

A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF THE LIFE STYLES OF FORMER HONORS AND
NON-HONORS STUDENTS IN THE COLLEGE OF HOME ECONOMICS

by

SIERRILL MINNEMAN METZGER

B. A., University of Missouri at Kansas City, 1966

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Family and Child Development

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1967

Approved by:

Ruth Hoeflin

Major Professor

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express sincere appreciation to Dr. Ruth Hoeflin who served as advisor for this thesis. Her supportive guidance, encouragement, and resourcefulness made the planning and development of this study possible.

The writer also wishes to express her gratitude to Dr. Marjorie Stith and Dr. Walter Friesen for their helpful suggestions and for serving on the writer's committee. A special thanks goes to Dr. Stephen R. Bollman who gave many hours of his time to discussion of ideas which resulted in the instrument and framework used in the study.

Finally, an expression of appreciation goes to the participants in the Honors Research Project, whose overwhelming cooperation made the study possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
Theoretical Orientation	
Long-term Effects of Academic Experiences	
Life Styles of Educated Women	
III. METHOD	20
Subjects	
Instrument	
Collection of Data	
Operational Definitions	
Analysis of Data	
IV. RESULTS	27
Description of Total Group	
Long-term Effects of Academic Experiences	
V. DISCUSSION	52
VI. SUMMARY	61
LIST OF REFERENCES	64
APPENDIX A - CORRESPONDENCE	67
APPENDIX B - INSTRUMENT	74

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Year of Matriculation of Subjects.	20
2. Size of Home Town of Subjects.	21
3. Distribution of Subjects by Honors and Graduation Status .	27
4. Size of Communities Where Subjects Reside	28
5. Marital Status of Respondents.	29
6. Income Level of Husbands of Subjects	29
7. Career Orientation of Subjects as Measured by Times in Life Cycle when Subjects Expect to Work	30
8. Income Level of Subjects Presently Employed.	32
9. Job Aspirations of Subjects Planning to Work in Future . .	33
10. Rationale Given for Future Work Plans of Subjects.	34
11. Degree of Satisfaction with Undergraduate Major, as Expressed by Subjects.	35
12. Plans for Further Education by Subjects with Varying Degrees of Career Orientation	36
13. Distribution of Number of Organizations to which Subjects Belonged.	38
14. Comparison of Marital Status of Honors and Non-honors Subjects	40
15. Annual Income of the Husbands of Honors and Non-honors Subjects	41
16. Comparison of Career Orientation of Honors and Non-honors Subjects	42
17. Job Aspirations of Honors and Non-honors Subjects.	43

18.	Number of Contacts with Faculty Members as Reported by Honors and Non-honors for their Freshman Year of College	44
19.	Changes in Majors to Outside the College of Home Economics by Honors and Non-honors Subjects	44
20.	Number of Honors and Non-honors Subjects Returning to Kansas State University for Further Academic Studies . .	45
21.	Primary Future Goals Listed by Honors and Non-honors Subjects	46
22.	Degree of Satisfaction with Prospective Total Life, Expressed by Honors and Non-honors Subjects.	47
23.	Comparison of Career Orientation of College Graduate and Non-graduate Subjects.	49
24.	Reported Income Levels of College Graduate and Non-graduate Subjects.	50

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The contemporary educated woman is confronted with increasing numbers of options in planning her life. According to Glick (1955) all women's lives have been affected by the trends toward earlier marriage, smaller families, and longer life. Larger numbers of significant options are available to women due to breakthroughs after World War II which reduced the barriers against the employment of married women in middle- and upper-income classes. Besides this modification in the social mores related to women's employment, Ginzberg (1966) emphasizes the changes brought about by the encouragement of the education of women.

The contemporary American woman with a college education has access to many stimulating professional jobs (Ginzberg, 1966). Educated young women today may pursue careers in combination with married life with greater ease than ever. Educational training in combination with the changing social mores, and the trends toward smaller families and longer life create a large number of significant options from which educated women may shape their life styles. Women with college educations remain a minority in the contemporary American society. Their experiences and life styles may set the pace for the future.

Although the changing life styles of educated women have

received much attention in the past decade, more research is required on the causes of such changes. The recent research of Freedman (1962) and Ginsberg (1966) have contributed to the body of knowledge on the kinds of roles that educated women are choosing to play. Much less research has focused on the causes of the types of roles women play. Many factors might influence role choices. According to Freedman (1962) the effect that academic experiences while in college have upon later role choices is an area of influence which has rarely been explored.

This research focuses on the roles played in the present stages of selected young women's life cycle. The entire sequence of roles is not studied, only the clusters of roles at this selected young adult stage of the subjects. Another area of focus is the effect of academic experiences in college on future life styles of women. Overall, the longitudinal research will be involved in analyzing the role sequences and total life style of the subject.

A longitudinal descriptive study of educated women's roles is regarded as important for several reasons. Since educated women may be in the forefront of new trends, more adequate predictions of potential family life patterns are enabled by such a study. A longitudinal study provides further insight into the causes of educated women's role preferences. Such a study provides a method of evaluating the college experiences and their impact on educated women's life styles after college. A longitudinal study of this type is important to educators, counselors, family sociologists, and other professionals concerned with women's changing life styles.

The initiation of an Honors Program by the College of Home

Economics at Kansas State University in the Fall of 1958 stimulated the plan to study the participants of that program as they progressed through their college years. According to Kell and Kennedy (1966) these honors students ranked in the top 10 per cent on American College Testing Program scores. Although the Honors Program could not be termed an accelerated program, opportunities were provided for members to bypass some elementary courses, attend honors sections of certain classes, participate in honors student seminars and be assigned to special advisors. The main purpose of the Honors Program was to challenge superior home economics students by adding enrichment and depth to their college experience (Hoffman, 1959).

Other students were selected for study along with the honors students. These non-honors students were matched with the honors students by father's occupation, size of home town, and size of high school graduating class. These non-honors students ranked below the top 10 per cent level on the American College Testing Program scores (Kell, Kennedy, 1966).

The design of the Honors Research Project included interviews of all subjects in their freshman, sophomore, and senior years. A selected battery of tests was administered at scheduled intervals. Subjects remained participants in this phase of the research as long as they were enrolled in the College of Home Economics. The present research is the first follow-up contact with the subjects since they originally left Kansas State University.

The three major objectives of this research are as follows:

- 1) To describe the current roles of the subjects, as a total group;

- 2) To compare descriptively the current roles of the subjects who were participants in the College of Home Economics Honors Program with those subjects who were not participants in the Honors Program;
- 3) To compare descriptively the current roles of the subjects who graduated from college with those who did not graduate.

The area of focus for this thesis has been presented in the above paragraphs. From the review of literature in Chapter II, the major concepts of the study will be derived and relevant empirical research findings presented. Chapter III will include the explanation of how the subjects were selected for the study, a biographic description of the subjects, and presentation of the methods of data collection.

The findings will be reported in Chapter IV. The relationships of the findings to the concepts of the life styles of educated women will be discussed in Chapter V and Chapter VI is a summary of the thesis.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Theoretical Orientation

Study of the developmental processes of young women's life styles is aided by examination within a framework. The developmental framework, selected for this study, is appropriate for the longitudinal analyses of the family system. The developmental theoretical approach has not been established as a bona fide theoretical system distinct from all other theories. However many concepts from the developmental framework were derived for use in the present study, laying a groundwork for the understanding of the developing life styles of the subjects of this study. The assumptions which appear to underlie the developmental framework are as follows (Hill and Rodgers, 1964):

1. Human conduct is best seen as a function of the preceding as well as the current social milieu and the individual conditions.
2. Human conduct cannot be adequately understood apart from human development.
3. The human is an actor as well as a reactor.
4. Individual and group development is best seen as dependent upon stimulation by a social milieu as well as on inherent (developed) capacities.
5. The individual in a social setting is the basic autonomous unit.

The first major concept of the developmental framework is that of the family life cycle which defines phases of individual's lives in

terms of the stage of his family. The stages in family life cycles can be defined by marked changes in the roles in any family member. As the concept of the family life cycle has been refined, the originally designated stages have been supplemented (Hill and Rodgers, 1964). From earliest conceptualizations involving four stages, Duvall developed an eight stage cycle, and more recently Rodgers has developed stages that include twenty-four distinct role complexes. Originally the life cycle concept was utilized for demographic categories. However, according to Hill and Rodgers, it has developed into a "sensitizing concept for descriptive writing about the content of family living over the family life span."

Glick (1955) utilized the family life cycle concept and demonstrated changes in families from 1890 to 1950. He concluded that while the average family undergoes many changes in the course of its life cycle, these changes are different from those which prevailed a generation or two ago. He pinpointed trends toward earlier marriage, smaller families and longer life. These trends would have an effect then on the individual roles played within the family. One such change is the greater opportunity for women to be gainfully employed, due to the smaller families and the longer life span.

At the time when the Honors Research Project began, all the subjects were involved in the launching stage of the family life cycle, the stage that includes the years in the family when children begin to leave the home. At the time of the follow-up study, most had begun the establishment phase of the family life cycle. The stage of the life cycle a family is in may affect significantly the kinds of roles the

woman plays. Therefore, some researchers believe that focus cannot be placed on an isolated area of women's lives, such as their careers, because "each decision with respect to their jobs might have an even greater impact on their families than on their careers" (Ginzberg, 1966). Also, according to Glick's studies (1955), changes in family life patterns between generations seem to affect the kinds of roles which women play. Thus, although the present study focuses on selected roles in young women's lives, such as mother, student, and paid employee, the total family setting must be considered to gain some understanding of the processes occurring in these women's lives.

The examination of each individual's role in a family is best conceptualized through "role sequence," defined as: "The series of roles which an occupant of a position is called upon to play as he moves through the life cycle" (Hill and Rodgers, 1964). The positional career concept (Farber, 1961) also portrays this dimension as, ". . . progression of statuses and functions which unfold in a more or less orderly though not predetermined sequence in the pursuit of values which themselves emerge in the course of experience." This concept can be utilized to examine the dimension of the total life span of the individual within the family. The concept of life style also encompasses the total life span of the individual. According to Ginzberg (1966) the life style of an individual is defined as, ". . . that orientation to self, others, and society, that each individual develops, that is, his value orientation."

The second major concept of the developmental framework is that of the developmental task, defined as:

... a set of norms (role expectations) arising at a particular point in the career of a position in a social system, which, if incorporated by the occupant of the position as a role or part of a role cluster, brings about integration and temporary equilibrium in the system with regard to a role complex; failure to incorporate the norms leads to lack of integration, application of additional normative pressures in the form of sanctions and difficulty in incorporating later norms into the role cluster of the position (Christenson, 1964).

Some of the individual developmental tasks of the teenager during the launching stage are: achieving emotional independence of parents, selecting and preparing for an occupation, preparing for marriage and family life, selecting a mate, and starting a family (Havighurst, 1952). It is difficult to assess the validity of assuming completion of college as a necessity for some women to complete their other developmental tasks. Thus, application of this concept to this phase of the study is tenuous. Much would depend on the subjects' original motives and goals that they possessed as college freshmen. If they were highly motivated to attain a career requiring college training, graduation might be considered a developmental task. Those who failed to reach this goal would consequently experience ramifications of "... lack of integration ... and difficulty in incorporating later norms" in later roles. If such motivation were not high, attainment of a degree would probably not be considered as necessary for success in future tasks.

Earlier research on the subjects involved in this Honors Research Project did not attempt to measure motivation for college education, thus it would be difficult to draw conclusions regarding differences between the college graduates and the college drop-outs from the concept of developmental tasks.

Concepts from the developmental framework derived for use in the

present study were presented in the above paragraphs. The following discussions attempt to summarize the information which is available about the life styles of educated women. A more specific section explores literature related to the area of the long term effects of academic experiences on later roles in women's lives.

Long-term Effects of Academic Experiences

A review of the literature revealed little research directed toward investigation of possible relationships between academic roles played by female college students and their later roles in life. Two subgroups from the total group of subjects were selected for investigation in the present study which related to academic experiences during college years.

Academic experiences of the subjects must be kept in perspective with their total life style. The academic ability or motivation of an individual while in college is probably congruent with the roles the individual played before his college experiences and his subsequent performance after college.

If one looks at the college experience against the background of a total life, or a considerable part of one, . . . the experience tends to shrink in importance. It takes its natural place within a life pattern, being utilized in different ways by different individuals almost always in a fashion which is consistent with what they were and what they were becoming (Sanford, 1957). Sanford's theory of development would indicate that students' differences evident during college should persist into their later life, resulting in different life patterns for different types of students.

One of the most complex and systematic analysis of undergraduates' characteristics and their relationships to activities

subsequent to graduation was carried out by Brown (1962). The subjects involved were fifty Vassar College alumnae of the classes 1929-1935. These women were classified into five general educational patterns of social activity and poor group orientation, overachievers, under-achievers with future family orientation, high achievers, and identity seekers. Brown's work demonstrated the possible different meanings and different implications of equivalent academic achievement for students. Socialization by the family, environmental demands, and social identity groups during socialization predispose students to react selectively to the educational experience. Clearly there is a need for an enlargement of the context within which students and their achievements are viewed.

From research such as Brown's, it is evident that caution must be exercised in drawing conclusions about the causes for possible differences between honors and non-honors students in the present study. Students in the College of Home Economics Honors Program experienced special privileges and a degree of acceleration (Hoffman, 1959). However, according to Quint (1961) a more significant variable might be that of the existing differences in intellectual ability.

I do not think that a direct correlation can be made between Honors work and their subsequent careers and achievements. If they make good, can we ascribe their success to their work in Honors? And if conversely, they do not - what then? . . . Naturally bright students are picked for Honors, and if they turn out to be successful it comes in part from the fact that they were good to start with . . . Who is to say they would not have done just as well without Honors work (Quint, 1961)?

The sample for the present study included honors students ranked in the top 10 per cent on the American College Testing Program scores, and the non-honors who ranked below the 10 per cent level (Kell, Kennedy, 1966).

Flesher and Pressey (Freedman, 1962) studied alumnae of an accelerated program in Ohio and the controls from a regular academic program. Ten years after graduation, the accelerates had obtained a significantly higher number of advanced degrees, and a significantly larger number were working after marriage. A slightly higher percentage of nonaccelerates were married. The two groups participated to the same degree in community activities.

Freedman (1962) notes the rarity of studies such as Pressey and Flesher's which evaluate the later effects of educational programs. Freedman reviewed some studies which report conflicting findings in this area. Plasse's doctoral dissertation found undergraduate scholarship was little related to alumni achievement. In contrast, Havemann and West (1952) reported that grades were related to financial success in all fields except business.

A study of the honors, non-honors participants of the present research, while in college, revealed that while attitudinal differences between the two groups existed in their freshman year, by their junior year these attitudinal differences no longer held (Kell, Kennedy, 1966). These findings might lead to conclusions that there would presently be no significant differences in the two groups.

Due to the complex factors involved in the effects of academic experiences on later role performance and the lack of systematic research in the area, realistic predictions of present differences between the honors and non-honors subjects of this study were not possible.

The other area of comparison between subjects of the present study was that of graduation from college, versus failure to graduate.

Many surveys compared college graduates with high school graduates, but such studies did not include the effects of the college experience as measured by changes occurring during college (Marquis, 1958). Likewise, little literature existed comparing students who graduated with students who began their college education but did not persist to graduation.

The majority of research on student graduation focused on the causative factors leading to college graduation. Birth order was one area often investigated. Bayer (1966) reported a significant overrepresentation of first born children in college and graduate school. The last born were the least likely to attend college, except where families of the same size were compared, then no significant differences between first and last born existed. Kammev (1966) advanced the hypothesis that the first born women are more traditional and more likely to choose marriage over graduation. This was seen as consistent with Rossi's thesis that the first born girl is more committed to the preservation of traditional social roles. No conclusions could be drawn regarding the effects of birth order on persistence to graduation from the above findings.

After a review of available literature on factors associated with dropping out of college, Summerskill (1962) summarized the main factors usually investigated: biological and social factors including age at matriculation, socio-economic factors, and hometown size; academic factors of secondary school preparation and scholastic aptitude; and such factors as motivation, adjustment, illness and injury, and finances. The most important of these appeared to be the academic,

motivational, and financial factors. The present study did not investigate reasons for dropping out of school, and the previous research indicates there are no clear-cut reasons for students leaving school.

Related also to the area of college graduation are studies of attrition rates. The average rate cited of students leaving college before receiving their undergraduate degree was 50 per cent (Summerskill, 1962), with some variations between schools. A recent study by Eokland (1964) highlighted errors existing in many college attrition studies. The main error was the failure of predictions related to the return and graduation of the drop-out. Leaving college did not always mean termination of the student's education. Eokland reported a Vanderbilt study which had a 49 per cent dropout rate, however seven years later more than half of these returned or were potential graduates. Eokland also reported that of those who gave marriage as a reason for dropping out, 71 per cent never graduated.

Thus, a review of the available literature revealed a lack of research or knowledge about the effects of these selected academic experiences on the later role performance of female college students. The research which does exist demonstrates the complexity of the problem and the need for further, more systematic studies.

Life Styles of Educated Women

Many magazine articles and books in recent years have focused on the subject of women's changing life patterns. The Feminine Mystique (Friedan, 1963) depicts one side of the ongoing debate, highlighting the positive aspects of the role of the working woman. Sixpence in her Shoe (McGinley, 1965) represents the other end of the continuum,

romanticizing the role of homemaker and mother. Both books were written for the general public and depict the general debate of the interplay between a woman's education, career, and/or homemaking.

Along with the popular literature, there has been research investigating the actual roles that women play, and more relevant to this research, the roles educated women play. The four areas of role clusters on which the present research focused were related to education, family, career, and community orientation. From focus on these roles, it was hoped a general picture could be obtained of the combinations of roles and resulting life styles of the subjects.

A major study of women college graduates by Ginzberg (1966) focused on the many options existing in women's lives and the general choices made within these options by educated women. The sample of Columbia University women for the study represented a wide age range and the subjects displayed "significant intelligent ability." Like the present study, Ginzberg obtained information on the types and combinations of roles played and the subjects' feelings about their present life.

The career-orientation of this sample of women from Columbia University was explored extensively by Ginzberg (1966). He analyzed the young girl in a middle class family as growing up in a household and social group where there is no single model of the adult woman. Several different kinds of models might exist within the girl's extended family. Girls often feel little pressure to concern themselves with the kind of work they would like to do when they grow up. As a result, Ginzberg felt most girls had been socialized to be more husband- than

career-oriented. He summarized the present role of work in the lives of women as follows:

The place of work in the lives of educated women can be considered to be the outcome of these three interacting constellations: ambiguous models of an alternative life style, broadened scope for self-determination, changes in life circumstances which require contingency planning.

Ginzberg did predict that because more women now work after marriage and children, there will be altered role models for the next generation. From these altered role models, young girls would have a new identification with the role of work, and in turn would become more work-oriented.

Ginzberg also explored the woman's roles in relation to her husband and family. Women were viewed as making their long range plans on a "contingency basis." Due to their lives being conditioned by a host of circumstances, women must be flexible and capable of accommodation in their life plans. Ginzberg regarded women as going through a process of "confrontation and response." The findings of Ginzberg demonstrated the interplay between the family setting and the woman's orientation to the home, education, career, and community.

A major study begun by the Mary Conover Mellon Foundation at Vassar in 1952 (Sanford, 1962) was designed to measure changes occurring in college and their persistence in later years. Personality variables of each student were measured periodically and two interviews were conducted during their four years of college. The aspect of the Vassar study mainly related to the present research was its study of alumnae with its purpose of gaining additional perspective on the persistence of student change. Two groups of alumnae were involved,

those from the classes of 1954-1956, and those graduating in 1929-1935.

In the alumnae study, Freedman (1962) found most young alumnae had made few plans for the next fifteen to twenty years of their life. Only those women with definite professional commitment had made more exact plans. Most of their plans were to resume their careers when family commitments would allow.

The alumnae who pursued further education or work were viewed as highly competent and had made many impressive accomplishments. Most were in positions of some prominence and responsibility.

Freedman noted the great flexibility of the younger alumnae in adapting to their life situations. This was especially evident in their attitudes toward "the role of educated women in our society." Here it was quite difficult to detect that any problems of this kind existed in the lives of these young educated women.

These women were quite disposed to attune their lives to those of their husbands. The husband's career and the family unit took precedence over any ambitions or aspirations they themselves may have had. And these adjustments were made with a minimum of conflict or feeling of sacrifice. Certainly the manifest conflicts of the feminist era were a pretty dead issue among the young alumnae (Freedman, 1962).

These findings appeared consistent with Ginzberg's (1966) concept of the accommodation process of married women, as discussed earlier.

The conclusions drawn from this alumnae study were positive ones showing little conflict or frustration in the lives of these women. Most of the young alumnae were getting along well and most reported at least a reasonable degree of satisfaction with their life.

The United States Department of Labor (1966) recently completed a study of 5,846 college women seven years after graduation. This study

had many similar features to the present research, including its function as a follow-up.

One area of findings reported was that of the role of work in these subjects' lives. In contrast to the national average of 35 per cent of the married women working, 51 per cent of the Department of Labor's sample were employed. Before becoming involved with family commitments, 85 per cent of the women had worked. Twenty-six per cent of the sample who were mothers worked. One fourth of the sample expressed desire for a lifetime career, and one half had some future work planned. In stating reasons for desiring employment, two-thirds of the sample gave financial reasons, while one-fifth gave "work-oriented" reasons.

In the area of education, the Department of Labor found fifteen per cent had earned Master's degrees (71 per cent of these worked), and only one per cent had earned a Ph.D. Three-fourths of the women expressed a desire for further training or education.

Eighty-one per cent of these college educated women were married, almost 60 per cent had children. The women appeared quite involved in community activities, three-fourths being involved in organizations and two-thirds in volunteer work of some type.

This survey presented a picture of college educated women who were highly work-oriented, but many were still able to perform the roles of wife and mother along with, as well as exclusive of work. These women were also highly active in community work.

A study focused only on the home economics graduate in Ohio from 1900 through 1950, similarly found the majority of the subjects

married three years after graduation (Lehman, 1953). However, the work orientation was much lower, with only a fourth of the married women employed. This sample of women was not active in the community due to efforts in establishing a family or continuing a profession. Differences in findings between the Lehman study and the Department of Labor study might be due to the time difference, or the specific sample and location of the Lehman study.

A survey done for Time magazine devoted one section to a "portrait of the ex-coed" (Havemann and West, 1952). The typical college career woman was found to be a school teacher, consistent with the findings of Lehman (1953) and the study by the Department of Labor (1966). Havemann and West (1952) found a correlation between working one's way through school and being a working wife. Working wives reported a lack of leisure time, but they still read as much as the other graduates.

In the study by Havemann and West (1952), findings were reported relating to the family orientation of their sample. Of women graduates who had children, the average family size was 1.88 children. Of those married and over forty, 40 per cent were childless. Relating family life and work orientation, it was found that those women who had a child early in marriage were highly unlikely to ever return to paid employment. Thirty-one per cent of this sample of college graduates had never married.

The above studies related to the roles which educated women play will serve as a comparative base for the findings of the present study related to the total sample characteristics. Although variations

existed in results of the reviewed literature, the general trend appeared one of diversity of orientations, some women pursuing careers and some women pursuing a more home-oriented role in life. Regardless of roles played, the literature presented a picture of most women being satisfied with their lives.

Much more research was found that related to the general characteristics of college women than that directed at comparisons within the total group. The comparative studies presented will be relevant to the present research's comparison of honors and non-honors and of the graduates and non-graduates of the sample. The area of subgroup comparisons is one which requires much further investigation.

The reviewed literature portrayed the need to study the woman as an individual within an environment, rather than as an isolated being. As implied in developmental theory (Hill and Rodgers, 1964), the woman is best viewed as, "an actor as well as a reactor" in her environment, and her development as, "dependent upon stimulation by a social milieu as well as inherent capacities." This developmental viewpoint, as described in the section on theoretical orientation (page 5), will be reflected throughout the discussion of the present research.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Subjects

The present study is a continuation of the original research project¹ of the Department of Family and Child Development described earlier. In the summer of 1966 the Department began tracing the original participants of the research project. This was the first contact with the subjects since they originally left Kansas State University. Although it was hoped that all original subjects would cooperate in the follow-up study, six did not respond in time for their questionnaire to be analyzed. The result was that 93 per cent (81) of the original subjects participated in this study. The number of participants from each freshman class is shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1
YEAR OF MATRICULATION OF SUBJECTS

Year	Frequency	Percentage
1958	23	28.4
1959	10	12.3
1960	26	32.1
1961	22	27.2
Total	81	100.0

¹Project #341, under the auspices of the Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station, originally directed by Mrs. Leone Kell.

While attending Kansas State University the participants of the research took batteries of tests. All but two of the original participants completed a Freshman Biographical Information Sheet developed by the Counseling Center at Kansas State University. From this sheet it was learned that 92 per cent of the subjects were native Kansans and more than 60 per cent of the total group came from families living in home towns of less than 10,000 population (Table 2).

TABLE 2
SIZE OF HOME TOWN OF SUBJECTS

Size of Town	Frequency	Percentage
Less than 1,000	22	25.9
1,000-2,500	17	20.0
2,500-10,000	16	18.8
10,000-25,000	12	14.1
Over 25,000	18	21.2
Total	85 ^a	100.0

^aTwo of the original 87 respondents did not complete a Freshman Biographical Information Sheet.

The education level of the parents of the subjects was relatively high: 69 per cent of the mothers had between one and six years of college education, while 68 per cent of the fathers had a college education. As entering freshmen, 82 per cent of the subjects reported their parents had "wanted them to attend college, but didn't insist."

The majority of the mothers (71 per cent) were housewives at the time the subjects were freshmen. Only 18 per cent of the mothers were

employed in a professional capacity at that time. Occupations described as "professional, managerial, executive, or semi-professional" were reported for 50 per cent of the fathers of the subjects. Another 27 per cent were engaged in farming.

The background data indicate that the majority of subjects came from rural Kansas areas and from families which placed some emphasis upon college education. Most fathers held jobs high in the occupational hierarchy. The majority of subjects had the role of homemaker as their role model.

Instrument

The questionnaire (Appendix B) for this study was developed after reading sources describing research techniques and studies done on similar populations (Goode and Hatt, 1952; Sanford, 1962; Havemann, 1952). The primary objective of the devised questionnaire was to obtain a description of the present life patterns of selected former College of Home Economics students. Information was sought on roles being played in the areas of career, family life, education, and community involvement. Due to the scattered geographic location of the subjects and the type of information desired, a structured questionnaire was utilized to obtain data for the study.

Although it was recommended (Goode and Hatt, 1952) that mailed questionnaires should take less than twenty-five minutes to complete, the devised questionnaire took approximately forty-five minutes to complete. Since all subjects were involved in earlier phases of the research project, it was hoped that they would tolerate the length of the instrument. These subjects had cooperated fully for the project

in taking tests and participating in hour-long interviews periodically during their college years. Those subjects who had completed four years in the original research project consented in their senior year to cooperate with any subsequent follow-up studies. Due to this earlier involvement of the participants in the research, the project planners felt a forty-five minute questionnaire could be successfully utilized.

A pretest group consisted of six subjects judged as having similar characteristics to the research subjects. This group consisted of four young professional women, one housewife, and one secretary. All pretestees had home economics backgrounds, five were married, and two had children. The eleven-page questionnaire contained fifty-four major items, selected and revised from an original fifty-seven items. The questionnaire contained ten questions relating to background information; thirteen questions relating to occupation experiences and plans; twenty-one questions on college experiences, including past experiences and future goals; seven questions related to present community activities and future life goals; and three sub-instruments relating to personality description (self-esteem test, adjective check list, and the F test). The adjective check list and F test were included to compare present scores with those on the tests taken during the original study. The personality description instruments were not used in the present analysis.

Collection of Data

The tracing of all original subjects was one major aspect of this study. Most addresses available for the subjects were obsolete, therefore they were traced through their parents. Parents' addresses were obtained through the subjects' permanent files. A cover letter

and a short form were sent to each parent to obtain the needed information on the subjects' present location (Appendix A). Five parents had moved and their mail was no longer forwardable. These parents were traced in some cases through the firm where the father was last employed, and in one case through the postmaster of the town where the parents originally lived. Several parents were slow to respond and follow-up letters were sent to them. After four months all of the parents had responded with the needed information on their daughter's present location. Most parents were quite cooperative and some even included personal notes to the original Honors Program coordinator² regarding their daughter's present activities.

The fifty subjects who had been dropped from the project (who had not finished college according to the project's records, or who had transferred out of the College of Home Economics) were sent a one-page information sheet to complete (Appendix A, page 70). The objective of sending this information sheet was to determine which of these subjects had actually finished their college education so that group sizes could be established for the research design.

All subjects were sent the twelve-page questionnaire in November, 1966. The questionnaire was accompanied by a cover letter (Appendix A, page) and a stamped return envelope. Two cover letters were sent: one for those who had completed the four year original study and one for those who had not completed the original study. After two weeks, there was a 61 per cent return (53 of the 87 subjects). A follow-up reminder card which was signed by the Honors Program coordinator was

²Dr. Ruth Hoeflin, Associate Dean of Home Economics, Kansas State University.

was sent at that time. In January another copy of the questionnaire and a letter (Appendix A, page 73) were sent to the 23 per cent who had not yet responded. In February a second, handwritten note from the Honors Program coordinator was sent to the 15 per cent not yet responding. This resulted in a final response of 93 per cent of the original 87 participants, or a total of eighty-one subjects. These eighty-one subjects make up the total group analyzed for the present study.

Operational Definitions

In this research, the definition of the concept, "life style," is consistent with Ginzberg's (1966) definition: ". . . that orientation to self, others, and society that each individual develops, that is, his value orientation." This value orientation is reflected in the roles an individual plays. At the time of the follow-up study, most of the subjects had begun the establishment phase of their family life cycle. Thus, the life styles described will be only applicable to the stage in the family life cycle that the subjects were in at the time of the research. To ascertain the life styles of the subjects of the present study, the role clusters of the subjects at their young adult stage were studied. The concept of "role cluster" is employed in the manner that Hill and Rodgers (1964) defined it: ". . . the set of roles being played by the incumbent of a position at any one point in time."

The present role clusters of the subjects were analyzed by use of a structured questionnaire. The general areas covered by this questionnaire were not regarded as exhaustive of all roles played by

the subjects at this time in their lives. The questionnaire focused on the roles played in each of the enumerated following areas of the subjects' lives:

- 1) Career orientation: number of jobs held, present work status, satisfaction with work experience, rationale for working, and future work plans.
- 2) Educational orientation: involvement in earlier college experiences, work towards advanced degrees, and future educational goals.
- 3) Family orientation: future work plans, number of children planned, satisfaction with life's picture, and goals for future.
- 4) Community orientation: organization membership and involvement in volunteer work.

The interdependence of the family setting and the roles played by women has been recognized by many, including Glick (1955) and Ginzberg (1966). Therefore, a description of the family setting of the subjects is included in this study. This information should provide a more complete picture of the life styles of the subjects.

Analysis of Data

Responses to the questionnaires were coded numerically and recorded on flow sheets. The Computer Center of the Department of Mathematics at Kansas State University computed frequencies and percentages for each variable for the total group and for the selected subgroups. The chi square test was used where appropriate for group comparisons. Due to the nature of the study, a level of significance for acceptance or rejection was not established.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The stated objectives of this research were to describe the total group of subjects, to descriptively compare honors and non-honors subjects, and to compare college graduate and non-graduate subjects. The subgroups of honors and non-honors, graduate and non-graduate were selected for comparison due to their congruence with the larger research project and their measurement of significant aspects of the subjects' academic experiences (Table 3).

TABLE 3
DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECTS BY HONORS AND GRADUATION STATUS

	Honors	Non-honors	Total
Graduates	29	38	67
Non-graduates	6	8	14
Total	35	46	81

Description of Total Group

Family Setting Data. A limited rationale was constructed for the family setting data. These findings are presented to provide a more complete picture of the life styles of the subjects.

The majority of subjects were living in urban areas when the present data were gathered. A total of 66 per cent were residing in

communities with a population of 15,000 or over, with 39 per cent of the total group residing in cities with a population of over 100,000 (Table 4).

TABLE 4
SIZE OF COMMUNITIES WHERE SUBJECTS RESIDE

Population	Frequency	Percentage
Farm	7	8.9
Rural, Non-farm	6	7.6
Under 5,000	4	5.1
5,000-15,000	9	11.4
15,000-50,000	16	20.2
50,000-100,000	5	6.3
Over 100,000	32	40.5
Total	79 ^a	100.0

^aTwo of the subjects were in the Air Force and reported no community size.

Analysis of the data related to marital status revealed that 77 per cent (63) of the subjects were married (Table 5, page 29). The average length of marriage was 3.2 years. Only three of the subjects had been divorced.

Less than half (48 per cent) of the married subjects had children, with the average of 1.5 children reported for those subjects who had started families. The mean age of the oldest child was 2.5 years old.

TABLE 5

MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS

Marital Status	Frequency	Percentage
Single or engaged	15	18.5
Married	63	77.8
Divorced	1	1.2
Divorced and remarried	2	2.5
Total	81	100.0

Of those subjects married, the majority married men with a Bachelor's degree or higher (84 per cent), with nine husbands (13.6 per cent) working toward or presently holding, a doctorate degree. Of those who reported incomes, 40 per cent were below \$6,500 a year. Twenty-eight per cent had reached salaries of \$8,500 or above (Table 6).

TABLE 6

INCOME LEVEL OF HUSBANDS OF SUBJECTS

Income Level	Frequency	Percentage
Under \$4,499	13	20.6
4,500 - 6,499	12	19.0
6,500 - 8,499	20	31.8
8,500 - 10,499	10	15.9
10,500 - 12,499	5	7.9
Over 12,500	3	4.8
Total	63 ^a	100.0

^aTwo of the sixty-five married respondents did not report the husband's income.

Twenty-five of the husbands (37.9 per cent) were in the upper level of the occupational hierarchy, which includes professions as doctors, lawyers, and engineers. Another twenty husbands (25 per cent) were in occupations on a level similar to high school teaching.

Career Orientation. The degree of career orientation of the subjects was measured by their response to a question concerning when in their life cycle they planned to work. Answers ranged from planning to work at no time to planning to work at all times during their lives. The more years of work the subjects planned, the more career-oriented they were judged to be. In a few cases the subjects checked several categories (Table 7). The distribution of answers presented in this thesis represent the longest period of work which each subject selected.

TABLE 7
CAREER ORIENTATION OF SUBJECTS AS MEASURED BY TIMES
IN LIFE CYCLE WHEN SUBJECTS EXPECT TO WORK

Times in Life Cycle	Frequency	Percentage
At no time	6	7.4
After marriage, before children	17	21.0
After children are 18 years	16	19.8
After children are between 5 and 12 years	25	30.8
At all times	17	21.0
Total	81	100.0

Approximately one-half (51.8 per cent) of the subjects were

judged highly work-oriented, planning to work at all times, or at all times except when their children were young. The three subjects who were divorced, or divorced and remarried were judged highly career-oriented, planning to work at all times in their lives. Those subjects who were married displayed trends of career-orientation consistent with the over-all trends of the group. The subjects with children displayed the same degree of career-orientation as those without children.

Of the fifty (62 per cent) subjects presently employed, seven held positions regarded as being in an upper level of the occupational hierarchy. All of these seven subjects planned on working at some time in the future, with five of them classified as highly career-oriented. The other occupational levels reflected the over-all trend with approximately one-half in each level being highly career-oriented. Forty-two per cent (44) of the subjects employed were in the middle level of occupations. These were mainly teachers (22), dieticians, and graduate students.

Over one-half (56 per cent) of the subjects who worked reported incomes between \$4,500 and \$6,500 (Table 8). The salaries of the seven subjects who worked part time were not reported in Table 8. Their incomes ranged from less than \$3,500 to \$7,500.

Subjects had held, on the average, two jobs since leaving Kansas State University, with the highest number reported as five jobs held. Of the sixty-seven married subjects, sixty (89 per cent) had worked at some time since being married. Fourteen of the thirty-three (42 per cent) mothers had worked since having children. Ten of the fourteen mothers who had worked were ranked as highly career-oriented.

TABLE 8

INCOME LEVEL OF SUBJECTS PRESENTLY EMPLOYED

Income Level	Frequency	Percentage
Under \$3,499	4	9
3,500 - 4,499	5	12
4,500 - 5,499	14	32
5,500 - 6,499	11	26
6,500 - 7,499	7	16
7,500 - 8,499	0	0
8,500 - 10,499	2	5
Total	43	100

Of the subjects who had worked, all but ten (13 per cent) expressed satisfaction with their work experience. There was no significant relationship between the degree of career orientation and satisfaction with work experiences.

The type of work planned in the future appeared significantly related to the career orientation of the subject. Responses to the question concerning the type of work desired in the future were divided into two groups, those who desired to stay at their present level of work (49), and those who desired to raise their occupational level (20). Seventeen (85 per cent) of those who desired to raise their level of employment were classified as highly career-oriented (Table 9).

TABLE 9

JOB ASPIRATIONS OF SUBJECTS PLANNING TO WORK IN FUTURE

Level of Career Orientation	Same Job or Same Level of Job	Raise Level from Present Job	Total
Work at no time	0	0	0
After marriage, before children	12	1	13
Work after children are 18 years	13	2	15
Work after children are 5 to 12 years	13	12	25
Work at all times	11	5	16
Total	49	20	69
	$\chi^2 = 51.609$ $p = > .001$		

The reason the subjects desired to work in the future also appeared related to the career orientation of the subjects. Reasons for working were classified as financial, self-satisfaction, both of these, or "other" reasons. Only twelve of the seventy-one subjects answering this question gave financial reasons for planning to work. Of those twelve, only three were highly career-oriented. Distribution of the rationales for working within the career-orientation continuum is presented in Table 10.

TABLE 10

RATIONALE GIVEN FOR FUTURE WORK PLANS OF SUBJECTS

Career Orientation Level	Rationale Given				Total
	Finan- cial	Self-satis- faction	Financial and Self- satisfac- tion	Other	
Work after marriage before children	4	4	7	0	15
Work after children are 18 years	5	5	4	1	15
Work after children are 5 to 12 years	3	5	17	0	25
Work at all times	0	3	13	0	16
Total	12	17	41	1	71 ^a

^aSix of the subjects planned to work at no time. Four other subjects chose not to answer the question on their rationale for working.

Education Orientation. The degree of education orientation of the subjects was judged by their present educational status and their future plans for educational advancement. The more years of schooling the subjects had completed and the higher the desire to pursue further education, the greater the education orientation was judged to be.

As shown in Table 2, sixty-seven of the subjects had persisted to graduation, with only fourteen (17 per cent) of the subjects classified as non-graduates, or drop-outs from college. Several subjects had pursued advanced degrees, seven reported completing work on Master's degrees, nine reported present work towards Master's degrees, and one reported work towards a doctoral degree.

A total of twenty-nine subjects reported attending colleges

other than Kansas State University to complete Bachelor's or advanced degrees. Of those twenty-nine, only thirteen had continued to major in the area of home economics. When asked to express their degree of satisfaction with their undergraduate major, only 15 per cent expressed dissatisfaction (Table 11).

TABLE 11
DEGREE OF SATISFACTION WITH UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR,
AS EXPRESSED BY SUBJECTS

Degree of Satisfaction	Frequency	Percentage
Very satisfied	28	46.9
Reasonably satisfied	25	30.9
Indifferent	2	2.5
Somewhat dissatisfied	9	11.1
Very dissatisfied	4	4.9
Did not answer	3	3.7
Total	81	100.0

Many of the subjects expressed a desire to return to school. In planning for the future, 80 per cent of the subjects reported plans for further education. When asked when in their life cycle they planned to return to school, 40 per cent expressed plans for education within the next five years. Only 24 per cent (4) of the subjects who planned no further education were classified as highly career-oriented (Table 12).

TABLE 12

PLANS FOR FURTHER EDUCATION BY SUBJECTS WITH
VARYING DEGREES OF CAREER ORIENTATION

Career Orientation	Plans for Further Education					Al-ways	Total
	None	Within 5 yrs.	Within 10 yrs.	Within 20 yrs.	Within 30 yrs.		
Work at no time	3	0	2	0	0	1	6
After marriage, before children	6	8	0	0	0	3	17
After children are 18 years	4	5	2	3	0	2	16
After children 5 to 12 years	2	12	4	2	2	3	25
Work at all times	2	8	1	0	0	6	17
Total	17	33	9	5	2	15	81

In examining the level of education the subjects aspired to, thirty-seven (46 per cent) expressed a desire to earn an advanced degree. Sixty-five per cent of the subjects desiring an advanced degree were classified as highly work-oriented. Of the sixty-five subjects who planned some further education, with the goal of a degree or not, twenty-six (40 per cent) planned to continue studying in the area of home economics.

Family Orientation. The degree of family orientation was judged by the question related to periods in their life cycle when the subjects planned paid employment. This same question was utilized to determine career orientation of the subjects. However, the subjects at the other end of the continuum of career orientation, planning work

only when no children were in the home, or not planning to engage in paid employment at any time, were judged as family-oriented.

Thirty-nine of the subjects (48 per cent) were classified as highly family-oriented (Table 7). Of the twenty-eight subjects who planned to work at some time and were classified as family-oriented, only three expressed a desire to raise their occupational level in the future (Table 9). A second relationship between education orientation and career orientation is shown in Table 12. Of those subjects who planned no further education, thirteen (76 per cent) were classified as highly family-oriented. However, two-thirds (66.6 per cent) of the highly family-oriented still planned further education.

Related to family orientation is the number of children planned by the subjects. The range of numbers was from zero to six, with the mode number planned being 3.3 children. There was no significant difference in number of children planned between the family and career-oriented groups, only a trend existed for the family-oriented subjects to plan more children than the career-oriented.

Regardless of classification as career- or family-oriented, 92 per cent (75) of the subjects expressed satisfaction with their "prospective total life picture." In expressing goals for their lives within the next twenty years, the majority of subjects (70 per cent) listed primary goals that related to family and husbands, that is, family-oriented goals.

Community Orientation. Community orientation was measured by the subjects present involvement in community activities only. No attempt was made to measure their commitment to community involvement

in futuro years. When the subjects were asked if they were presently involved in any volunteer work, only nineteen (23 per cent) of the eighty-one subjects reported they were.

In the general area of organization participation, the average number of organizations to which the subjects belonged was 2.6, with a range from zero to six. Only four subjects reported belonging to no organization (Table 13).

TABLE 13
DISTRIBUTION OF NUMBER OF ORGANIZATIONS TO
WHICH SUBJECTS BELONGED

Number of Organizations	Frequency	Percentage
0	4	4.9
1	14	17.3
2	22	27.2
3	22	27.2
4	9	11.1
5	7	8.6
6	3	3.7
Total	81	100.0

Each subject was also assigned a total score for participation in organizations. This score ranged from one to four for each organization depending on the rate of attendance and offices held by the subject. The average "score" for this degree of participation in organizations was six, with a range from zero to eighteen. Many subjects commented that they had lived in their community only a short time and

had not had time to become involved in the community.

Long-term Effects of Academic Experiences - Comparison of Honors and Non-honors Subjects

Descriptive comparisons were made between the honors and non-honors subjects on selected variables from each of the areas of career, education, family, and community orientation. Comparisons were not made on every variable reported in the overall description of the group. The purpose of the descriptive comparisons was to attempt to discover existing differences in the present life style of women who had been honors students and women who had been non-honors students in the College of Home Economics at Kansas State University.

Family setting. The first area examined in this descriptive comparison was that of the family setting of the two groups. No significant difference was found in the size of the communities where the two groups of subjects resided. The same percentage of both groups (66 per cent) resided in towns with populations over 15,000.

There was no significant difference in marital status between the honors and non-honors groups (Table 14). A trend existed for more of the non-honors subjects (23 per cent) to be single or engaged than the honors subjects (11 per cent). Of those subjects married, there appeared to be no significant difference in the number of years they had been married, or the number of children each group had. Also, there was no difference in the number of subjects within each of the groups who were mothers, with 40 per cent of the honors subjects having children, and 39 per cent of the non-honors subjects having children.

TABLE 14

COMPARISON OF MARITAL STATUS OF HONORS AND NON-HONORS SUBJECTS

Student Status	Single	Engaged	Married	Divorced	Divorced and Remarried	Total
Honors	3	1	29	1	1	35
Non-honors	9	2	34	0	1	46
Total	12	3	63	1	2	81

An analysis by the chi square test revealed no significant differences in the levels of husbands' occupations between the two groups. However, further examination of the data revealed that seven (23 per cent) of the honors subjects' husbands were ranked in the top two levels of the occupational hierarchy, while eighteen (50 per cent) of the non-honors subjects' husbands ranked in the top two levels. There was no significant difference in the husbands' present educational levels between the two groups, however seven husbands of honors subjects were still classified as students. There was a trend for the non-honors subjects' husbands to make more money than the honors subjects' husbands (Table 15). A further analysis of the nine husbands of honors subjects who earned less than \$3,500 revealed that seven were students, one a farmer, and one was in the Army.

TABLE 16

ANNUAL INCOME OF THE HUSBANDS OF HONORS AND NON-HONORS SUBJECTS

Income Level	Honors	Non-honors	Total
Under \$3,499	9	1	10
3,500 - 4,499	1	2	3
4,500 - 5,499	3	2	5
5,500 - 6,499	4	3	7
6,500 - 7,499	5	8	13
7,500 - 8,499	3	4	7
8,500 - 10,499	2	8	10
10,500 - 12,499	2	3	5
Total	30	33	63 ^a

$\chi^2 = 11.929$ $p = > .11$

^aThree of the married subjects did not report husband's income.

Career orientation. Assessment of the career orientation between the honors and non-honors group was accomplished by analysis of the times in their life that each subject planned paid employment. A comparison of the honors and non-honors subjects within this continuum revealed a trend for the women who had been honors students to be more highly career-oriented than the non-honors subjects (Table 16).

No significant difference existed in the number of subjects presently employed from both groups, with 66 per cent of the honors subjects and 69 per cent of the non-honors subjects employed. Little difference existed between the subjects within the two groups in the level of jobs held within the occupational hierarchy. Consequently, the income levels of the two groups were similar to the total distri-

bution (see page 32). No differences existed in the number of jobs held by the subjects since they left Kansas State University, or in the degree of satisfaction with work experiences.

TABLE 16
COMPARISON OF CAREER ORIENTATION OF HONORS
AND NON-HONORS SUBJECTS

Career Orientation	Honors	Non-honors	Total
Work, at no time	2	4	6
After marriage before children	3	14	17
After children are 18 years	6	10	16
After children are 5 to 12 years	16	9	25
At all times	8	9	17
Total	35	46	81
	$\chi^2 = 9.484$	$p = >.05$	

Trends existed for a higher percentage of honors subjects to continue working after they were married and after they had children. No difference existed between the honors and non-honors group in the percentage of subjects who planned to work at some time in the future, but a difference existed in the aspirations for types of future jobs. More honors than non-honors subjects desired to raise the level of their future occupations (Table 17). No difference existed in the reasons given by the two groups of subjects for desiring to work in the future.

TABLE 17

JOB ASPIRATIONS OF HONORS AND NON-HONORS SUBJECTS

Job Aspiration	Honors	Non-honors	Total
Remain at same job or level of job	18	31	49
Raise level of job	13	7	20
Total	31	38	69

Education orientation. An analysis of the data revealed no differences in the percentage of subjects who graduated from college within the honors and non-honors groups, as shown in Table 2 (page 21).

Experiences while the subjects were students in college were regarded as potential indicators of differences in academic experiences between the two groups. The number of extracurricular activities that subjects from each group engaged in as freshmen in college was analyzed. No significant difference existed between the two groups, with a mean of approximately three activities reported for both the honors and non-honors subjects. A trend existed for honors students to report more close contact with faculty members outside the classroom as freshmen in college (Table 18).

TABLE 18

NUMBER OF CONTACTS WITH FACULTY MEMBERS AS REPORTED
BY HONORS AND NON-HONORS SUBJECTS FOR THEIR
FRESHMAN YEAR OF COLLEGE

Number of Contacts	Honors	Non-honors	Total
0	18	35	53
1	8	4	12
2	6	4	10
3	3	2	5
4	0	1	1
Total	35	46	81
	$\chi^2 = 7.022$	$p = > .15$	

The number of times the two groups of subjects changed their college major was explored. No significant difference in the average number of changes existed between the two groups, with an average of less than one change per subject for each group. A trend existed for more of the non-honors subjects who changed majors to transfer out of the College of Home Economics ($p = > .07$), while more honors subjects tended to change majors within the College (Table 19).

TABLE 19

CHANGES IN MAJORS TO OUTSIDE THE COLLEGE OF HOME ECONOMICS
BY HONORS AND NON-HONORS SUBJECTS

Area of Major Change	Honors	Non-honors	Total
Within College of Home Economics	16	11	27
Outside College of Home Economics	6	13	19
Total	22	24	46
	$\chi^2 = 3.42$	$p = > .07$	

A total of thirty-eight subjects reported returning to college after originally leaving Kansas State University. Of this group of college returnees, significantly more ($p = > .05$) of the honors subjects returned to Kansas State University for their work than the non-honors subjects (Table 20).

TABLE 20
NUMBER OF HONORS AND NON-HONORS SUBJECTS RETURNING
TO KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY FOR
FURTHER ACADEMIC STUDIES

University Returned to for Studies	Honors	Non-honors	Total
Kansas State University	7	2	9
University other than Kansas State	11	18	29
Total	18	20	38
	$X^2 = 4.37$	$p = > .04$	

A trend also existed for more honors subjects who returned to school to remain in the area of study of home economics ($p = > .10$), while the non-honors subjects tended to change their major to an area other than home economics.

Five of the seven subjects who had received Master's degrees when they returned to school were honor students. A comparison revealed that 54 per cent of the honors and 39 per cent of the non-honors subjects had plans to earn advanced degrees in the future.

Family orientation. Table 16 (page 42) shows that 61 per cent of the non-honors and 31 per cent of the honors subjects were judged as family oriented ($p = > .05$). No difference existed between the two

groups in the average total number of children planned for their families.

Statements of goals for the next twenty years revealed little difference between the percentage of honors and non-honors subjects whose primary goals centered around their home and family (68 per cent of honors and 72 per cent of non-honors). Five of the honors subjects rated "personal development" types of goals as primary while none of the non-honors listed such goals (Table 21).

TABLE 21
PRIMARY FUTURE GOALS LISTED BY HONORS AND NON-HONORS SUBJECTS

Future Goals	Honors	Non-honors	Total
Educational and vocational goals	5	11	16
Domestic goals	24	33	57
Personal development goals	5	0	5
"Status" goals	1	1	2
Miscellaneous goals	0	1	1
Total	35	46	81

A tendency existed for the non-honors subjects to express more complete satisfaction with their prospective total life picture than the honors subjects (Table 22).

TABLE 22

DEGREE OF SATISFACTION WITH PROSPECTIVE TOTAL LIFE,
EXPRESSED BY HONORS AND NON-HONORS SUBJECTS

Degree of Satisfaction	Honors	Non-honors	Total
Very satisfied	9	21	30
Mostly satisfied	21	24	45
Indifferent	0	0	0
Partially dissatisfied	5	1	6
Very dissatisfied	0	0	0
Total	35	46	81

Community orientation. No significant differences existed in the number of organizations belonged to by honors and non-honors subjects. Only a trend existed for more non-honors (28 per cent) than honors (17 per cent) subjects to participate in volunteer activities.

Long-term Effects of Academic Experiences - Comparison of
College Graduate and Non-graduate Subjects

Descriptive comparisons of the group of graduate and non-graduate subjects were made on the same selected variables as the comparison of honors and non-honors subjects. A total of sixty-seven subjects were classified as graduates, six of these had dropped out of school, but had returned to college to receive their degree. The remaining fourteen subjects were classified as non-graduates, or drop-outs.

Family setting. No difference was found in the size of the communities where the two groups resided. The marital status of the

two groups differed slightly, with 21 per cent of the college graduates single or engaged and only 7 per cent of the drop-outs in this category. The married college graduates reported a mean of 2.7 years of marriage, while the non-graduates reported a mean of 4.5 years of marriage. The average number of children for college graduate families was 1.3, while the average number of children for non-graduate families was 2.1.

Although there was no difference in the percentage of husbands from both groups who had received Master's degrees, five of the husbands of college graduate subjects had received doctoral degrees, while none of the husbands of non-graduate subjects had. Consequently, five of the husbands of the college graduates ranked in the top level of the occupational hierarchy, while none of the husbands of the non-graduates ranked there. However, proportionately more of the husbands of non-graduates ranked in the second level of the occupational hierarchy. There appeared to be no difference in the income levels of the husbands of the two groups.

Career orientation. Fifty-three per cent of the college graduate subjects were judged to be highly career-oriented, in comparison with 43 per cent of the non-graduates (Table 23).

TABLE 23

COMPARISON OF CAREER ORIENTATION OF COLLEGE GRADUATE
AND NON-GRADUATE SUBJECTS

Career Orientation	Graduates	Non-graduates	Total
Work at no time	3	3	6
Work after marriage before children	15	2	17
Work after children are 18 years	13	3	16
Work after children are 5 to 12 years	22	3	25
Work at all times	14	3	17
Total	67	14	81

A slightly higher percentage of the college graduate subjects (64 per cent) than the drop-outs (50 per cent) were presently employed. A definite difference in occupation levels existed, with none of the drop-outs ranking in the top three levels, while 62 per cent of the employed college graduate subjects ranked in these levels. Consequently, a difference existed in the income levels of the two groups (Table 24). All seven of the subjects who worked part-time were college graduates; their incomes are not reported in Table 24.

TABLE 24

REPORTED INCOME LEVELS OF COLLEGE GRADUATE AND
NON-GRADUATE SUBJECTS

Income Level	Graduates	Non-graduates	Total
Under \$3,499	3	1	4
3,500 - 4,499	0	5	5
4,500 - 5,499	14	0	14
5,500 - 6,499	11	0	11
6,500 - 7,499	6	1	7
7,500 - 8,499	0	0	0
8,500 - 10,499	2	0	2
Total	36	7	43

The college drop-outs had held an average of 2.5 jobs, while the college graduates had held an average of 1.3 jobs since they left Kansas State University. A higher percentage of college graduates (94 per cent) than non-graduates (69 per cent) reported continuing to work after they were married. However, a higher percentage of the non-graduates (56 per cent) than the college graduates (33 per cent) reported continuing to work after they had children.

A higher percentage of the college graduates (94 per cent) planned to work at some time in the future than did the non-graduates (71 per cent). No difference existed in the aspirations of the subjects within the two groups to raise their level of employment or in the reasons given for desiring to work in the future.

Education orientation. While enrolled as freshmen in college, the college graduate subjects reported involvement in an average of 3.2 extracurricular activities, while the non-graduate subjects reported an average of 2.0 activities. No difference existed in the number of close contacts with faculty members each group reported.

No difference existed in the average number of times each group reported changing their college major, or in the area the major was changed to. Fifty-two per cent of the college graduates and 14 per cent of the non-graduates reported returning to college after originally leaving Kansas State University. One-fourth of the college graduates and none of the non-graduates continued their education at Kansas State University.

Sixty-four per cent of the non-graduate subjects and 83 per cent of the college graduates planned to return to school some time in the future, with 50 per cent of the college graduates and 21 per cent of the non-graduates desiring to earn an advanced degree.

Family orientation. Forty-seven per cent of the college graduates and 57 per cent of the non-graduates were judged to be highly family-oriented (Table 22). No differences existed in the average number of children planned by the two groups. No differences between the two groups existed in their list of primary goals for the next twenty years, nor in their degree of satisfaction with their total life picture.

Community orientation. No differences existed in the community orientation of the college graduates and non-graduate subjects. Both groups participated to approximately the same degree in community organizations and volunteer work.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The description of the total group of subjects revealed characteristics that were consistent with findings from studies of similar populations (U. S. Department of Labor, 1966). One trend that was evident, but also consistent with the national trend, was the shift of residence from rural to urban locations. The home towns of the majority of the subjects were small, while their present residence tended to be in more highly populated areas.

A relatively large proportion of the total group of subjects (one-half) were classified as career-oriented. Although it is difficult to make comparisons with similar studies, because of the different terminologies employed to designate degrees of career orientation, the subjects of this study appear to be somewhat more career-oriented than subjects of similar studies (U. S. Department of Labor, 1966). This is evidenced not only in future work plans of the subjects, but also in the percentage presently employed and the relatively high percentage of subjects classified as "working mothers." The high career orientation of all subjects who had been divorced was noteworthy, even though conclusions could not be drawn due to the small number represented. Although career orientation might be expected to be higher among the single than married subjects, this was not true for these subjects.

The highly career-oriented subjects displayed significantly

more ambition to raise the level of their occupation. This degree of aspiration perhaps demonstrates the career-oriented subjects interest and involvement in their employment. The reasons given for desiring to work in the future revealed a small proportion of the group with a monetary interest only in employment. Of those who did give financial reasons only for desiring to work, the majority (75 per cent) were classified as family-oriented. This suggests that most career-oriented subjects had a somewhat different motivation for desiring employment than the family-oriented subjects. A possible relationship between career orientation and education aspirations seemed to exist since more of the career-oriented subjects desired further education and advanced degrees.

The small degree of community orientation, especially the lack of volunteer work by the subjects might be expected to change in the future. Almost all subjects reported membership in some community organization, however the average number belonged to was somewhat low. Many of the subjects are in the establishment phase of their life cycle, and many are highly mobile at this time in their life. Community orientation might increase as the subjects become less mobile and settle in a community.

A comparison of subjects classified as college graduates and non-graduates was done with the hope of assessing the possible effects of college graduation on the life styles of women. A higher proportion (83 per cent) of the subjects had graduated from college than the usual 50 per cent attrition rate cited (Summerskill, 1962). However, some of the college graduates had dropped out of school and returned later, and

some had transferred universities. Thus the "original" attrition rate of the group might have been close to the 50 per cent level.

Many of the differences in family settings between these two groups might be directly related to the fact that those who had continued in school to graduate had not had as long a time to establish a family as those who dropped out of college. Therefore, a higher proportion of the college graduates were single. Those college graduates who were married had been married a shorter time and had fewer children than the non-graduate subjects. More of the husbands of the college graduates ranked high in the occupational hierarchy, but these findings were not conclusive.

The higher levels of occupations and incomes of the college graduates are probably due to their higher level of education. Only a slight difference in career and family orientation was evident between the two groups, with more college graduates judged as career-oriented. Although a higher proportion of college graduates reported continuing to work after they were married, more non-graduates reported continuing to work after they had children. One possible reason for this might be a greater financial motivation for working on the part of the non-graduate at this time in her life.

The subjects who had graduated from college recalled involvement in somewhat more extracurricular activities as freshmen than those subjects who had dropped out of college. Perhaps the college graduates were more adjusted to or involved in college life as freshmen than the non-graduates. However, the college graduates might have had a better recall ability on this topic than the non-graduates for a number of

reasons.

A slightly higher proportion of college graduates desired to return to school and to earn advanced degrees. This, along with the fact that they had persisted to graduation illustrates their relatively higher degree of education orientation than that of the non-graduates.

Conclusions cannot legitimately be drawn from the findings of the comparison of college graduates and non-graduates due to the large difference in size of the two groups. However some differences were apparent in the family settings of the two groups and in the degree of education orientation of the two groups.

The other area of comparison of subjects was between those classified as honors students and non-honors students while enrolled in college. This comparison was done to ascertain the possible effects of participation in the College of Home Economics Honors Program on the subjects' life styles. Some differences in the life styles of the two groups were apparent from the comparisons.

The family settings of the two groups differed very little. A larger proportion of the non-honors subjects were classified as single. The reasons for this are difficult to ascertain. It seems more reasonable to expect a higher proportion of single honors subjects due to their greater degree of career orientation. Another interesting difference in the family settings was the greater proportion of husbands of non-honors subjects who ranked high in the occupational and income levels. Most of the husbands of honors subjects who ranked in the lowest income level were also classified as graduate students. If the low income level of some of the husbands of honors subjects is due

to their status as students, the educational, occupational, and income levels of these husbands should increase in the next five years. No data on the ages of the spouses was obtained, so this variable could not be analyzed. However, it appears likely that husbands of non-honors subjects might be somewhat older since they tend to be more settled in their life-time occupation.

One of the most significant differences was the larger percentage of honors subjects than non-honors who were ranked as highly career-oriented. Although few other differences between the two groups appeared in the realm of employment, more honors subjects did report continuing to work both after they were married and after they had children. Also, more of the honors subjects aspired to raise the level of their occupation, rather than continue at the same, or a similar job.

The honors subjects were also more highly education-oriented than the non-honors subjects. This might be expected since a possible relationship between career and education orientation was revealed from the total group of subjects. A higher percentage of honors subjects planned to earn advanced degrees in the future, and more of the subjects who had already earned Master's degrees were honors subjects. The proposition that the honors subjects are more education-oriented than the non-honors was nullified somewhat by the fact that the same percentage from both groups of subjects had received their Bachelor's degrees.

Besides a greater degree of career and perhaps education orientation, another possible effect of involvement in the Honors Program was revealed in the higher proportion of honors subjects who changed majors within the College of Home Economics, rather than transferring to another

college, as more of the non-honors subjects did. This was further evident in the group of subjects who dropped out and later returned to school. From that group, more of the honors subjects returned to study in the area of home economics, and significantly more of these honors subjects returned to study at Kansas State University. These findings suggest that involvement in the Honors Program results in a higher identification with, and/or commitment to the area of home economics and Kansas State University.

The trend for freshmen honors subjects to have more close relationships with faculty members may be one factor in the greater identification with home economics which the honors subjects apparently had. The practice of the Honors Program to provide small seminars for their students with top faculty members, and the opportunities provided for informal gatherings with some of the faculty, would probably result in the honors students developing even more close relationships with the faculty as they progressed through college. Since all of the home economics faculty closely involved with the Honors Program were women, this might have provided significant role models of highly career-oriented women for the honors subjects. This factor might contribute to the greater proportion of honors subjects who developed into career-oriented women.

Naturally, the more basic possible difference of intellectual ability between the honors and non-honors subjects must not be ignored. This factor could contribute to any or all of the differences between the honors and non-honors subjects.

Thus, one might conclude that the honors subjects were more

ambitious to achieve occupational and educational merit than their non-honors counterparts. However, only standardized tests could verify this potential difference. One other difference worth noting is the listing of primary future goals which each subject attempted. Only honors subjects (and then only five) emphasized "personal development" types of goals such as "better understanding of myself." This potential area of difference might be related to a difference noted in the two groups as freshmen (Kell, Kennedy, 1966). Then, "Honors girls placed considerable more value on the uniquely personal aspects of human experience than did non-honors girls"; and the honors freshmen also had had more "cultural exposure" in their homes than the non-honors. Thus, at least some of the honors subjects might be more sensitized to the more "human aspects" of life. This characteristic might be a result of training or emphasis they received from their parents.

An additional difference revealed between the two groups was the tendency of the non-honors subjects to express a more complete satisfaction with their "prospective total life picture." This finding might be related to the higher aspirations which the honors subjects expressed. These greater ambitions might leave some less satisfied with what they feel is a realistic picture of their future.

The differences revealed between the honors and non-honors subjects are probably a result of a complex combination of factors. The differing life styles of the groups may be a culmination of characteristics and background factors originating in their early home life. The basic difference in scholastic aptitude of the two groups might

contribute to the differences. The involvement in the College of Home Economics Honors Program and the experiences inherent in it might contribute to the differences discussed.

Limitations. The large variation of group size between the college graduates and non-graduates limited the comparison of these two groups and the conclusions that could be drawn. The measure of family orientation was not based on all facets of the respondents' attitudes toward their families and thus was somewhat tenuous.

More extensive analysis of the data was needed. A further exploration of characteristics of specific groups, such as profiles of the married and single subjects, or profiles of those subjects who were classified as both honors subjects and college graduates would have added much depth and meaning to the findings. Further psychological tests and repetition of tests the subjects took while in college, along with interviews would also have complimented this study.

Recommendations. The value judgment of whether those subjects classified as honors are constructing life styles deemed better than the life styles of the non-honors subjects is difficult to make. Perhaps a more basic question concerns the "goodness" of a career-oriented versus a family-oriented woman (if these two are opposites). Arguments exist in favor of both. A judgment in this area appears necessary however if home economic educators desire to plan curriculums and college programs. In such planning, goals, or desirable end products must be defined.

If the educators' goal is highly educated, career-oriented

women, this can possibly be accomplished by providing close faculty relationships and role models of such types of women for the students. This might be extended to all students, not just honors students.

Perhaps a larger, more meaningful goal of home economics educators and Honors Program planners should be a flexible, mature student who has some understanding of herself and the world around her, and moreover, values this self-insight. If the educators value a "self-development" type of goal for their students, methods could be explored for providing this. One possibility is the formation of small groups of students within the college where the participants would be free to explore and further understand themselves. These groups would provide an opportunity for the students to discuss and contemplate their future roles and desired life styles in a realistic manner.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

Much attention has been directed toward the changing life styles of contemporary educated women. However, little research has explored factors which influence the roles that educated women play. The purpose of this thesis was to describe the current roles being played by women who participated in the Honors Research Project. Comparisons of life styles were also planned between honors and non-honors subjects and college graduate and non-graduate subjects. These comparisons were planned in hopes of ascertaining the long-term effects of these selected academic experiences.

Concepts from the developmental framework were derived for use in the research, laying a groundwork for understanding the developing life styles of the subjects of the study. In the general area of roles that educated women play, several recent studies were reviewed. The general trend from these studies appeared to be one of a diversity of orientations, some women pursuing careers and some women pursuing a more family-oriented role in life. The few studies done in the area of the effects of academic experiences on women's life styles demonstrated the caution that must be exercised in drawing conclusions about the causes of differences of life styles of former college students. The reviewed literature portrayed the need to study the woman as an individual within an environment rather than as an isolated being.

The results of the research suggested that the subjects were developing a variety of life styles. Within this diversity however, some trends were evident. A relatively large proportion of the subjects had plans to pursue careers and further education. Along with this trend though, much interest in their family life was revealed through the subjects' listing of primary goals for the next twenty years.

Comparisons of honors and non-honors subjects suggested that many honors subjects may display more ambition and desire for achievement in employment and education. Another area of difference suggested that the honors subjects displayed a greater identification with the area of home economics and Kansas State University. The suggested differences between the honors and non-honors subjects might be due to a complex combination of factors, including their early home environment, inherent differences in intellectual capacities, and involvement in special programs such as the Honors Program.

This study has been the first step in the tracing of young educated women's life styles. The compilation of the present descriptive data may take on more meaning as these subjects continue to develop.

The findings are compatible with the trend for increasing numbers of career-oriented, educated women. Since women with college educations are in the forefront in contemporary American society, their experiences and life styles may set the pace for future women's life styles.

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Adamok, Raymond, and Willis Goudy. "Identification, Sex, and Change in College Major," Sociology of Education, XXXIX (Spring, 1966), 183-199.
- Astin, Helen S. "Patterns of Career Choices Over Time," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLV (February, 1967), 541-546.
- Bayer, Alan. "Birth Order and College Attendance," Journal of Marriage and Family, XXVIII (November, 1966), 480-482.
- Berry, Jane. "Life Plans of Freshman and Sophomore Women," Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, (January, 1955), 76-80.
- Brown, Donald. "Personality, College Environments, and Academic Productivity," in Nevitt Sanford (ed.) The American College. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.
- Eckland, Bruce. "A Source of Error in College Attrition Studies," Sociology of Education, XXXVIII (Fall, 1964), 60-72.
- Farber, Bernard. "The Family as a Set of Mutually Contingent Careers," in Nelson Foote (ed.) Household Decision-Making. New York: Columbia University Press, 1961.
- Freedman, Mervin B. "Studies of College Alumni," in Nevitt Sanford (ed.) The American College. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.
- Foster, Robert, and Pauline Wilson. Women After College. New York: Columbia University Press, 1942.
- Friedan, Betty. The Feminine Mystique. New York: Norton, 1963.
- Gass, Gertrude Zemon. "Counseling Implications of Woman's Changing Role," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXVII (March, 1959), 482-487.
- Ginzberg, Eli. Life Styles of Educated Women. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.
- Glick, Paul C. "The Life Cycle of the Family," Marriage and Family Living, XVII (February, 1955), 3-9.
- Goode, William, and Paul Hatt. Methods in Social Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1952.

- Havemann, Ernest, and Patricia West: They Went to College. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Company, 1952.
- Heath, Roy. Reasonable Adventurer. Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1964.
- Hill, Ruben, and Roy H. Rodgers. "The Developmental Approach," in Harold T. Christensen (ed.) Handbook of Marriage and the Family. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1964.
- Hoffman, Doretta S. "New Honors Program in Home Economics at Kansas State University," Journal of Home Economics, LI (May, 1959), 373-374.
- Jahoda, Marie, and Joan Havel. "Psychological Problems of Women in Different Social Roles," Educational Record, XXXVI (1955) 325-335.
- Kammeyer, Kenneth. "Birth Order and Feminine Sex Role Among College Women," American Sociological Review, XXXI (August, 1966), 509-516.
- Kell, Leone, and Carroll E. Kennedy. "Attitude Change in Honors and Non-honors Students Between Freshman and Junior Years," Journal of Home Economics, LVIII (October, 1966), 671-673.
- Komarovsky, Mirra. Women in the Modern World. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1953.
- Lehman, Ruth T. "The Married Home Economics Graduate," Marriage and Family Living, XV (November, 1953), 322-324.
- Marquis, Donald. "College Influences on Personality Development," Social Science Research Council Items, XII (September, 1958), 27-30.
- McGinley, Phyllis. Sixpence in Her Shoe. New York: MacMillan, 1965.
- Morrisett, Lloyd, Jr. "Research on College Influences on Personality," Social Science Research Council Items, XIII (September, 1959), 28-30.
- Nye, Ivan F., and Alan E. Bayer. "Some Recent Trends in Family Research," Social Forces, XLI (March, 1963), 290-301.
- Quint, Howard. The Superior Student, IV (October, 1961), 15.
- Rose, Arnold. "The Adequacy of Women's Expectations for Adult Roles," Social Forces, XXX, 69-77.
- Sanford, Nevitt. "Personality Development during the College Years," Journal of Social Issues, XII, No. 4 (1956).

- Sanford, Nevitt. "The Uncertain Senior," Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, XXI (October, 1957), 9-15.
- Sanford, Nevitt. "Impact of a Woman's College on its Students." Paper read at the 22nd Educational Conference, New York, November 1, 1957.
- Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956.
- Steinmann, Anne. "Vocational Roles of Older Married Women," Journal of Social Psychology, LIV (1961), 93-101.
- Summerskill, John. "Dropouts from College," in Nevitt Sanford (ed.) The American College. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.
- United States Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, College Women Seven Years after Graduation. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1966.

APPENDIX A

Kansas State University

Manhattan, Kansas 66504

Department of Family and Child Development
Justin Hall

August , 1966

Dear Mr. and Mrs. _____:

Your daughter _____ participated in an Honors student research project as a student in Home Economics here at Kansas State University. We are interested in knowing what _____ is doing now. If you would complete the enclosed form, this would enable us to keep in contact with your daughter. A stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Ruth Hoeflin
Acting Head
Associate Dean

Enclosure

INFORMATION SHEET ON LOCATION OF SUBJECTS

Date _____

Daughter's Name: _____
 Last First Middle Maiden Name

Address: _____
 Street City State Zip Code

Present Occupation: _____

Married _____ Single _____

If Married:

Husband's Name: _____

Husband's Occupation: _____

No. of Children: _____

Kansas State University

Manhattan, Kansas 66504

Department of Family and Child Development
Justin Hall

October , 1966

Dear _____:

When you were in the College of Home Economics, you participated in a research project in the Department of Family and Child Development. According to the department records, you left K-State before completing your Bachelor's degree. We are interested in what you have been doing since leaving the university.

Please fill out and return the enclosed form. In the near future we will ask you help once more with an additional questionnaire. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Ruth Hoeflin
Acting Head
Associate Dean

Enclosure

INFORMATION SHEET ON DROP-OUTS FROM RESEARCH PROJECT

Name _____

Present Address (if it has recently changed) _____

If married, how many children do you have? _____

What are their ages? _____

Are you presently employed? Yes _____ No _____

If so, do you work full time or part time? _____

How long have you held this position? _____

Have you continued work towards your Bachelor's degree since you left

Kansas State? Yes _____ No _____

If so, how much time elapsed from the time you left Kansas State
until you resumed work towards your degree?

Have you received your Bachelor's degree?

No _____

Yes _____ Month _____ Year _____

At what university have you continued your education?

What was your major? _____

Kansas State University

Manhattan, Kansas 66504

Department of Family and Child Development
Justin Hall

November 28, 1966

Dear Former K-Stater:

You were recently contacted to send us information about your present activities. Now we are asking you to tell us in more detail what you have done since you left K-State. Although a few of the questions may seem similar to the ones you answered recently, we find we need a little more detailed information concerning your college experiences.

We want you to feel free to answer the questions openly, therefore your name does not appear on the questionnaire. As you will notice, the questionnaire is identified by a number so that it can be filed with your other records. Your specific answers will be anonymous however.

The research schedules should take you around an hour to complete. Will you please complete them during the next week. A stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience in returning the forms. Thank you for your continuing cooperation.

Sincerely,

Ruth Hoeflin
Acting Head
Associate Dean

Enclosures

Kansas State University

Manhattan, Kansas 66504

Department of Family and Child Development
Justin Hall

November 28, 1966

Dear Home Economics Graduate:

As you will recall, you were one of the participants in our research project during the four years you were at K-State. In your senior year, you expressed your willingness to cooperate further. This past summer I contacted your parents to obtain your present address.

Now we are asking you to tell us what you have done since leaving K-State. We want you to feel free to answer the questions openly, therefore your name does not appear on the questionnaire. As you will notice, the questionnaire is identified by a number so that it can be filed with your other records. Your specific answers will be anonymous however.

The research schedules should take you around an hour to complete. Will you please complete them during the next week. A stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience in returning the forms. Thank you for your continuing cooperation.

Sincerely,

Ruth Hoeflin

Ruth Hoeflin
Acting Head
Associate Dean

Enclosures

Kansas State University

Manhattan, Kansas 66504

Department of Family and Child Development
Justin Hall

January , 1967

Dear _____ :

Your help is needed. On November 28 we mailed you a questionnaire. The number of returned questionnaires has been most gratifying but a few are still missing. Perhaps yours was lost in the Christmas mail, mislaid or forgotten in the holiday rush. Your questionnaire is very important to us.

We are enclosing another questionnaire and a self-addressed and stamped envelope for returning it. If there are items you do not wish to complete, please place an X through them and go on to the other items.

We hope to have your questionnaire in the very near future. Thank you for your continued cooperation.

Sincerely,

Ruth Hoeflin
Associate Dean

Enclosure

APPENDIX B

C O N F I D E N T I A L

Do Not Remove From Files

Organized Research Project 341
Department of Family & Child Development
College of Home Economics in Cooperation With
Agricultural Experiment Station
Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas

November, 1966

CASE NUMBER

A. PRESENT SITUATION

It will be most helpful to have information about your current situation.

1. In what size of community are you presently located?

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Farm | 5. <input type="checkbox"/> 15,000 - 50,000 |
| 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Rural, non-farm | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> 50,000 - 100,000 |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Under 5,000 | 7. <input type="checkbox"/> Over 100,000 |
| 4. <input type="checkbox"/> 5,000 - 15,000 | |

2. Marital status:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Single | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Separated |
| 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Engaged | 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Divorced |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Married | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Divorced and remarried |

3. If not married, go to question 10. If married, how many years have you been married? (Circle one.)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7+

4. How many children do you have? (Circle one.)

0 1 2 3 4 5+

5. What are their ages?

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Under 6 months | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Between 2 & 3 years |
| 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Between 6 months & 1 year | 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Between 3 & 4 years |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Between 1 & 2 years | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Over 4 years old |

6. What is your husband's occupation? _____

7. Give a brief description of your husband's work: _____

8. Check the following category which best represents the present level of your husband's education:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> High school graduate | 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Some work toward Master's |
| 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Technical training | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Has Master's degree |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> 1-3 years of college | 7. <input type="checkbox"/> Some work toward Ph. D. |
| 4. <input type="checkbox"/> College graduate | 8. <input type="checkbox"/> Has Ph. D. |

9. What is your husband's gross income, before taxes, at the present time?

1. Under \$3,500 4. 5,500-6,500 7. 8,500-10,500
2. 3,500-4,500 5. 6,500-7,500 8. 10,500-12,500
3. 4,500-5,500 6. 7,500-8,500 9. Over 12,500

10. If you are employed, what is your gross income, before taxes, at the present time?

1. Under \$3,500 4. 5,500-6,500 7. 8,500-10,500
2. 3,500-4,500 5. 6,500-7,500 8. 10,500-12,500
3. 4,500-5,500 6. 7,500-8,500 9. Over 12,500

B. OCCUPATIONAL EXPERIENCES AND PLANS

We know from other research that women with college training have many different kinds of work experiences. We need to know what your experience has been and what your plans are.

11. List the jobs you have held since leaving K-State:

	Position	Company	Length of Employment
1.	_____	_____	_____
2.	_____	_____	_____
3.	_____	_____	_____
4.	_____	_____	_____

12. How satisfied are you with your work experiences?

1. Completely satisfied 4. Somewhat dissatisfied
2. Reasonably satisfied 5. Very dissatisfied
3. Indifferent

13. You may want to elaborate and give reasons for your above answer.
(Use the back if necessary)

14. If you are married, have you held a job at any time after your marriage?

1. Yes 2. No

15. If you have children, have you held a job at any time since your children were born?

1. Yes 2. No

16. Are you presently employed?

1. Yes 2. No

17. If employed, what is the title of your job? _____

18. Give a brief description of your work: _____

19. If currently employed part-time, give the average number of hours per week which you work:

1. Under 10 hours 3. Between 21 & 30 hours
2. Between 11 & 20 hours 4. Between 31 & 36 hours

20. Do you plan to work in the future? (If No, go on to question 24.)

1. Yes 2. No

21. If so, what type of work do you plan to do? _____

22. What is your reason for planning to work?

1. Financial 3. Other (be specific)
2. Self-satisfaction _____

Please explain: _____

23. At what times in your life do you expect to work?

1. At all times 5. After children are 12
2. Before marriage 6. After children are 18 and/or
3. After marriage, before have left home
children 7. Other, please specify
4. After children are 5 years _____
old

C. COLLEGE EXPERIENCES

We are interested in your past and present college experiences. We also would like to know of any future aspirations you have to return to school.

Past Experiences

24. How many activities were you involved in during your freshman year in college? (Circle one.)

0 1 2 3 4 5 more

25. Did you establish any close relationships with faculty members when you were a freshman in college?

1. Yes 2. No

If so, how many? (Circle one.)

1 2 3 more

In what way? _____

26. What were your future goals when you were a freshman? (List in order of priority.)

27. What were your future goals four years later? (List in order of priority.)

28. Some students change their major while in college. How often did you change your major? (Circle one.)

0 1 2 3 4 or more

What did you change to? _____

29. Since originally leaving K-State have you done any college work and/or are you presently doing any college work?

1. Yes 2. No

(If No, go on to question 37.)

30. If Yes, give the dates of your work: _____

31. The name of the college(s) or university(ies) where your work was done and/or is being done:

32. What curriculum are you enrolled in? _____

33. Have you received any advanced degrees?

1. Yes 2. No

34. If so, what degree? _____

35. Are you currently working toward a degree?

1. Yes 2. No

36. What degree are you working toward? _____

Future Educational Goals

37. Do you plan to do further college work or receive additional training in the future?

1. Yes 2. No

38. If so, when in your life? (Check the most appropriate.)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Within the next 5 years | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Within the next 30 years
or after children have left
home |
| 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Within the next 10 years | 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Continuously during my life |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Within the next 20 years | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Other, please specify |
- _____

39. What area do you expect to study in? _____

40. Do you hope to earn advanced degree/degrees?

1. Yes 2. No

Present Feelings

41. How satisfied are you with your present level of training ?

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Very satisfied | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat dissatisfied |
| 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Reasonably satisfied | 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Very dissatisfied |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Indifferent | |

42. If you are not satisfied with your present level of training, how much schooling would you like to have ?

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Less than I have | 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Professional or Graduate School |
| 2. <input type="checkbox"/> More vocational training | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Other, please specify _____ |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> More college work | |
| 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Finish Bachelor's degree | |

43. How satisfied are you with your undergraduate major ?

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Very satisfied | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat dissatisfied |
| 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Reasonably satisfied | 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Very dissatisfied |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Indifferent | |

44. If you are not satisfied with your undergraduate major what major do you think would have been a better choice? _____

Why? _____

D. PRESENT ACTIVITIES AND FUTURE GOALS

45. List the three main goals which you now have for your life within the next 20 years. (List in order of priority.)

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

46. If married, or if you intend to marry, how many children do you expect to have when your family is complete? (Circle the one number that represents your answer.)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8+

47. In viewing what you have done since leaving K-State, and what you see that your future realistically holds, do you feel satisfied with your prospective total life picture?

1. I feel very satisfied
2. I am satisfied with most aspects
3. I feel indifferent about it
4. I am dissatisfied with some aspects
5. I feel very dissatisfied

48. What organizations are you presently a member of? (Check appropriate columns.)

Organization Name	Attend less than 50%	Attend more than 50%	Committee Member	Officer
1. _____				
2. _____				
3. _____				
4. _____				
5. _____				
6. _____				

49. Are you presently involved in any volunteer work?

1. Yes 2. No

If so, please describe: _____

50. We know that many women, after leaving school, find it difficult to use their education in creative and meaningful ways. We are interested in the kinds of stimulating experiences you find in your community. Have these experiences been challenging to you?

51. If you have any additional remarks about these questions, or any related feelings, feel free to discuss them here.

PART II

We would like for you to complete the following instruments. There is no right or wrong answer for any of the questions. We only need to know your feeling and opinion.

- A. How do you feel about yourself as a person? Read each of the following statements very carefully. As you read each statement, decide whether you agree or disagree with it. Then circle the number under the term that best describes how you honestly feel.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I take a positive attitude toward myself.	1	2	3	4
2. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.	1	2	3	4
3. I wish I could have more respect for myself.	1	2	3	4
4. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.	1	2	3	4
5. I certainly feel useless at times.	1	2	3	4
6. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.	1	2	3	4
7. I am able to do things as well as most other people.	1	2	3	4
8. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.	1	2	3	4
9. At times I think I am no good at all.	1	2	3	4
10. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.	1	2	3	4

- B. Below are a variety of adjectives. Draw a circle around each adjective which you think describes you.

Shy	Lazy	Kind	Sympathetic	Worrisome
Popular	Tense	Noisy	Unbalanced	Mature
Individualistic	Happy	Inferior	Attractive	Intelligent
Aggressive	Suspicious	Industrious	Guilty	Considerate
Depressed	Friendly	Irritable	Ambitious	Nervous

This is a study of what the general public thinks about a number of problems. The best answer to each statement below is your personal opinion. We have tried to cover many different points of view. You may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about others. Whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many other people feel the same way that you do.

Mark each statement in the left margin according to how much you agree or disagree with it. Please mark every one. Write in +1, +2, +3; or -1, -2, -3, depending on how you feel in each case.

+1: I AGREE A LITTLE	-1: I DISAGREE A LITTLE
+2: I AGREE PRETTY MUCH	-2: I DISAGREE PRETTY MUCH
+3: I AGREE VERY MUCH	-3: I DISAGREE VERY MUCH

- _____ 1. Negroes have their rights, but it is best to keep them in their own districts and schools, and to prevent too much contact with whites.
- _____ 2. One trouble with Jewish business men is that they stick together and prevent other people from having a fair chance in competition.
- _____ 3. The worst danger to real Americanism during the last 50 years has come from foreign ideas and agitators.
- _____ 4. It would be a mistake ever to have Negroes for foremen and leaders over Whites.
- _____ 5. I can hardly imagine myself marrying a Jew.
- _____ 6. Religious sects whose beliefs do not permit them to salute the flag should be forced to conform to such a patriotic action or be abolished.
- _____ 7. The trouble with letting Jews into a nice neighborhood is that they gradually give it a typical Jewish atmosphere.
- _____ 8. The best guarantee of our national security is for America to have the biggest Army and Navy in the world and a large stockpile of hydrogen bombs.
- _____ 9. Most Negroes would become overbearing and disagreeable if not kept in their place.
- _____ 10. Americans may not be perfect, but the American way has brought us about as close as human beings can get to a perfect society.

- _____ 11. What this country needs most, more than laws and political programs, is a few, courageous, devoted leaders in whom the people can put their faith.
- _____ 12. What the youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country.
- _____ 13. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down.
- _____ 14. Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, deserve more than mere imprisonment; such criminals ought to be publicly whipped, or worse.
- _____ 15. People can be divided into two distinct classes: the weak and the strong.
- _____ 16. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.
- _____ 17. Nowadays more and more people are prying into matters that should remain personal and private.
- _____ 18. Most of our social problems would be solved if we could somehow get rid of the immoral, crooked and feebleminded people.
- _____ 19. If people would talk less and work more, everybody would be better off.

A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF THE LIFE STYLES OF FORMER HONORS AND
NON-HONORS STUDENTS IN THE COLLEGE OF HOME ECONOMICS

by

SHERRILL MINNEMAN METZGER

B. A., University of Missouri at Kansas City, 1966

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Family and Child Development

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Manhattan, Kansas

1967

The initiation of an Honors Program by the College of Home Economics at Kansas State University in the Fall of 1958 stimulated the plan to study the participants of that program as they progressed through their college years. Non-honors students were matched with the honors students on selected variables. The present study was the first follow-up contact with the subjects of the Honors Research Project since they originally left Kansas State University. The three major objectives of the research were to describe the current life styles of the subjects as a total group, to descriptively compare the current roles of honors and non-honors, and to compare college graduate and non-graduate subjects.

All eighty-seven original subjects were located by correspondence with their parents. A total of eighty-one (93 per cent) subjects responded to the twelve-page, mailed questionnaire. The questionnaire was designed to obtain information on the family setting of the subjects and to measure the roles played in relation to their education, career, family, and community orientation.

The revealed characteristics of the total group corresponded somewhat with findings from similar studies. One-half of the subjects were classified as highly career-oriented. These career-oriented subjects displayed significantly more ambition to raise the level of their occupation than the family-oriented subjects. More of the career-oriented subjects desired further education and advanced degrees. Of the eighty-one subjects, 83 per cent had graduated from college. A comparison of college graduates and non-graduates revealed that more non-graduates were married and had more children per family. A slightly higher percentage of college graduates desired to return to

school and earn advanced degrees.

A comparison of the honors and non-honors subjects revealed a larger percentage of honors subjects ranked as highly career-oriented. More honors than non-honors subjects aspired to raise the level of their occupation and to earn advanced degrees. The honors subjects also appeared to be more identified with the area of home economics. Non-honors subjects seemed to express a more complete satisfaction with their prospective total life picture. The differences revealed between the non-honors and honors subjects are probably a result of a complex combination of factors including early environmental differences, intellectual capacities, and involvement in special programs such as the Honors Program.

The findings indicate that academic experiences while in college may have an effect on the future life styles of women. More refined studies and further longitudinal research may help clarify the degree to which such experiences effect the later lives of educated women.