

# **Alumni Survey – Classes of 1996, 2000, 2001**

**Office of Institutional Research**

**Prepared by Mary Ann Weaver**

**February 1, 2007**

The Classes of 1996, 2000, and 2001 were invited to complete the HEDS Alumni survey in the spring of 2006. This report compares responses from the three classes.

The response rate for the three classes was similar with 42% of the Class of 1996 responding, 43.1% of the Class of 2000 and 32.8% of the Class of 2001 completing the survey. Gender breakdown was very similar also. Females made up 68.8% of the Class of 1996 respondents, 71.7% of the Class of 2000 respondents, and 71.4% of the Class of 2001 respondents.

As could be expected, there were differences in ages. Whereas 98.8% of the Class of 1996 was 30 or older, 98% of the Class of 2000 and 93.8% of the Class of 2001 were between the ages of 26 and 29. Looking at ethnicity breakdown, the Class of 2001 had the highest response rate from Blacks (9.7%). Whites made up 91.3% of the Class of 1996 respondents, 93.9% of the class of 2000 respondents, and 87.1% of the Class of 2001 respondents.

While 76.3% of the Class of 1996 were married or living with a partner, only 54.5% of the Class of 2000 and 46.9% of the Class of 2001 indicated the same. Along the same line, the Class of 1996 respondents also had more children with 36.3% indicating they had 1 or 2 children and 5% had more than 2.

Table 1 shows the undergraduate majors of the respondents. The majority of the respondents majored in Social Science, Humanities or Life Sciences. There was an unusually large percentage of Psychology graduates from the Class of 2000.

**Table 1**

	Class of 1996	Class of 2000	Class of 2001
Arts and Music	3.7%	7.1%	4.5%
Business/Management	3.7%	3.0%	3.0%
Education	1.2%	0%	0%
Geosciences	2.5%	1.0%	3.0%
Humanities	18.5%	23.2%	19.7%
Life Sciences	18.5%	15.2%	19.7%
Math/Computer Science	3.7%	3.0%	6.1%
Physical Sciences	9.9%	4.0%	3.0%
Psychology	7.4%	22.2%	10.6%
Social Sciences	25.9%	19.2%	25.8%
Other Non-Science Fields	11.1%	13.1%	9.1%

When surveyed 10 years after graduation, 20% of the Class of 1996 indicated that their major was unrelated to their career. This compares to 13.5% of the Class of 2000 (6 years after graduation) and 15.6% of the Class of 2001 (5 years after graduation).

**Table 2****Evaluation of Undergraduate Education****Extent enhanced by undergraduate experience**

<b>Ability/Knowledge</b>	<b>Class of 1996</b>	<b>Class of 2000</b>	<b>Class of 2001</b>
	<b>Mean Scores</b>		
<b>CRITICAL THINKING</b>			
Acquire new skills and knowledge	3.7	3.6	3.7
Think analytically and logically	3.8	3.6	3.8
Formulate creative/original ideas	3.5	3.4	3.5
Academic ability	3.5	3.5	3.6
<b>SKILLS/LEARNING</b>			
Write effectively	3.7	3.6	3.7
Use quantitative tools	3.1	3.0	3.2
Appreciate arts, literature, music, drama	3.4	3.3	3.3
Gain in-depth knowledge of a field	3.4	3.4	3.5
Read or speak a foreign language	2.8	2.9	3.0
<b>SOCIAL/MORAL AWARENESS</b>			
Develop awareness of societal problems	3.7	3.7	3.7
Place current problems in perspective	3.6	3.6	3.5
Understand moral/ethical issues	3.6	3.6	3.6
<b>SELF DEVELOPMENT</b>			
Understand myself	3.4	3.5	3.6
Function independently, w/o supervision	3.4	3.4	3.5
Develop self-esteem	3.3	3.3	3.3
Establish a course of action for goals	3.3	3.4	3.3
Intellectual self-confidence	3.5	3.5	3.5
Develop desire for continued learning	3.5	3.6	3.6

RELATIONSHIP SKILLS			
Lead/supervise tasks/groups of people	2.8	3.1	3.2
Relate well to people of different culture/races	3.5	3.4	3.4
Function effectively as member of team	3.4	3.4	3.4
Communicate well orally	3.4	3.3	3.5
Understand others	3.5	3.5	3.5
UNDERSTANDING SCIENCE/TECHNOLOGY			
Understanding the process of science	3.1	3.0	3.2
Use technology	2.8	2.8	3.0

**Scale: 4=Greatly 3=Moderately 2=A Little 1=Not at all**

When evaluating the extent to which certain abilities or knowledge were enhanced by their Earlham education, the responses from the Classes of 1996, 2000 and 2001 were remarkably similar. However, when rating the extent to which their ability to lead or supervise groups of people was enhanced, the Classes of 2000 and 2001 gave somewhat higher ratings than the Class of 1996.

How important are these skills in their current activities? Table 3 compares the responses from Classes of 1996, 2000, and 2001. The importance of academic ability in their current activities is less important for the Class of 2001.

**Table 3****Importance in current activities**

<b>Ability/Knowledge</b>	<b>Class of 1996</b>	<b>Class of 2000</b>	<b>Class of 2001</b>
	<b>Mean Scores</b>		
<b>CRITICAL THINKING</b>			
Acquire new skills and knowledge	3.8	3.8	3.9
Think analytically and logically	3.9	3.8	3.9
Formulate creative/original ideas	3.8	3.7	3.7
Academic ability	3.4	3.4	3.1
<b>SKILLS/LEARNING</b>			
Write effectively	3.7	3.7	3.6
Use quantitative tools	3.2	3.2	3.2
Appreciate arts, literature, music, drama	3.1	3.1	3.0
Gain in-depth knowledge of a field	3.5	3.5	3.6
Read or speak a foreign language	2.3	2.5	2.5
<b>SOCIAL/MORAL AWARENESS</b>			
Develop awareness of societal problems	3.5	3.6	3.5
Place current problems in perspective	3.6	3.6	3.6
Understand moral/ethical issues	3.6	3.7	3.6
<b>SELF DEVELOPMENT</b>			
Understand myself	3.7	3.6	3.6
Function independently, w/o supervision	3.9	3.8	3.8
Develop self-esteem	3.7	3.5	3.5
Establish a course of action for goals	3.8	3.7	3.8
Intellectual self-confidence	3.8	3.7	3.8
Develop desire for continued learning	3.8	3.6	3.7
<b>RELATIONSHIP SKILLS</b>			

Lead/supervise tasks/groups of people	3.5	3.3	3.4
Relate well to people of different culture/races	3.6	3.6	3.7
Function effectively as member of team	3.7	3.7	3.7
Communicate well orally	3.8	3.8	3.8
Understand others	3.8	3.8	3.8
UNDERSTANDING SCIENCE/TECHNOLOGY			
Understanding the process of science	2.9	3.0	3.0
Use technology	3.4	3.3	3.4

**Scale: 4=Greatly 3=Moderately 2=A Little 1=Not at all**

The alumni were asked about their satisfaction with various services or aspects of Earlham. Table 4 shows that with few exceptions the level of satisfaction is similar among the three classes surveyed. A slight difference in satisfaction is seen in academic experiences in courses and independent studies, library resources, and recreation or athletic experiences where the Class of 2001 indicated greater satisfaction.

**Table 4**

**Satisfaction with College Experiences**

<b>College Experiences</b>	<b>Class of 1996</b>	<b>Class of 2000</b>	<b>Class of 2001</b>
	<b>Mean Scores</b>		
<b>ACADEMIC EXPERIENCES</b>			
Academic advising	3.3	3.3	3.4
Contact with faculty	3.7	3.8	3.8
Quality of teaching	3.8	3.8	3.8
Courses in major field	3.5	3.6	3.7
Courses outside major field	3.4	3.4	3.6
Independent study/research	3.4	3.4	3.6
<b>CAMPUS SERVICES AND FACILITIES</b>			
Career services	2.6	2.9	2.7
Financial services	3.3	3.3	3.1
Library resources	3.5	3.5	3.7
Recreation/athletics	3.2	3.3	3.5
Residential life	3.3	3.3	3.3
<b>CAMPUS CLIMATE</b>			
Student voice in policies	3.3	3.3	3.3
Campus safety	3.6	3.7	3.6
Sense of belonging	3.5	3.6	3.5
Ethnic/racial diversity	3.1	3.0	3.1
Social life on campus	3.3	3.2	3.3

**Scale: 4=Very Satisfied 3=Generally Satisfied 2=Generally Dissatisfied 1=Very Dissatisfied**

To what extent did their undergraduate experience fulfill their original expectations?

Table 5 shows all expectations at least moderately and often times greatly fulfilled for all three classes.

**Table 5**

**Expectations**

<b>Expectation</b>	<b>Class of 1996</b>	<b>Class of 2000</b>	<b>Class of 2001</b>
	<b>Mean Scores</b>		
Enhance your intellectual growth	3.7	3.7	3.8
Acquire in-depth knowledge in a particular field	3.4	3.4	3.5
Develop competence in career relevant skills	3.1	3.0	3.0
Foster your personal growth	3.6	3.7	3.6
Promote your ability to form relationships	3.4	3.6	3.3

**Scale: 4=Greatly 3=Moderately 2=A Little 1=Not at all**

The mean score of their rating of overall satisfaction with their undergraduate education was 3.7 for all three classes (scale: 4=very satisfied, 1=very dissatisfied). Almost 73% of the Class of 2000 indicated they were very satisfied with their Earlham education while 71.2% of the Class of 2001 and 69.1% of the Class of 1996 indicated the same.

Would these graduates encourage others to attend Earlham? 76% of all of these graduates indicated they definitely would. None of the graduates indicated they definitely would not encourage others to attend Earlham; however seven said they probably would not. Five of those were in the Class of 1996 and two in the Class of 2001. 99% of the Class of 2000 indicated they probably or definitely would recommend Earlham compared to 91.3% of the Class of 1996 and 90.9% of the Class of 2001.

The alumni were asked to indicate their level of involvement in extracurricular activities and then to evaluate the contribution of these various activities to their personal or professional life after graduation. Table 6 shows the mean scores.

The respondents from the Classes of 2000 and 2001 were less involved in student government, athletics, and on-campus employment compared to the Class of 1996. They were more involved in study abroad, student publications, performing arts/music and independent studies.

**Table 6**

**Level of Involvement in Activities**

<b>Level of Involvement</b>	<b>Class of 1996</b>	<b>Class of 2000</b>	<b>Class of 2001</b>
	<b>Mean Scores</b>		
<b>EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES</b>			
Student or campus government	1.7	1.5	1.4
Intercollegiate athletics	2.0	1.8	1.7
Intramural sports	1.8	1.6	1.7
Student publications	1.3	1.5	1.6
Performing arts/music	2.2	2.3	2.6
Political organization or club	1.9	2.0	2.1
Community service	2.4	2.5	2.5
Religious groups	1.5	1.9	1.7
<b>ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES</b>			
Internships	2.0	2.2	2.1
Study abroad	2.8	3.2	3.0
Work on faculty research	1.8	1.5	1.7
Independent study	2.2	2.3	2.6
<b>EMPLOYMENT ACTIVITIES</b>			
On-campus employment	3.0	2.6	2.7
Off-campus employment	1.6	1.6	1.7

**Scale: 1=None 2=A Little 3=Moderate 4=Extensive**

As shows in Table 7, the Classes of 2000 and 2001 indicated student government, athletics, intramural sports, community service, internships and work on faculty research made less of a contribution to their personal or professional life after graduation compared to the Class of 1996.

**Table 7**

**Contribution of Activities to Personal/Professional Development**

<b>Contribution to your development</b>	<b>Class of 1996</b>	<b>Class of 2000</b>	<b>Class of 2001</b>
	<b>Mean Scores</b>		
<b>EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES</b>			
Student or campus government	2.0	1.8	1.7
Intercollegiate athletics	2.3	2.1	2.0
Intramural sports	2.1	1.7	1.8
Student publications	1.5	1.7	2.1
Performing arts/music	2.5	2.2	2.7
Political organization or club	2.2	2.3	2.3
Community service	2.9	2.8	2.5
Religious groups	1.8	2.3	2.1
<b>ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES</b>			
Internships	2.6	2.9	3.0
Study abroad	3.2	3.4	3.6
Work on faculty research	2.3	2.1	2.6
Independent study	2.6	2.6	2.7
<b>EMPLOYMENT ACTIVITIES</b>			
On-campus employment	2.8	2.4	2.8
Off-campus employment	2.2	1.9	2.4

**Scale: 4=Extensive 3=Moderate 2=A Little 1=None**

Table 8 shows to what extent these graduates felt their undergraduate experience prepared them for various post-graduation activities. The Class of 2001 felt slightly more prepared for further education than the Class of 1996 or 2000. However, they were somewhat less prepared for interpersonal relationships.

**Table 8**

**Level of Preparedness for post-graduation Activities**

<b>Activities</b>	<b>Class of 1996</b>	<b>Class of 2000</b>	<b>Class of 2001</b>
	<b>Mean Scores</b>		
Post-baccalaureate education	3.3	3.4	3.6
Current career	3.3	3.2	3.2
Social and civic involvement	3.2	3.3	3.2
Interpersonal relationships	3.2	3.1	3.0

**Scale: 4=Greatly 3=Moderately 2=A Little 1=Not at all**

To determine the amount of involvement these graduates have had with their alma mater, they were asked how frequently they participated in various activities that were sponsored by Earlham. Table 9 shows there was very little difference in the level of involvement with Earlham after graduation in most areas. However, the Class of 1996 has a higher level of involvement in contributing to or soliciting for the annual fund compared to the Class of 2000 and 2001.

**Table 9**

**Involvement with Alma Mater**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Class of 1996</b>	<b>Class of 2000</b>	<b>Class of 2001</b>
	<b>Mean Scores</b>		
Read campus publications	3.2	3.1	3.1
Visited the institution's Web site	2.7	2.9	3.0
Visited campus for any purpose	1.9	2.1	2.1
Attended alumni functions on campus	1.4	1.5	1.3
Attended alumni functions off campus	1.5	1.5	1.3
Attended alma mater sporting events	1.3	1.3	1.4
Served as an alumni admissions volunteer	1.3	1.1	1.0
Participated in a career advisory program	1.2	1.1	1.1
Participated in alumni continuing education program	1.0	1.0	1.0
Participated in an alumni community service program	1.1	1.0	1.0
Contributed to or solicited for the annual fund	2.4	1.7	1.6
Maintained contact with other alumni	3.5	3.5	3.7
Maintained contact with faculty members	2.2	2.5	2.7
Maintained contact with administrators	1.4	1.3	1.5

**Scale: 4= Frequently 3=Occasionally 2=Briefly 1=Never**

The majority of the alums from all three classes (72.9% of the Class of 1996, 80.8% of the Class of 2000 and 80.3% of the Class of 2001) indicated that they strongly or very strongly identified with Earlham.

Table 10 shows alumni involvement in organizations since graduation. As might be expected, the Class of 1996 is more involved in civic organizations and youth activities than the Class of 2000 or 2001.

**Table 10**

**Involvement in Organizations**

<b>Organization</b>	<b>Class of 1996</b>	<b>Class of 2000</b>	<b>Class of 2001</b>
	<b>Mean Scores</b>		
Civic/Community	2.4	2.2	2.1
Cultural/Arts	2.1	2.2	2.2
Educational Service (e.g., PTA)	1.4	1.5	1.5
Political	1.7	1.9	1.9
Professional	2.4	2.3	2.5
Recreational (e.g., sports club)	2.2	2.0	2.0
Religious	1.8	1.9	2.0
Service (e.g. Rotary, Kiwanis)	1.3	1.4	1.3
Youth (e.g. Little League, Scouting)	1.8	1.5	1.5

**Scale: 4=Greatly 3=Moderately 2=A Little 1= Not at All**

Currently most of these alums (68.1%) are working full time; 27.2% are going to graduate school full time and 6% are going to graduate school part time. Of those who are working, sixty (26.5%) of them are educators.

Ten have received doctoral degrees; six of these were in Life Sciences, one each in Education, Psychology, Humanities/Arts, and Physical Science. Twenty-six are currently enrolled in doctoral degree programs in Humanities and Arts, Life Science, Social Science, Physical Science, Psychology, Religion and other programs.

Twenty-three have received professional degrees; seven in law and four in medicine. Seventy-four have received Master's degrees. Another 51 are enrolled in a Master's degree program.

**Table 11**

**Degrees**

	Class of 1996	Class of 2000	Class of 2001	Total
Master's received	30	32	12	74
Enrolled in Master's	7	24	20	51
Professional degree received	11	4	8	23
Law degree received	5	0	2	7
Medical degree received	1	1	2	4
Enrolled in professional degree program	2	5	11	18
Enrolled in law program	0	2	3	5
Enrolled in medical program	0	1	5	6
Doctorate degree received	9	1	0	10
Enrolled in a doctorate degree	6	12	7	25

Table 12 shows the current annual income of the respondents. As would be expected, the respondents from the Class of 1996 have a higher annual income than the Classes of 2000 and 2001.

**Table 12**

**Current Annual Income**

	<b>Class of 1996</b>	<b>Class of 2000</b>	<b>Class of 2001</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
No earned income	7.4	9.1	9.1
Less than \$19,999	12.3	24.2	30.3
\$20,000 to \$39,999	29.6	39.4	37.9
\$40,000 to \$59,999	24.7	19.2	16.7
\$60,000 to \$79,999	14.8	5.1	3.0
\$80,000 to \$99,999	6.2	1.0	1.5
\$100,000 to \$119,999	1.2	1.0	1.5
More than \$120,000	3.7	1.0	0

Over 50% of the Class of 1996 now has annual incomes of \$40,000 whereas only 27.3% of the Class of 2000 and 22.7% of the Class of 2001 have incomes at that level.

In 2006, supplemental questions were added to the alumni survey. Table 13 shows that Earlham's language requirement at least somewhat contributed to the overall value of their Earlham education. International off-campus programs contributed most to their personal development and to their overall Earlham education. It also motivated them quite a bit to think about and understand international affairs.

**Table 13**

**Supplemental Questions**

	<b>Class of 1996</b>	<b>Class of 2000</b>	<b>Class of 2001</b>
	<b>Mean Scores</b>		
To what extent did Earlham's language requirement contribute to the overall value of your Earlham education?	3.03	3.17	3.17
To what extent did your international off-campus program contribute to your personal development?	4.71	4.54	4.51
To what extent did your international off-campus program contribute to your professional development?	3.53	3.41	3.20
To what extent did your international off-campus program have an impact upon your overall Earlham education?	4.65	4.34	4.34
To what extent did your international off-campus program prepare you to understand international affairs?	3.96	4.01	3.78
To what extent did your international off-campus program motivate you to think about international affairs?	4.08	4.08	3.88
To what extent did your domestic off-campus program have an impact upon your overall Earlham education?	3.91	4.25	4.50

**Scale: 5=Very significantly 4=Quite a bit 3=Somewhat 2=Very little 1=Not at all**

Almost 70% of these graduates went on an international off-campus program. Participation rates by class were surprisingly different. While 80.8% of the Class of 2000 went on an international off-campus program, only 63.8% of the Class of 1996 and 65.1% of the Class of 2001 did so.

Over 11% of the respondents from these classes went on a domestic off-campus program. Conversely, more of the graduates from the Class of 1996 and 2001 (13.8% and 12.5% respectively) participated in a domestic program compared to 8.1% of the Class of 2000.

Seventy-five percent of the respondents from the classes surveyed reported that their current employment is not at all or very little international in nature. However 9.4% of the Class of 2001 as well as 7.1% from the Class of 2000 and 5.1% from the Class of 1996 indicated that their current position is very significantly international in nature.

Over 50% of the respondents are not using their foreign language skills in their work. Six percent are using their foreign language skills quite a bit and 7.3% use them very significantly. We found that the more recent graduates are somewhat more likely to be using their foreign language skills. Over 9% of the Class of 2001, 8.1% of the Class of 2000 and 5.1% of the Class of 1996 reported using foreign language very significantly in their present employment situation.

*Created by Mary Ann Weaver*

*weavema@earlham.edu*

*May 7, 2007*