationship with level of educational attainment (EDUC). Graduate Preparation (GP) is also positively related to sociology postgraduate and social work postgraduate. The strong relationship of graduate preparation and level of educational attainment is important. This finding supports one mission of liberal arts programs. In general, alumni of the sociology concentration at William and Mary who pursued graduate level study feel that preparation for graduate school was an important outcome of the undergraduate experience. More pointedly, the methodological skills gained at the undergraduate level is identified by sociology alumni as a key component in their preparation for graduate school. This suggests that the William and Mary sociology department is succeeding in preparing graduates with necessary skills for achieving graduate level training, not only in sociology but
also across a variety of disciplines.

Future projects based on this work might include examining the variance of academic integration — methodological (AIM), academic integration — theoretical (AIT), and graduate school preparation (GP) by graduation cohort (GR). It would also be interesting to apply these indices to other liberal arts disciplines. An interdisciplinary comparison would be of value as part of an institutional assessment program.
APPENDIX A

As explained in the first section, the sociology department assumed responsibility for development of the survey instrument. The instrument was first drafted by the chair of the department in cooperation with the graduate seminar research class. The survey is attached as Appendix B. As the survey took form three major areas of interest emerged. A section of background information includes work history with chronologies, employment plans, avocational activities, post baccalaureate educational attainment or plans for pursuit, marital status, children, and respondents' gender. The background information allows examination of status characteristics. Next, the respondents are asked to complete items pertaining to attitudinal indicators. These questions assess the relative importance of sociology on occupational and avocational activities. Behavioral indicators are ascertained through a series of ordinal responses to outcomes statements. The outcomes address specific dynamics of the program that represent the thrust of the curriculum. Respondents are allowed to add possible outcomes they perceived that were not listed.

Different from the curriculum dynamics but also very important are the dimensions of the sociology concentration.
In the final section of the survey, strengths and weaknesses of the program dimensions are assessed. A forced answer, strength, weakness, uncertain option identifies areas of the program to retain and to consider for improvement. Finally, respondents are given a chance to rate the program overall, and in a separate question, evaluate their decision to major in sociology, through an ordinal response and opportunity to comment. Given the positive and negative thoughts on the program, the respondent has an opportunity to submit suggestions for improvement of the sociology concentration.

The sample for this assessment was drawn from sociology graduates 1968 to 1988. The year 1968 was selected as a cutoff for two reasons: one, prior to 1968 the department was combined with anthropology and two, twenty years provided a large enough population to examine chronological changes in students' evaluation of the program. The latter could be problematic but I think the relative small turnover of the faculty and curriculum offsets this problem.

Due to the relatively small population, the decision was made to sample the entire population. The sample consisted of 612 sociology alumni. The individuals in the sample were drawn from the university alumni data base. The more recent graduates were contacted by phone to confirm addresses. The sample is limited because the alumni data base in not comprehensive and consists largely of individuals who have contributed to college annual fund drives. The sample is
proportionately representative of each respective year. The total number of graduates each year has fluctuated from the early 1970s to the early 1980s.

Dissemination of the survey took place in February of 1989 with an initial mailing. Approximately three weeks later a follow up mailing was conducted. Surveys returned marked "return to sender" were researched for more adequate addresses. If new a address could not be located the unit was classified with invalid responses. Approximately 15% of the surveys were invalid responses.

Initial returns were 40% within two weeks and approached 50% several weeks after the follow up mailing. Returned surveys were marked as either valid or invalid responses and recorded by identification number.

A code book (Appendix C) was developed to accurately facilitate the coding process. The majority of the coding was done by students in the undergraduate research class under the supervision of a faculty member. This group coding setting allowed for consistency of coding open-ended questions and classification of items by the faculty supervisor. New items introduced to the code book were posted so the coders could modify their code books as necessary. Please note that the codebook does not reflect the NORC classification recodings. The occupational prestige item was not employed in this research and, therefore, these recodings do not affect the findings reported here.
Dear Sociology Graduate:

The College of William and Mary is undertaking a thorough assessment of its undergraduate programs. The assessment focuses on both general education and undergraduate majors (concentrations) in arts and sciences, business, and education. Sociology is one of five pilot departments being examined in this first year of assessment. With your help, we want to learn more about our strengths and weaknesses as we plan for the future.

One part of the Sociology assessment plan is an outside review of our undergraduate program. It focuses on requirements for concentrators and minors, general education courses, and special opportunities for undergraduates (for example, independent studies and internships). A second part of the plan involves evaluations of senior essays written by current sociology majors. The third part of the plan is a survey of sociology alumni from the past twenty years. The goals of the survey are to learn something about your post-graduate experiences, to get your thoughts on the importance of a sociology background up to this point in your life, and to benefit from your reflections about the strengths and weaknesses of your undergraduate training in sociology.

You have been included in a sample of sociology alumni dating back to 1968. Please help us by completing the enclosed questionnaire. Some of the questions may be answered by simply checking the appropriate box. Other items ask you either to write in a short description or briefly comment in any manner you deem appropriate. The questionnaire should take about 15-20 minutes to complete and can be returned in the enclosed self-addressed envelope.

To ensure a representative sample of sociology alumni, it is important that we achieve a high response rate of those who have been selected. Please be assured that your responses will be completely confidential. The ID numbers at the top of the questionnaires are being used by us to identify non-respondents who will be surveyed in a second mailing. Findings from the study will be presented in aggregate form only, and no individual graduate will ever be identified by name.

My colleagues and I have appreciated very much the opportunity of working with so many of you in the past. We hope to hear from you, to learn about and from your experiences, and to benefit from your thoughts and recollections. The information we seek will enable us to better serve present and future students of William and Mary. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Gary A. Kreps
Professor and Chair

Members of the Sociology Faculty

David Aday  
Lawrence Beckhouse  
Vernon Edmonds  
Michael Faia  
Satoshi Ito  
Jon Kerner  
Wayne Kernodle (Emeritus)  
Victor Liguori  
Edwin Rhyne  
John Stanfield (Cummings Professor of Sociology and American Studies)  
Elaine Themo  
Marion Vanfossen
Background Information

When did you graduate from William and Mary? _______

Are you currently employed?  
[ ] Yes, employed full-time  
[ ] Yes, employed part-time  
[ ] No, not currently employed

If you are not currently employed, please skip to the next question. If you are currently employed, please provide us with your job title, a brief description of your work activities, and the time period of employment (dates) in your current job.

Please also summarize your employment history since graduating from the College (earliest to most recent position). It would be helpful if you could describe briefly the kinds of positions you have held in the past, and during what time periods. Feel free to add a sheet if you need more space.

Job Descriptions  

Time Periods

What are your employment plans for the future?

We would like you now to describe your major avocational and other personal interests and activities (such as voluntary associations, political action groups, social clubs, hobbies, and other leisure pursuits). It would be helpful in this regard if you could indicate how important these kinds of activities are to you and how much time you spend on them.
Have you pursued any post-graduate education? [ ] No [ ] Yes

If yes, please indicate in what field(s) and highest level of education attained (check all fields that apply)

- Sociology: [ ] Coursework [ ] Master's [ ] Doctorate
- Law: [ ] Coursework [ ] Law Degree
- Business: [ ] Coursework [ ] Master's [ ] Doctorate
- Education: [ ] Coursework [ ] Master's [ ] Doctorate
- Social Work: [ ] Coursework [ ] Master's [ ] Doctorate
- Public Admin: [ ] Coursework [ ] Master's [ ] Doctorate
- Urban Planning: [ ] Coursework [ ] Master's [ ] Doctorate
- Other: (What Field? _____________________)
  [ ] Coursework [ ] Master's [ ] Doctorate

Do you plan to pursue post-graduate education beyond that noted in the previous question? [ ] No [ ] Yes
If yes, in what field __________________________________________

Are you currently — married, widowed, divorced, separated, or have you never been married?

[ ] Married [ ] Divorced [ ] Never married
[ ] Widowed [ ] Separated

Do you have any children? [ ] No [ ] Yes If yes, how many and what are their ages ________

What is your gender? [ ] Male [ ] Female

Sociology Training, Career and Personal Development

What is your best recollection of why you majored in sociology?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Considering the employment history and plans you described earlier, to what extent has your undergraduate background in sociology been important to your career development?

[ ] Very important [ ] Moderately unimportant
[ ] Moderately important [ ] Very unimportant

Briefly describe the reason(s) for this evaluation.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Considering the avocational and other personal interests and activities you described earlier, to what extent has your undergraduate background in sociology been important to your personal development.

[ ] Very important [ ] Moderately unimportant
[ ] Moderately important [ ] Very unimportant

Briefly describe the reason(s) for this evaluation.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Based on your own experience, please rate on a scale of 1 to 5 each of the following items as possible outcomes of your sociology major. A rating of 1 means that the item was an unimportant outcome of your sociology major. A rating of 5 means that the item was a very important outcome of your sociology major. Feel free to add outcomes at the end of the list that you think should be on it.

Please circle the appropriate number for each item on the list.
(1 = unimportant outcome 5 = very important outcome)

1 2 3 4 5 Learned how to address issues sociologically
1 2 3 4 5 Gained better understanding of myself and others
1 2 3 4 5 Gained better understanding of human societies
1 2 3 4 5 Could evaluate competing sociological theories
1 2 3 4 5 Improved research and data analysis skills
1 2 3 4 5 Completed a piece of sociological research
1 2 3 4 5 Prepared for graduate or professional school
1 2 3 4 5 Developed job related skills and insights
1 2 3 4 5 Increased analytical and interpretive skills
1 2 3 4 5 Enhanced verbal and written expression
1 2 3 4 5 Other outcome: _________________________________________________________________
1 2 3 4 5 Other outcome: _________________________________________________________________

Strengths and Weaknesses of Sociology Concentration

Based on your own experience, please rate each of the following items as a strength or a weakness of the sociology major at William and Mary. Feel free to add items at the end of the list that you think should be on it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Dimension of Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Core requirements (theory, methods, statistics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent research opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty assistance outside of classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participation in faculty research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Career preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preparation for graduate school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extra-curricular activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other: ________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other: ________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From your experience, how would you rate the sociology undergraduate program at William and Mary?

[ ] Excellent Comment: ____________________________________________________________
[ ] Good
[ ] Fair
[ ] Poor

If you had it to do over again, would you have concentrated in sociology?

[ ] Definitely would Comment: ____________________________________________________________
[ ] Probably would
[ ] Probably would not
[ ] Definitely would not

What suggestions would you offer for improving the undergraduate major in sociology at William and Mary?

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

Thank you very much.
### APPENDIX C

**SOCIOLOGY ASSESSMENT CODE BOOK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLUMNS</th>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>IDNUM, Identification Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>YRGRAD, Year of Graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>EMPLOY, Currently Employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=yes, employed full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2=yes, employed part-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3=no, not currently employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>JOB1, Description of Most Recent Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00=no jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01=not employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02=college professor, sociologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03=college professor, other field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04=elem. or secondary teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05=lawyer or judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06=physician or dentist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>07=other medical professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08=research specialist, public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>09=research specialist, private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10=clergyman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11=other religious professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12=accountant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13=comptroller, CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14=social worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15=writers, artist, entertainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16=engineers, chem., elect, mech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17=engineers, technicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18=bank officers &amp; financial mgr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19=bank tellers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20=staff specialist, public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21=staff specialist, private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22=criminologist, probation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23=real estate, stock broker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24=computer specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25=librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26=sales managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27=sales representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28=counselors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29 = protective service worker
30 = postal service worker
31 = personnel manager, public
32 = personnel manager, private
33 = administrative assistant
34 = clerical worker
35 = craftsman
36 = mechanic and repairman
37 = military service, not officer
38 = self employed
39 = coach
40 = employee relations spec.
41 = office manager
42 = consultant
43 = college administrator
44 = large business executive
45 = paralegal work
46 = military, officer
47 = insurance agent
48 = communications specialist
49 = child care, other low level service
50 = administrator/manager, private
51 = unskilled, semiskilled, manual labor, (grave digger, home maker, painter)
52 = graduate assistant/graduate/professional student
53 = intern, trainee

11-12 JOB2, Description of next most recent job, same format as above
13-14 JOB3, Description of third most recent job, same format
15-16 JOB4, Description of fourth most recent job, same format
17-18 JOB5, Description of fifth most recent job, same format
19-20 YEARSJ1, Years in most recent job
21-22 YEARSJ2, Years second most recent job
23-24 YEARSJ3, Years third most recent job
25-26 YEARSJ4, Years fourth most recent job
27-28 YEARSJ5, Years fifth most recent job
29-30 TOTJOBS, Total number of jobs since graduation

31-32 TOTWORK, Total number of years worked (computer generated)

33-34 TOTYEARS, Total number of years since graduation (computer generated)

35 PLANS, Employment plans
   1=no plans
   2=plan to remain in present job
   3=plan regular career advance.
   4=plan major career change
   5=uncertain

36 AVRLG, Religious organizations
   1=yes
   2=no

37 AVEDORG, Educational organizations
   1=yes
   2=no

38 AVCLUB, Social club
   1=yes
   2=no

39 AVPOL, Political organizations
   1=yes
   2=no

40 AVPUBINT, Public Interest groups
   1=yes
   2=no

41 AVSPORT, Sports
   1=yes
   2=no

42 AVFAF, Involvement with Family and Friends
   1=yes
   2=no
43 AVPHIL, Philanthropic, non religious or education
   1=yes
   2=no

44 AVBUS, Business, civic organizations
   1=yes
   2=no

45 AVARTS, Fine arts, music, performing arts
   1=yes
   2=no

46-47 AVHOBBY, Hobbies
   01=running or jogging
   02=reading or writing
   03=swimming
   04=boating, motor and sail
   05=hunting, game or skeet
   06=fishing, angler or sport
   07=knitting or sewing
   08=woodworking or crafts
   09=collector of items
   10=racquetball
   11=tennis
   12=golf
   13=hiking, spelunking
   14=rafting
   15=camping
   16=computer games
   17=no hobbies listed
   18=games and puzzles
   19=dancing
   20=wine tasting
   21=gardening
   22=travel
   23=cards
   24=aerobics
   25=flying
   26=restoration (house, cars)
   27=horseback riding
   28=photography
   29=raises cats, dogs
**AVCCH, Coaching**

- 1 = soccer
- 2 = football
- 3 = baseball, teeball
- 4 = basketball
- 5 = softball
- 6 = swimming
- 7 = cheerleading
- 8 = other
- 9 = no coaching activities listed

**AVOCTOT, Total number of avocational activities**

- 00 = list AV Activities Not Codable
- 01 to 98 = corresponding to Number of codable AV activities
- 99 = no response or blank

**AVOCTIME, Hours/week spent on avocational activities**

- 00 = blank
- 01 = no time for activities; none
- 02 = one to five hours/week
- 03 = six to ten hours/week
- 04 = eleven to fifteen hours/week
- 05 = more than sixteen hours/week
- 06 = important but no time listed

**POSTGRAD, Have pursued post graduate education**

- 1 = no
- 2 = yes

**SOCPOST, Post-graduate education Soc.**

- 1 = none
- 2 = coursework
- 3 = masters
- 4 = doctorate

**LAWPOST, Post-graduate education law**

- 1 = none
- 2 = coursework
- 3 = Law Degree
BUSPOST, Post-graduate education Bus.
1=none
2=coursework
3=masters
4=doctorate

EDUPOST, Post-graduate education Ed.
1=none
2=coursework
3=masters
4=doctorate

SOCWPOST, Post-graduate in Soc. Work
1=none
2=coursework
3=masters
4=doctorate

PUBAPOST, Post-graduate education in public administration
1=none
2=coursework
3=masters
4=doctorate

URBPPOST, Post-graduate education in urban planning
1=none
2=coursework
3=masters
4=doctorate

OTHPOST, Other Post-graduate work
1=none
2=coursework
3=masters
4=doctorate
MOREPOST, Further Graduate education plans

0=no answer or blank
1=no
2=yes
3=maybe

FFIELD, Field of Future Graduate education

0=none
1=religion
2=sociology
3=law
4=business
5=education
6=social work
7=public administration
8=urban planning
9=other

MRSTATUS, Marital status

1=married
2=widowed
3=divorced
4=separated
5=never married
6=other, not provided

CHILD, Number of Children

00 to 98=total number listed
99=blank

GEND, Gender

1=male
2=female

MAJORED, reasons for majoring in sociology

00=no answer
01=faculty
02=interest in people, groups
03=course content
04=career possibilities
05=liberal arts
06=intro course
07="save the world"
08=easy major, easier major
09=family member encouraged
10=friends encouraged
11=related to many social sciences
12=other

SOCAREER, Importance of Sociology for career development

1=very important
2=moderately important
3=moderately unimportant
4=very unimportant

CAREEVAL, Reasons for evaluating importance of sociology in career development

00=no answer
01=not important
02=sociological insight helpful
03=job is people oriented
04=sociology required for current job
05=theory & methods skills helpful
06=gave different view of world
07=understanding of org. behavior
08=shaped personal philosophy
09=good liberal arts discipline
10=appreciation for diversity

SOCPERS, Importance of Sociology for personal development

1=very important
2=moderately important
3=moderately unimportant
4=very unimportant

PERSEVAL, Reasons for evaluating importance of sociology in personal development

00=no answer
01=expanded intellectual horizons
02=understand group interaction
03=not important in pers. dev.
04=developed compassion, understanding
05=developed critical thinking skills
06=more politically aware
07=self understanding, pers. phil.
08=gave world perspective
09=help with family
10=understand sociohistorical influen.
11=understand gender influences
12=understand racial influences
13=underclass dynamics

RECORD NUMBER 2

1-3 IDNUMM, Identification Number same as IDNUM

4 OADDRISS, Learned how to address issues sociologically

0=no answer
1=unimportant outcome
2
3
4
5=very important outcome

5 OSELFUND, Gained better self understanding
same format

6 OUNDSOCT, Gained better understanding of human societies
same format

7 OSOCTH, Evaluate competing sociological theories
same format

8 ORESSK, Improved research skills
same format
9 OPCR SCH, Completed piece of research
   same format

10 OGRADSCH, Prepared for graduate or professional school
   same format

11 OJOBSK, Developed job related skills and insights
   same format

12 OANLSK, Increased analytical and interpretive skills
   same format

13 OVBWR, Enhanced verbal and written expression
   same format

14 OOUTHOUT1, Other outcome
   same format or 0 if no answer

15 OOUTHOUT2, Other outcome
   same format or 0 if no answer

16 EOVCUR, Overall curriculum
   0=no answer
   1=strength
   2=weakness
   3=uncertain

17 ECORREQ, Core Requirements
   same format

18 EINDRSCH, Independent research opportunities
   same format
19 EFAC, Faculty
   same format

20 ECLINST, Classroom instruction
   same format

21 EFACHLP, Faculty assistance outside of class
   same format

22 EPTFRCH, Participation in faculty research
   same format

23 WCARPREP, Career preparation
   same format

24 EGRADPRP, Preparation for graduate school
   same format

25 EEXTRAC, Extra-curricular activities
   same format

26 EDFACIL, Department facilities
   same format

27 EDEV1, Other
   same format

28 EDEV2, Other
   same format

29 RATESOC, Rating of Sociology Program
   0=no answer
   1=excellent
   2=good
   3=fair
   4=poor
30-31 PROGRATE, Comments on rating program

00=no answer
01=good, overall curriculum
02=good, faculty
03=good, better than others
04=good, senior thesis
05=good, provided outlook
06=good, developed skills
07=bad, more international needed
08=bad, more practical experience
09=bad, more computer work, statistics
10=bad, better faculty
11=bad, faculty too narrow
12=bad, faculty not approachable
13=bad, can't find job or high pay job
14=bad, general

32 CONCSOC, Concentrate in sociology

1=definitely would
2=probably would
3=probably would not
4=definitely would not

33-34 COMCON, Comments on concentration

00=no answer
01=yes, no qualifications
02=yes, important to outlook
03=yes, important to job
04=yes, shaped personal philosophy
05=yes, also business, economics
06=yes, also psychology
07=yes, also government
08=yes, also anthropology
09=yes, education
10=no, can't find job or high pay job
11=no, business
12=no, psychology
13=no, government
14=no, anthropology
15=no, education
16=no, religion
17=no, history
18=yes, other
19=no, other
IMPROVE, Comments on improving major in sociology

00=no answer, can't evaluate
01=more career counseling
02=more independent research
03=improve quality of faculty
04=expand department
05=more internships-practicums
06=smaller classes
07=keep quality faculty
08=stick to basics
09=keep theory orientation
10=treat students as persons
11=more business applications
12=more computer work
13=more female faculty
14=more black faculty
15=more applied coursework
16=suggest related courses elsewhere
17=more informal get togethers
18=social work orientation
19=more "real world" applications
20=more public policy
21=more discussion
22=more course offerings
Anderson, C.J., et. al.

Astin, A. and Panos, R.

Babbie, Earl

Boyer, Ernest L.

Ethington, C.A. and Smart, J.C.

Hearn, J.C.

Jencks, C., et. al.

Jencks, C. and Riesman, D.

Land, Kenneth
1989 From discussions with Dr. Kenneth Land, Professor of Sociology, Duke University.

Miller, K.A., et. al.
Pascarella, E. T.  

Riesman, D.  

Rossi, A.S. and Calderwood, A.  

Scully, M.G.  

Thistlewaite, D.L.  
1960  Fields of Study and Development of Motivation to Seek Advanced Training." Journal of Educational Psychology, V. 53, No. 2, pp. 53-64.

Tinto, V.  

Ottinger, C.A., compiler  

1988-1989  The College of William and Mary Undergraduate Program Catalog.

Assessment Plan  
1987  The College of William and Mary Assessment Plan. Written under the Direction of Associate Provost Kathleen Slevin.
VITA

Benjamin Wofford Smith was born March 21, 1964 in Greenville, South Carolina. Raised in Ashland, Virginia, he graduated from Hermitage High School in Richmond, Virginia, June 10, 1982. Receiving a B.S. degree in sociology at Longwood College, Farmville, Virginia, Mr. Smith was graduated May 17, 1986 President of the Senior Class and recipient of the Kathleen Cover Sociology Award. He entered the College of William and Mary as a graduate assistant August 1988, and was graduated December 1990, M.A. degree in sociology.