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Definitions & Assumptions

• Who we are shapes what we see and what we deem important.
• Class is complex - may shift over time (or not).
• Class is more than $
Self Reflection

• What were markers of your social class growing up? While in college? Now?
• How has your class of origin influenced your choices related to education and/or career?
• What efforts have you led/observed related to increasing class consciousness?
Context of Student Affairs

- Beyond retention/graduation towards involvement/engagement
- Emphasis often on traditional, liberal arts institutions
- Value educationally enriching, “deep” learning through
  - Living on-campus
  - Studying abroad
  - Volunteering
  - Participating in group projects
  - Conducting research with faculty
  - Joining/leading student clubs and organizations
Concern(s)

• When students demonstrate high sense of belonging, we take credit (our “enriching” activities)

• When they do not, we may blame them for their “choices” (not participating in clubs, commuting)

• We may assume a “good” student is an engaged one, and all students have equal access to engagement opportunities.
Working Class Students

Often cast as heroes or victims, who experience...

- Imposter syndrome
- Fear of success (moving ahead = leaving behind)
- Cultural suicide (surrender of memory)
- Stereotype threat / internalized oppression
- Code switching at school (to avoid being “outclassed”) and at home (to avoid being “uppity”)
- Status anxiety / survivor guilt
Working Class Students

- Significant gaps in four-year degree attainment
  - 12% from the lowest quarter of the social and economic strata and 73% from higher income families (Sacks, 2007)
  - 21% of lower-class background and 84% of upper-class background (Perrucci & Wysong, 2008)
  - High income youth are more than 6 times as likely to earn a degree as low income youth, and the gap between them had doubled in the last 35 years (Engle & Tinto, 2008)
Research Questions

○ Compared with middle/upper-class students, are working-class students less involved in campus co-curricular activities, more likely to be employed, and less likely to live on or near campus?

○ Compared with middle/upper-class students, are working-class students more or less likely to be involved in specific types of student clubs or organizations on campus?
SERU Instrument

- Core questions focus on time use, evaluation of a student’s major, campus climate and satisfaction, with four thematic research areas:
  - academic engagement,
  - community and civic engagement,
  - global knowledge and skills, and
  - student life and development.
- Administered to 213,160 undergraduates from nine large, Midwest public research universities
- Average institutional level response rate was 38% ($n=81,135$).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40582</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>54955</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>5135</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>10780</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Filipino, or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>15880</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>53412</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1337</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3258</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>4682</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-First-Generation</td>
<td>54352</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Generation</td>
<td>17714</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-middle or professional-middle</td>
<td>23207</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-class</td>
<td>30861</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working-class</td>
<td>13395</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income or poor</td>
<td>4288</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social Class

- Students were asked to self-report their social class when growing up and could choose from five categories:
  - low-income/poor,
  - working-class,
  - middle-class,
  - upper-middle/professional class, and
  - wealthy.

- Majority of respondents self-identified as middle-class (41.9%) or upper-middle or professional (31.5%).

- Self-reported data was checked against family income and parental educational attainment, and self-reports were deemed reliable.
Engagement Defined

- **Hours per week in student clubs/organizations**
  - Type of clubs or organizations (academic or honors, governmental/political, sports clubs/teams, recreation, religion, advocacy, Greek)
  - Nature of involvement (participant/member, officer/leader, neither)

- **Hours per week in paid employment**

- **Where they lived**
  - On- or off-campus
  - If off-campus, distance (less than a mile, 1-2 miles, etc.)
Results re: clubs and work

- 37.7% of working-class students reported spending no time per week participating in student clubs and organizations compared with 29% of middle/upper-class students.

- Middle/upper-class students were slightly more likely to spend more time participating per week, more likely to hold leadership positions

- 57% of working-class students worked in paid employment (compared to 46.6% of middle/upper-class)

- Working-class students were more likely to work more hours per week (13.9% of working-class students reported working more than 20 hours per week compared with 8.3% of middle/upper-class students).
Results re: home

- Working-class students were slightly less likely (24.5%) to live on-campus than their middle/upper-class peers (28%)

- Working-class students were more likely to live with their families (8% compared with 4.5% of middle/upper-class students), less likely to live in a fraternity or sorority (1.5% compared with 5.3% of middle/upper-class students), and more likely to live in off-campus in an apartment (43% compared with 39% of middle/upper-class students).
Results re: home

- Working-class students were more likely to live farther from campus; 63.6% of middle/upper-class students lived on campus or less than one mile from campus, compared with 48.4% of working-class students.

- Working-class students were nearly twice as likely to live three to 10 miles from campus (19% compared with 11.2% of middle/upper-class students), 11 to 20 miles from campus (5.9% compared with 2.9% of middle/upper-class students), and 21 miles or more from campus (6.8% compared with 3.1% of middle/upper-class students).
Results re: types of orgs

- While working-class students were generally less likely to participate in clubs/orgs, the differences in participation rates for various types of clubs/orgs were relatively small.
  - 24.8% of working-class students participated in service or advocacy clubs compared to 27.6% of middle/upper-class students.
Results re: types of orgs

- Greater differences between working-class and middle/upper-class students are present in two specific organization types:
  - 34.1% of working-class students participated in academic/honors organizations compared with 42% of middle/upper-class students
  - 10.8% of working-class students participated in Greek organizations compared with 20.1% of middle/upper-class students
Research Summary

- Working-class students at large, public, Midwest research institutions are:
  - overall less likely to participate in student clubs and organizations, and especially less likely to participate in Greek and academic/honors organizations,
  - more likely to be employed,
  - more likely to live off campus or with family, and
  - more likely to live a considerable distance from campus.

- Each of these factors is related to a lower sense of belonging and lower ‘engagement.’
Implications

• Class background influences behaviors related to student engagement
• Variations are a logical outcome of structural patterns rather than simply a matter of personal choices
• Institutions can do more to examine how “deep” learning practices privilege some groups and risk alienating others
Pragmatic Changes

- Develop stronger commuter programs/services
- Provide leadership possibilities in work-study positions and/or classroom environments
- Offer paid employment for student leadership positions
- Explain internships, fellowships, networking
- Broaden understanding of what an involved student looks like (e.g., family obligations and off-campus work are forms of involvement)...and have that reflected in selection processes (for leadership positions or scholarships)
- Be conscious of the economic and cultural capital required to navigate systems (ex - deposit bridge loans)
Questions? Feedback?

- What additional implications have you considered? Suggestions for practice others can learn from?

- Thanks for your time!
  - Krista Soria (ksoria@umn.edu)
  - Tori Svoboda (vasvoboda@stthomas.edu)