

**First Developed 4/8/2005  
Last Revised 4/20/05**

# **ST. CLOUD STATE UNIVERSITY STUDENT SURVEY-2005**

- I. METHODOLOGY STATEMENT-SCROLL DOWN**
- II. LINK TO QUESTIONNAIRE**
- III. LINK TO FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS AND STUDENT REPORTS**

**A SCIENTIFIC TELEPHONE SURVEY  
CONDUCTED  
BY AND FOR THE  
SCSU SURVEY STUDENT DIRECTORS  
ST. CLOUD STATE UNIVERSITY  
BY  
ST. CLOUD STATE UNIVERSITY SURVEY**

**A PRELIMINARY REPORT**

**April 2005**

# **ST. CLOUD STATE UNIVERSITY SURVEY**

## **SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH INSTITUTE**

### **COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**

#### **PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS**

**Dr. Stephen I. Frank**  
**Department of Political Science**  
**319 Brown Hall**  
**320-308-4131**  
[sfsurvey@stcloudstate.edu](mailto:sfsurvey@stcloudstate.edu)

**Dr. Steven C. Wagner**  
**Department of Political Science**  
**318 Brown Hall**  
**320-308-5423**  
[swagner@stcloudstate.edu](mailto:swagner@stcloudstate.edu)

**Dr. Michelle Kukoleca Hammes**  
**Department of Political Science**  
**315 Brown Hall**  
**320-308-4130**  
[mhammes@stcloudstate.edu](mailto:mhammes@stcloudstate.edu)

**SCSU SURVEY HOMEPAGE**  
[HTTP://web.stcloudstate.edu/scsusurvey](http://web.stcloudstate.edu/scsusurvey)

Drs. Frank, Wagner and Kukoleca Hammes are members of the Midwest Association of Public Opinion Research (M.A.P.O.R.) and the American Association of Public Opinion Research (A.A.P.O.R.) and subscribe to the code of ethics of the A.A.P.O.R.

## **I. HISTORY AND MISSION OF THE SURVEY**

The SCSU Survey is an ongoing survey research extension of the Social Science Research Institute in the College of Social Sciences at St. Cloud State University. The SCSU Survey performs its research in the form of telephone interviews. Telephone surveys are but one of the many types of research employed by researchers to collect data randomly. The telephone survey is now the instrument of choice for a growing number of researchers.

Dr. Steve Frank began the SCSU Survey in 1980 conducting several omnibus surveys a year of central Minnesota adults in conjunction with his Political Science classes. The SCSU Survey conducts its statewide omnibus survey once a year. In addition to questions focusing on the research of the faculty directors, clients can buy into the survey or contract for specialized surveys.

Presently, the omnibus surveys have continued, but have shifted to a primary statewide focus. These statewide surveys are conducted once a year in the fall and focus on statewide issues such as election races, current events, and other important issues that are present in the state of Minnesota. Besides the annual fall survey, the SCSU Survey conducts an annual spring survey of SCSU students on various issues such as campus safety, alcohol and drug use, race, etc. Lastly, the SCSU Survey conducts contract surveys for various public and private sector clients. The Survey provides a useful service for the people and institutions of the State of Minnesota by furnishing valid data of the opinions, behaviors, and characteristics of adult Minnesotans.

The primary mission of the SCSU Survey is to serve the academic community and various clients through its commitment to high quality survey research and to provide education and experiential opportunities to researchers and students. The directors of the SCSU Survey strive to assure that all SCSU students and faculty directors contribute to the research process, as all are essential in making a research project successful. This success is measured by our ability to obtain high quality survey data that is timely, accurate, and reliable while maintaining an environment that promotes the professional and personal growth of each staff member. The survey procedures used by the SCSU Survey adhere to the highest quality academic standards. The SCSU Survey maintains the highest ethical standards in its procedures and methods. Both faculty and student directors demonstrate integrity and respect for dignity in all interactions with colleagues, clients, researchers, and survey participants.

## **II. SURVEY STAFF**

The Survey's faculty directors are Dr. Steve Frank (SCSU Professor of Political Science), Dr. Steven Wagner (SCSU Professor of Public and Non-Profit Administration) and Dr. Michelle Kukoleca Hammes (SCSU Assistant Professor

of Political Science). The faculty directors are members of the Midwest Association of Public Opinion Research (M.A.P.O.R.) and the American Association of Public Opinion Research (A.A.P.O.R.). The directors subscribe to the code of ethics of A.A.P.O.R.



## **A STEPHEN I. FRANK**

Dr. Frank holds a Doctor of Philosophy in Political Science from Washington State University. Dr. Frank teaches courses in American Politics, Public Opinion and Research Methods at St. Cloud State University. Dr. Frank started the SCSU Survey in 1980, and since has played a major role in the development, administration and analysis of over 150 telephone surveys for local and state governments, school districts and a variety of nonprofit agencies. Dr. Frank has completed extensive postgraduate work in survey research at the University of Michigan. Dr. Frank coauthored with Dr. Wagner and published by Harcourt College, *"We Shocked the World!" A Case Study of Jesse Ventura's Election as Governor of Minnesota*. Revised Edition. He also recently published two academic book chapters: one appears in the current edition of *Perspectives on Minnesota Government and Politics* and the other, co-authored with Dr. Wagner, is contained in *Campaigns and Elections*, edited by Robert Watson and Colton Campbell. Dr. Frank is past chairperson of the SCSU Department of Political Science and currently serves as President of the Minnesota Political Science Association.

## **B. STEVEN C. WAGNER**

Dr. Wagner holds a Doctor of Philosophy in Political Science and a Master of Public Administration from Northern Illinois University. Dr. Wagner earned his Bachelor of Science in Political Science from Illinois State University. Dr. Wagner teaches courses in American Politics and Public and Nonprofit Management at St. Cloud State University. Dr. Wagner joined the SCSU Survey in 1997. Before coming to SCSU, Dr. Wagner taught in Kansas where he engaged in community-based survey research and before that was staff researcher for the U.S. General Accounting Office. Dr. Wagner has written many papers on taxation and state politics and budgeting, and has published articles and book chapters on voting behavior, federal funding of local services and organizational decision making. Dr. Wagner, with Dr. Frank, published two texts on Jesse Ventura's election and service as Minnesota's Governor. With Dr. Frank, Dr. Wagner recently published a chapter on Ventura's election in Watson and Campbell's *Campaigns and Elections*.

## **C. MICHELLE KUKOLECA HAMMES**

Dr. Kukoleca Hammes holds a Doctor of Philosophy in Political Science and a Masters in Political Science from the State University of New York at Binghamton. Dr. Kukoleca Hammes earned her Bachelor of Arts in Political Science from Niagara University. Kr. Kukoleca Hammes' is a comparativist with an area focus on North America and Western Europe. Her substantive focus is representative governmental institutions. She teaches courses in American Government, Introduction to Ideas and Institutions, Western European Politics, and a Capstone in Political Science at St. Cloud State University. Dr. Kukoleca

Hammes, since joining the survey team, is using her extensive graduate school training in political methodology to aid in questionnaire construction and results analysis. She recently published a book chapter on Minnesota public participation in the Fifth Edition of *Perspectives on Minnesota Government and Politics*.

SCSU students, Mr. Jason Lunser serve as senior student lab supervisors assisted by Ms. Nichole Kahler. Mr. Jason Amunrud, also a SCSU student, provided technical support to ensure the interviewing software and all related hardware functioned.

After five or more hours of training and screening, approximately 40 SCSU students completed the calling. These students were enrolled in two of Professor Steve Frank's courses: one his undergraduate political science research course and his course on democracy and citizenship. Under the director of Drs. Frank, Wagner and Kukoleca Hammes, the student directors trained all callers and supervised all calling. These students serve the SCSU Survey as student directors and, in addition to supervising the lab for the SCSU Survey spring survey of SCSU students, perform similar functions for the fall omnibus survey and client-centered surveys.

#### **D. SCSU SURVEY LAB STUDENT DIRECTORS/CONSULTANT**

##### **SENIOR STUDENT LAB DIRECTORS/SUPERVISORS**

Mr. Jason Lunser, Senior, Political Science Major,  
Cold Spring, Minnesota

Ms. Nicole Kahler, 4<sup>th</sup> Year Student, Social Work Major,  
Roseville, Minnesota

##### **STUDENT LAB DIRECTORS/SUPERVISORS**

Mr. Michael Fox, Senior, Political Science Major, International Relations Minor,  
Breckenridge, Minnesota

Ms. Sara Lohrman, sophomore, Political Science Major,  
Willmar, Minnesota

Mr. Joshua Mattison, 4<sup>th</sup> Year Student, Political Science Major, Sociology Minor,  
Thief River Falls, Minnesota

Ms. Sara Oldakowski, 3rd year, Political Science and Communication Studies,  
Pierz, Minnesota

Ms. Stacey Springer, Senior, Psychology and Political Science Majors,  
Lincoln, Nebraska

Ms. Nicole Severson, 3<sup>rd</sup> Year Public Administration Major, Photo Journalism  
Minor,  
Sauk Rapids, Minnesota

Ms. Stacy Gauthier, Public Administration Major and Accounting Minor,  
sophomore,  
St. Cloud, Minnesota

Ms. Ngoc Phan, 3rd year, Major: Political Science, Minor: Sociology,  
St. Cloud, Minnesota

### **STUDENT TECHNICAL CONSULTANT**

Mr. Jason Amunrud, Junior, Computer Science Major  
Shoreview, Minnesota

### **III. METHODOLOGY**

The SCSU Survey operates the CATI Lab in Stewart Hall 324. The CATI Lab, which stands for Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing Lab, is equipped with 13 interviewer stations that each includes a computer, a phone, and a headset. In addition to the interviewer stations, there is the Supervisor Station, which is used to monitor the survey while it is in progress. The SCSU Survey has its own server designated solely for the use of the SCSU Survey.

The SCSU Survey is licensed to use Sawtooth Software's Ci3 Questionnaire Authoring Version 4.1, a state-of-the-art windows-based computer-assisted interviewing package. This program allow us to develop virtually any type of questionnaire while at the same time programming edit and consistency checks and other quality control measures to insure the most valid data. Interviewing with Ci3 offers many advantages:

1. Complete control of what the interviewer sees;
2. Automatic skip or branch patterns based on previous answers, combinations of answers, or even mathematical computations performed on answers;
3. Randomization of response categories or question order;
4. Customized questionnaires using respondents' previous responses, and,
5. Incorporation of data from the sample directly into the sample database.



In addition, all interview stations are networked for complete, ongoing sample management. Sawtooth Software's Ci3 allows immediate data updating, ensuring maximum data integrity and allowing clients to get progress reports anytime. The Survey directors are able to review data for quality and consistency. Question answers are entered directly into the computer, thus keypunching is eliminated, which decreases human error and facilitates immediate data analysis. The calling system is programmed to store call record keeping automatically, allowing interviewers and supervisors to focus on the interviewing task. Callbacks are programmed through the computer network and made on a schedule. Each number is called ten times. Interrupted surveys are easily completed. Persons who are willing to be interviewed can do so when it is convenient to them, improving the quality of their responses.

Calls were made at various times during the week (Monday through Thursday, 4:30 to 9:30) and on Sunday afternoon and evening to maximize contacts and ensure equal opportunities to respond among various demographic groups. The calling system maintains full and detailed records, including the number of attempts made to each number and the disposition of each attempt. Initial refusals were contacted and many were converted to completions. The survey was administered on March 28 through March 31 and a few hours during the evening on April 3-4, 2005.

Several steps were taken to ensure that the telephone sample of SCSU students was representative of the larger student population. The sample was drawn proportional to the currently enrolled student population by the Minnesota State College and University (MnSCU) Regional Center. The sample was comprised of 1,500 currently enrolled students who had a telephone anywhere in the state of Minnesota. Our interest was to interview currently active full and part time students. The sample was screened to remove duplicate names and invalid telephone numbers from the sample. Although the same sample generation procedures this year mirrored past years, we found many student telephone numbers very dated. Once the student directors and interviewers found current not-working numbers, they looked up the respondent names in the current campus telephone book to locate current telephone numbers. These current telephone numbers were then used to contact the respondents. In order to reach hard-to-get respondents each number was called up to ten times over different days and times and appointments made as necessary to interview the designated respondent at her/his convenience.

The sample consists of 503 respondents. In samples of 505 interviews, the sample error due to sampling and other random effects is approximately plus/minus four percent at the 95 percent confidence level. This means that if one were to have drawn 20 samples of the student population and administered the same instrument it would be expected that the overall findings would be greater/lesser than four percent only one time in twenty. In all surveys there are other possible sources of error for which precise estimates are not calculated.



These include interviewer and coder error, respondent misinterpretation, and analysis errors. When analysis is made of sub-samples such as respondents who are live in university residence halls, or when the sample is broken down by variables such as gender, the sample error may be larger.

The demographics – gender, place of residence -- of the sample match known characteristics of the student population very well. One demographic, however, we are working on is the percentage of respondents who are seniors. See chart below. There appears to be more seniors in the sample than are in the population. As this occurred in two different student studies this semester and all other demographics of the sample are an almost exact match to the reported real population, we think there may be more seniors than Institutional Research reports. Or, the way SCSU is drawing the sample may need to be examined. As of April 17 we are considering weighting the sample for class standing. With a few exceptions there doesn't appear to be major differences between seniors and other classes. In terms of other demographic factors, interviewing resulted in a sample within the margin of error of the population and they were therefore not weighted.

SCSU INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH	PROVIDED SENIORS IN SAMPLE FROM SCSU	% SENIORS IN SAMPLE
26%	34%	39%

The cooperation rate of the survey was 83 percent. A cooperation rate of 83 percent is 30\_percentage points above the average for professional marketing firms. Cooperation rate means that once we reached an eligible respondent, more than eight of ten respondents agreed to participate in the survey. The cooperation rate is determined by adding the number of completed interviews (503) to the total number of refusals (106) and dividing the number of completed interview (503) by the sum of the completions and refusals (609).

The total survey consisted of 73 variables. Respondent gender, place of residence, year of birth, ethnic status, citizenship and class standing were imported from the database. Of the 73 questions, most are reported herein and the remainder are asked for various departments and operating units of SCSU and are reported to those units. The complete questionnaire is viewable by going to the SCSU Survey web site and following the links to the spring SCSU student 2005 survey.

<b>Table 1: Calling Record</b>	
<b>Disposition Record</b>	<b>Frequency</b>

Completed Calls (weighted shown)	503
Not Working Numbers	122
Not Eligible – Respondent not available during the period of the study, language problems, hearing problems, illness, out of state.	4
Callbacks – Appointments made but contact could not be made with designated respondent.	263
Refusals – Attempt to re-contact and convert refusals to a completion was made for all refusals.	106
Answering Machine – Live contact could not be made even after 10 calls.	177
Business Phones	4
No Answers – Probable non-working numbers.	45
Fax/Modem	6
Busy	47
Cell Phone	13
Call Blocking	5
No longer a student	11
No longer resident at phone number, new number not available, wrong number	172
.Other-partially completed but not finished, miscellaneous	22
<b>Total Calls Placed</b>	<b>1499</b>
Total starting sample, including duplicate names and invalid phone numbers	1501

# **IV. DEMOGRAPHIC BREAKDOWNS**

## **A. UNWEIGHTED**

## **B. WEIGHTED**

**NOTE: When reading tables such as SPSS tables normally pay attention to the valid percent and not the percent column.**

**The valid percent is the percent used after don't know, refused, etc have been taken out of the analysis.**

**Also, watch recoding such as putting categories together such as strongly agree and agree into one agree category. Contact a director if you have any questions.**

## **UNWEIGHTED**

**polpar1 WHO DID YOU VOTE FOR  
PRESIDENT IN 2004**

		Freque ncy	Perce nt	Valid Percent	Cumulat ive Percent
Valid	bush	149	29.6	32.4	32.4
	kerry	225	44.7	48.9	81.3
	nader	8	1.6	1.7	83.0
	didnt vote	67	13.3	14.6	97.6
	other	4	.8	.9	98.5
	dk	7	1.4	1.5	100.0
	Total	460	91.5	100.0	
Missi ng	ref miss oth	43	8.5		
Total		503	100.0		

**polpar2 SELF DESCRIBED PARTY  
AFFILIATION 2005**

		Freque ncy	Percen t	Valid Percent	Cumulati ve Percent
Valid	rep	97	19.3	20.1	20.1



	dem	157	31.2	32.5	52.6
	ind party	16	3.2	3.3	55.9
	green	9	1.8	1.9	57.8
	indep no party	105	20.9	21.7	79.5
	other	71	14.1	14.7	94.2
	apolitical	5	1.0	1.0	95.2
	dk	23	4.6	4.8	100.0
	Total	483	96.0	100.0	
Missi	ref miss	20	4.0		
ng	oth				
Total		503	100.0		

**Table 38:**  
**2004 Party Preference**

***“Generally speaking, do you consider yourself to be a Republican, Democrat, Green Party member, Independence Party member, independent, or something else?”***

<b>RESPONSE</b>	<b>COUNT</b>	<b>PERCENT</b>
Republican	133	27
Democrat	180	36
Independence Party	9	2
Green Party	13	3
Independent (not party)	67	14
Other	41	8
Apolitical	6	1
Don't Know	50	10
<b>Total</b>	<b>499</b>	<b>100</b>

## polpar3 SELF DESCRIBED POLITICAL IDEOLOGY 2005

		Frequ ency	Perce nt	Valid Percen t	Cumul ative Percen t
Valid	very lib	55	10.9	11.2	11.2
	lib	170	33.8	34.6	45.8
	mod	163	32.4	33.2	79.0
	somewhat conser	78	15.5	15.9	94.9
	very conservat ive	14	2.8	2.9	97.8
	dk	11	2.2	2.2	100.0
	Total	491	97.6	100.0	
Miss ing	ref miss oth	12	2.4		
Total		503	100.0		

**2004** Table 39:  
Ideology

***“Thinking about your own general approach to politics, do you consider yourself very liberal, somewhat liberal, moderate, somewhat conservative, or very conservative?”***

RESPONSE	COUNT	PERCENT
Very Liberal	54	11
Liberal	152	31
Moderate	139	28
Somewhat Conservative	104	21
Very Conservative	16	3
Don't Know	30	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>495</b>	<b>100</b>

## **relig1 HOW OFTEN DO YOU ATTEND CHURCH, MOSQUE, ETC 2005**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid at least 1 a day	5	1.0	1.0	1.0
at least once a week	60	11.9	12.1	13.1
almost every week	49	9.7	9.9	23.0
about once a month	116	23.1	23.4	46.4
seldom	180	35.8	36.3	82.7
never	83	16.5	16.7	99.4
dk	3	.6	.6	100.0
Total	496	98.6	100.0	
Missing ref miss oth	7	1.4		
Total	503	100.0		

**2004** Table 40:

Religion Attendance		
<i><b>“How often do you attend church, synagogue, temple, or mosque? Is it at least once a day, at least once a week, almost every week, about once a month, seldom or never?”</b></i>		
RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
At Least Once a Day	4	1
At Least Once a Week	82	16
Almost Every Week	60	12
About Once a Month	105	21
Seldom	155	31
Never	97	19
<b>Total</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100</b>

## relig2 SELF DESCRIBED RELIGION 2005

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid budd	21	4.2	4.2	4.2
cath	161	32.0	32.0	36.2
hindu	13	2.6	2.6	38.8
jewish	1	.2	.2	39.0
muslim	5	1.0	1.0	40.0
prot	208	41.4	41.4	81.3
mormon	3	.6	.6	81.9
aeth agno none	62	12.3	12.3	94.2
oth	18	3.6	3.6	97.8
dk	2	.4	.4	98.2
ref miss oth	9	1.8	1.8	100.0
	503	100.0	100.0	



Total				
-------	--	--	--	--

Table 43:  
**2004 Religious Classifications**

*"I am going to read a list of religious preferences, which of these would you classify yourself as?"*

RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Buddhist	5	1
Catholic	197	39
Hinduism	6	1
Jewish	3	1
Muslim	4	1
Protestant/Other Christian	204	41
Mormon	4	1
Atheist/Agnostic/No Affiliation	57	11
Other	21	4
Don't Know	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100</b>

## GPA SELF DESCRIBED GPA 2005

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1.5 or less	2	.4	.4	.4
1.6-2	5	1.0	1.0	1.4
2.1-2.5	27	5.4	5.5	6.9
2.5-3.0	157	31.2	31.8	38.7
3.1-3.5	152	30.2	30.8	69.6
3.6 or higher	138	27.4	28.0	97.6
dk	12	2.4	2.4	100.0
	493	98.0	100.0	

	Total			
Missing	ref miss oth	10	2.0	
Total		503	100.0	

**Table 44:**  
**2004** Grade Point Average

***“What is your cumulative GPA? Is it less than 1.5, between 1.6 and 2.0, between 2.1 and 2.5, 2.6 to 3.0, 3.1 to 3.5, or over 3.5?”***

<b>RESPONSE</b>	<b>FREQUENCY</b>	<b>PERCENT</b>
1.5 or less	2	0
1.6-2.0	9	2
2.1-2.5	47	9
2.6-3.0	135	27
3.1-3.5	154	31
Over 3.5	142	28
Don't Know	14	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100</b>

## **GENDER SAMPLE OF RESPONDENTS IMPORTED FROM SAMPLE 2005**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid male	232	46.1	46.1	46.1
female	271	53.9	53.9	100.0
Total	503	100.0	100.0	

**2004** Table 46:  
**Gender**

***“Gender was imported from the data base”***

RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Male	220	44
Female	285	56
<b>Total</b>	<b>505</b>	<b>100</b>

## DORM SAMPLE OF RESPONDENTS IMPORTED FROM SAMPLE 2005

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid no	422	83.9	83.9	83.9
yes	81	16.1	16.1	100.0
Total	503	100.0	100.0	

**2004** Table 45:  
Primary Living Arrangement

***“Regarding your primary living arrangement, do you live on campus in the dorms or do you rent an apartment or house in the St. Cloud area or do you have some other living arrangement such as being a homeowner, living in your family’s home, or do you commute from outside the St. Cloud area?”***

RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Dorm	100	20
Renter	203	40
Own Home	74	15
Live with Family	54	11
Commute	67	13
Other	6	1
Don’t Know	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>504</b>	<b>100</b>

--

<b>2004 Table 47:</b> <b>Residence</b>		
<i>“Place of residence was imported from the data base”</i>		
<b>RESPONSE</b>	<b>FREQUENCY</b>	<b>PERCENT</b>
Off Campus	404	80
University Residence Hall	100	20
<b>Total</b>	<b>505</b>	<b>100</b>

## YEARBI SAMPLE OF RESPONDENTS IMPORTED FROM SAMPLE 2005

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 0	1	.2	.2	.2
33	1	.2	.2	.4
48	1	.2	.2	.6
51	3	.6	.6	1.2
52	3	.6	.6	1.8
53	3	.6	.6	2.4
55	1	.2	.2	2.6
56	1	.2	.2	2.8
57	4	.8	.8	3.6
58	2	.4	.4	4.0
59	1	.2	.2	4.2
60	2	.4	.4	4.6
62	2	.4	.4	5.0
63	1	.2	.2	5.2
	2	.4	.4	5.6



64				
66	3	.6	.6	6.2
67	1	.2	.2	6.4
68	4	.8	.8	7.2
69	3	.6	.6	7.8
70	8	1.6	1.6	9.3
71	3	.6	.6	9.9
72	2	.4	.4	10.3
73	4	.8	.8	11.1
74	3	.6	.6	11.7
75	6	1.2	1.2	12.9
76	8	1.6	1.6	14.5
77	12	2.4	2.4	16.9
78	21	4.2	4.2	21.1
79	25	5.0	5.0	26.0
80	29	5.8	5.8	31.8
81	51	10.1	10.1	41.9
82	78	15.5	15.5	57.5
83	86	17.1	17.1	74.6
84	59	11.7	11.7	86.3
85	49	9.7	9.7	96.0
86	20	4.0	4.0	100.0
Total	503	100.0	100.0	

**2004 Table 48:  
Year of Birth**

<b><i>“Year of birth was imported from the data base”</i></b>		
<b>RESPONSE</b>	<b>FREQUENCY</b>	<b>PERCENT</b>
1942-1944	2	0
1950-1959	12	2
1960-1969	27	5
1970-1974	27	5
1975	7	1
1976	14	3
1977	10	2
1978	16	3
1979	24	5
1980	31	6
1981	60	12
1982	78	16
1983	86	17
1984	61	12
1985	36	7
1986	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>493</b>	<b>100</b>

## ETHNIC SAMPLE OF RESPONDENTS IMPORTED FROM SAMPLE 2005

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	black	2	.4	.5	.5
	asian	30	6.0	7.4	7.9
	white	366	72.8	90.1	98.0
	hispanic	4	.8	1.0	99.0
	native amer	4	.8	1.0	100.0
	Total	406	80.7	100.0	
Missing	missing	97	19.3		
Total		503	100.0		

**2004 Table 49:**  
**Ethnic Background**

*“Ethnic background was imported from the data base”*

RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Caucasian	397	93
African/African American	8	2
Latino/Hispanic	3	1
Asian/Pacific Islander	16	4
Native American/Alaskan	3	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>427</b>	<b>100</b>

## CLASS SAMPLE OF RESPONDENTS IMPORTED FROM SAMPLE 2005

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid special	3	.6	.6	.6
fresh	53	10.5	10.5	11.1
soph	75	14.9	14.9	26.0
jun	109	21.7	21.7	47.7
senior	197	39.2	39.2	86.9
prev degree	13	2.6	2.6	89.5
grad	53	10.5	10.5	100.0
Total	503	100.0	100.0	

**2004 Table 50**  
**Class Standing**

<i><b>“Class standing was imported from the data base”</b></i>		
<b>RESPONSE</b>	<b>FREQUENCY</b>	<b>PERCENT</b>
Freshman	89	18
Sophomore	90	18
Junior	131	26
Senior	133	26
Graduate	41	8
Post Degree	16	3
Special	6	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>505</b>	<b>100</b>

## INTSTUD SAMPLE OF RESPONDENTS IMPORTED FROM SAMPLE 2005

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid no	451	89.7	89.7	89.7
yes	52	10.3	10.3	100.0
Total	503	100.0	100.0	

<b>2004 Table 51: Citizens</b>		
<i><b>“Citizen was imported from the data base”</b></i>		
<b>RESPONSE</b>	<b>FREQUENCY</b>	<b>PERCENT</b>
U.S.	485	96
Not Resident Alien/ Resident Alien	20	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>