A Profile of Choice/Responsibleness and Goal-Seeking Attitudes among First-Generation and Non-First-Generation College Students

Terence Hicks and Dixie Dennis

Students who are the first in their family to enter college (first-generation students) differ in significant ways from students whose parents have a college degree (second-generation students). For example, researchers (Billson & Brooks-Terry, 1982, 1987; Brooks-Terry, 1988; Christie & Dinham, 1991; London, 1989; McGregor, Mayleben, Buzzanga, Davis, & Becker, 1991; Noel, Levitz, Saluri, and Associates, 1985; Tinto, 1985, 1988; York-Anderson & Bowman, 1991) have identified differences in family support for education, academic preparation, college knowledge, career versus academic orientation, level of commitment to the role of student, and attrition rates between first-generation and second-generation students.

First-generation college students often represent a large segment of the community college population (Dougherty, 1994; Willet, 1989), and they are a unique population with distinct goals, motivations, and constraints (Cross, 1990; Terenzini, Springer, Yaegar, Pascarella, & Nora, 1996). These first-generation students may be less well prepared academically and psychologically for college than second-generation students (Riehl, 1994). They typically have lower high school grade point averages (Riehl, 1994; Tulsa Junior College, 1995) and lower SAT scores (Riehl, 1994), and they have not been a part of families who have participated in honors programs. These students also are typically aware of their academic problems (Tulsa Junior College, 1995).

Because first-generation college students may be poorly prepared academically, be constrained by financial obligations, have lower self-esteem, and experience a culture shock, it would seem logical to expect that they will not perform as well as students whose parents succeeded in college (Inman & Mayes, 1999). Furthermore, it may seem reasonable to assume that first-generation students may not be committed to their academic goals and may not have much direction in life.

However, this is not necessarily the case. In terms of academic goals, Inman and Mayes (1999) found that first-generation college students were more concerned with increasing their self-confidence; non-first-generation students were more concerned with improving a previously poor academic record in order to transfer to another institution. Furthermore, in terms of their academic goals at the community college level, more first-generation college students (67.6%) than non-first-generation students (55.9%) said

Terence Hicks (thicks@uncfsu.edu) is an Associate Professor of Research in the Educational Leadership Doctoral Program and Director of the Research Center at Fayetteville State University in North Carolina.
Dixie L. Dennis (dldennis@umes.edu) is an Associate Professor and Research Coordinator of Organizational Leadership and Education Leadership Doctoral Programs at the University of Maryland, Eastern Shore.

that they would continue their education until reaching their academic goals. Overall, first-generation college students reported that they were more likely to stay at the college until they reached their academic goals and were more likely to complete a two-year degree at the community college.

The present study involved a sample (n = 430) of college students and investigated first-generation and non-first-generation students' goals and motivations for attending college. Previous studies have indicated that first-generation college students represent a unique demographic group and that their level of commitment and attitudes toward achieving a college degree are different from students whose parents have attended college. Because previous research studies provided contradictory evidence on the actual performance of first-generation college students, there was no clear indication how they would perform academically when compared to students whose parents had attended college. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine the differences of first-generation and non-first-generation college students' attitudes regarding goals and motivations for attending college.

Method

Participants

The data for this study were obtained from a questionnaire administered to college students (n= 430) who were enrolled in either an Introduction to Psychology, Abnormal Psychology, or Developmental Psychology course at a 4-year public research and doctoral degree granting institution on the eastern shore of Maryland. The participants were college students between the ages of 18 and 20 years old, most of whom were African Americans. Sixty-four percent of the sample was female and comprised of approximately equal percentages (30%) of freshmen, sophomores, and juniors, with only 12% of the sample being seniors. The students were surveyed during the fall 2003 and spring 2004 semesters.

Survey

The Life Attitude Profile-Revised (LAP-R) originally was developed by Reker and Peacock (1981). This 48-item questionnaire was designed for individuals of all ages, from adolescence to later adulthood. A fifth-grade reading level is required to complete the approximately 15-minute survey. A sample of 750 people, most of whom were university students between the ages of 17 and 24, provided normative scores. Coefficients of internal consistency for young adults (17-27 years old) ranged from 0.77 to 0.91 for all subscale and composite scores. Results of factor analysis lent strong support for the construct validity of the LAP-R, and concurrent validity was established from a series of eight previous studies. The LAP-R has been viewed as a valid measure of current and future meaning and purpose in life. It also is predictive of outcome variables, including health and life satisfaction (Reker, 1999).

Each of the 48 questionnaire items is rated on a 7-point Likert scale of agreement (1-7), ranging from "strongly agree" (7) to "strongly disagree" (1). The LAP-R is scored and profiled in terms of six subscales (Purpose [PU], Coherence [CO], Choice/Responsibleness [CR], Death Acceptance [DA], Existential Vacuum [EV], and Goal Seeking [GS]), and two composite scales (Personal Meaning Index [PMI] and Existential Transcendence [ET]). A high score for each scale and subscale reflects a high degree of the attribute.

The PU (purpose) subscale refers to having life goals; having a mission in life; and having a sense of direction from the past, in the present, and toward the future. Implicit in PU is the notion of what is centrally important in a person's life. The CO (coherence) dimension refers to an intuitive understanding of self, others, and life in general. CO gives an indication of a person's belief in a reason for existence. The CR (choice/responsibleness) subscale refers to the perception of freedom to make life choices. CR provides an index of the degree to which a person perceives self-direction in life. DA (death acceptance) refers to having an absence of fear as well as an acceptance of death as a natural aspect of life. The EV (existential vacuum) subscale refers to having a lack of meaning and direction in life. GS (goal seeking) refers to one's eagerness to get more out of life.

The PMI (personal meaning index) (PMI = PU + CO) composite score was developed to provide a more focused measure of a person's personal meaning. PMI refers to having life goals, as well as a mission and sense of direction in life. The other composite score, ET (existential transcendence) is a global measure of attitudes toward life that takes into account both the degree to which meaning and purpose has been discovered and the motivation to find meaning and purpose. ET is derived from the following formula: PU + CO + CR + DA – (EV + GS).

Statistical Analysis

A *t* test for equality of means was conducted on all data using SPSS© (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) to determine the difference between degrees of Choice/Responsibleness (CR) and Goal-Seeking (GS) life attitudes as expressed by first-generation and non-first-generation college students. All comparisons were made assuming an alpha = 0.05 significance level with two-tailed comparisons. In addition, means and standard deviations were assessed for all data.

Results

Table 1 illustrates the overall means and standard deviations for both first-generation and non-first-generation college students in each of the six LAP-R subscales; Table 2 shows first-generation and non-first-generation item scores within each subscale.

Overall Mean Dimension and Composite Scores. As shown in Table 1, the Choice/Responsibleness (CR) dimension had the highest mean (45.33) and a comparatively low standard deviation (6.44), followed closely by the Goal-Seeking (GS)

dimension (44.29 ± 5.61), suggesting that the group tested was homogeneous in having a high sense of freedom regarding making all life choices, felt able to exercise personal decision making and had a high internal locus of control (CR), and reflected a desire to deviate from the routine of life, seeking new and diverse experiences (GS). The Death Acceptance (DA) overall dimension scores for this sample were almost identical ($\mu = 36.13$, $\sigma = 9.45$) to those reported as national norms (Reker & Peacock, 1981).

In addition, the Existential Transcendence (ET) composite mean scores reported from this sample (predominantly African American) were also consistent ($\mu = 92.47$, $\sigma = 31.18$) to the scores reported at the national level and not consistent with scores reported from a previous study conducted on predominantly white students ($\mu = 144.30$, $\sigma = 18.62$) (Dennis, Muller, Miller, & Banerjee, 2004). This finding is consistent with what the literature reports about spirituality and ethnicity. Jagers and Smith (1996) reported that African American college students have higher levels of spirituality than white students, and, according to Chatters, Taylor, and Lincoln (1999) and Benson (2002), African American students also engage in spiritual practices (e.g., praying, meditating, reflecting on life, and fully living life) more frequently than whites.

Choice/Responsibleness and Goal-Seeking Dimensions. In Table 2, an item-wise difference is depicted between first-generation and non-first-generation college students regarding their expression of Choice/Responsibleness and Goal-Seeking attitudes. There were no statistically significant differences between the mean responses of first-generation and non-first-generation college students regarding the Purpose of Life (PU), Coherence (CO), Death Acceptance (DA), and Existential Vacuum (EV) dimensions.

A statistically significant difference between the means of first-generation and non-first-generation college students regarding the Choice/Responsibleness (CR) dimension was apparent in the three items stating, "My accomplishments are my effort" ($t = -2.29$, [95% CI = -0.456, -0.035]), "I can live my life the way I want to" ($t = 2.17$, [95% CI = 0.027, 0.545]), and "Regarding important life matters, I make my own choices" ($t = 3.17$, [95% CI = 0.159, 0.676]). The mean for this item was higher (5.77) for the first-generation college students than that of the non-first-generation college students (5.35). Only one statement in the Goal-Seeking dimension elicited a statistically significant difference in the mean responses of first-generation and non-first-generation college students: "I am eager to get more out of life than I have so far" ($t = 2.25$, [95% CI = 0.039, 0.572]). The mean for the first-generation college students was higher (6.25) than that of the non-first-generation college students (5.94).

The PMI composite score, which is designed to depict a sharper focus on personal meaning—in particular, life goals; a sense of direction; and a logical, consistent understanding of the self, others, and life in general—is comprised of the Purpose in Life (PU) and Coherence (CO) dimensions. The mean responses of first-generation and non-first-generation college students were not statistically significantly different for this scale. Similar to the PMI, the Existential Transcendence composite scale reflected no statistically significant difference in the responses by first-generation and non-first-generation college students, revealing that both groups reported similar experiences with

internalizing successes and failures of life; appreciations of the past; present, and future; and a view of life that is meaningful.

Discussion

Results of this study suggest that this cohort of first-generation and non-first-generation college students demonstrated a moderate degree of spirituality in the sense that the overall mean scores for Personal Meaning Index (PMI)—life goals, sense of direction, and self-understanding—was 85.52 out of a possible score of 112 (Likert-type score of 7 [strongly agree] times 8 questions each in PU and CO). In addition, composite scores for Existential Transcendence were also consistent ($\mu = 92.47$, $\sigma = 31.18$) with the scores reported at the national level.

Reker (1999) stated, "A person who has achieved Existential Transcendence has a new perspective on life, has internalized successes, has risen above the failures of living,…and views life as meaningful" (p. 20). This perspective on life is not unusual for college students, especially students who are first in their family to attend college. Bassoff (1988) noted that in college, young people can "start over"; they can make friends, establish intimate relationships, and develop the skills and knowledge to help become self-supporting adults. She also indicated that students see college as a time for discovering who they really are and who they really can become; they anticipate finding wholly new and permanent life identities during the college years. In addition, they believe that going to college provides a unique opportunity to consciously establish some new identities, according to Bassoff.

In a study conducted with inner-city college students in Philadelphia, Hicks (2002) found that a larger percentage of first-generation college students as opposed to second-generation college students responded that their parents believed that one of the best ways to become successful in life is to do well in school; they believed that if they did well in school, they would have more career options and a meaningful life. Hicks indicated that 100% of first-generation as opposed to 84% percent of second-generation college students believed that their parents valued education and achievement in life. A possible implication of this finding is that because parents of these first-generation college students did not attend a college or university, they showed more parental support for their child/children to attend and graduate from a college or university.

In the present study, the highest score for a dimension for the overall group was Choice/Responsibleness. This score reflects a high level of internal locus of control and a high sense of freedom among the group. The finding is consistent with research on adolescent high school students making a critical transition to the college environment. Life transitions, such as moving away from home to college, create valuable opportunities for growth and change while also potentially heightening self-doubt and disappointment, and even encouraging self-defeating habits (Compas, Wagner, Slavin, & Vannatta, 1986; Felner, Farber, & Primavera, 1983; Schlossberg, 1981; Weiss, 1990).

Even though college represents a time of freedom and choices, students anticipate that the college years, especially the freshman year, will be a test of their ability to

achieve their identity goals. Karp, Holmstrom, and Gray (1999) noted that it is not surprising for students to adopt concrete strategies to maximize the likelihood of success at the developmental tasks they face, while maintaining a family "safety net" in the event that they are not yet prepared for the emotional and practical challenges of independent, adult living. In addition, they indicated that the way students think about changing friendship patterns, meeting new academic challenges, mastering the routines of daily life on their own, and maintaining family connections reveals the contours of the college transition and the identity complexities associated with it.

The second highest mean score for the overall group was the Goal-Seeking dimension. This dimension suggested that the participants in this study were homogeneous in having a high sense of freedom regarding making all life choices, felt able to exercise personal decision making and had a high internal locus of control (CR), and reflected a desire to deviate from the routine of life, seeking new and diverse experiences (GS). This finding is consistent with what other researchers have discovered about first-generation college students and parental support.

Detailed interviews from case studies (London, 1989) and focus groups (Terenzini et al., 1994) revealed that first-generation students often feel they have to make an all-or-nothing decision about maintaining their parents' way of life or rejecting their family's culture to pursue an academic goal. The pressure from friends and family encouraging these students not to go to college is often intense. Pratt and Skaggs (1989) found that first-generation college students were actually more committed than non-first-generation college students to a particular college they were attending and were equally as capable of succeeding. In term of academic goal seeking, the authors discovered that first-generation college students were more likely than non-first-generation college students to have plans to continue at the college level until achieving academic goals.

The results of the item-wise difference between first-generation and non-first-generation college students regarding their expression of making life choices, accomplishing goals, and succeeding in life were depicted in the Choice/Responsibleness (CR) and Goal-Seeking (GS) dimensions. The pattern of these differences provides some interesting insights into how first-generation and non-first-generation students perceive making life choices, making academic decisions, and seeking an ultimate goal.

There were three questions in the Choice/Responsibleness (CR) dimension that elicited a statistically significant difference in the mean responses of first-generation college students and non-first-generation college students. The mean scores for the first-generation college students were higher than those of the non-first-generation college students in each of the following two questions: "I can live my life the way I want to," and "Regarding important life matters, I make my own choices." However, the mean scores for the third item, "My accomplishments are my effort," were slightly higher (6.35) for the non-first-generation college students than the first-generation college students (6.10). Because the groups in this study were predetermined by parents' college attendance status, it would make sense that first-generation college students would be at an academic disadvantage when discussing academic choices and setting career goals. However, this assumption was not true for this particular study; here,

first-generation college students were more enthusiastic about living their life and making important life choices than non-first-generation college students. In a recent USA Today article, Hicks (2004) praised the first-generation college student and gave them an "A" for motivation. Hicks indicated that a few studies have found that first-generation college students are more likely than non-first-generation college students to believe that college is the key to success in life and that first-generation students are more likely to have plans to stay in college until their academic goals are achieved.

Researchers have indicated that family support for education is a key difference between first-generation and second-generation students. In fact, it has been found that parental educational level has been highly correlated with a student's decision to attend college. According to Brooks-Terry (1988), "Parents communicate expectations and life goals to their children based on their own educational experiences" (p. 122). If parents have not attended college, they may be less likely to see the importance of a college education.

According to Ross (1990), "Many minority families may not be enthusiastic about their son's or daughter's desire to attend college" (p. 19). In contrast, Hicks (2002) found that a larger percentage of first-generation than second-generation college students responded that their parents believed that one of the best ways to become successful in life is to do well in school; they believed that if they did well in school, they could get the kind of job that they wanted (95% vs. 75% respectively). Also, a higher percentage of first-generation college students believed that their parents felt that they could grow up to be anything that they wanted to be (95% compared to 75% respectively). Hicks also noted that 79% of first-generation compared to 67% of second-generation college students believed that their parents felt that attending college right after completing high school was first priority. One hundred percent of first-generation as opposed to 84% of second-generation college students believed that their parents valued education and achievement. The results from Hicks' study clearly indicate that even though parents of these first-generation college students did not attend a college or university, they showed more parental support for their child/children to attend successfully and graduate from a college or university.

One question in the Goal-Seeking (GS) dimension elicited a statistically significant difference in the mean responses of first-generation college students and non-first-generation college students, "I am eager to get more out of life than I have so far." The mean for first-generation college students was higher (6.25) than that of non-first-generation college students (5.94). First-generation students believe college is important, as do their peers who are not first-generation (Pratt & Skaggs, 1989). Their desire to achieve is as great, but they are not sure that college is the road to success, and they aspire to the baccalaureate degree less often than second-generation students (Billson & Brooks-Terry, 1982; The Education Resources Institute & Institute for Higher Education Policy [TERI & IHEP], 1997; Inman & Mayes, 1999; Pratt & Skaggs, 1989; Riehl, 1994; Terenzini et al., 1996). Career preparation is the first-generation college student's primary reason for attending college, compared to personal growth for the second-generation student (Billson & Terry, 1982). First-generation students are more likely to

say that going to college would help them be well off financially than they are to say it would help them provide more opportunities for their children, which is what second-generation students assert (Nunez & Cuccaro-Alamin, 1998).

Researchers have indicated that first-generation students are less well prepared academically and psychologically for college. First-generation student reportedly have a lower sense of self-efficacy (Hellman, 1996) and lower self-esteem (McGregor, Mayleben, Buzzanga, Davis, & Becker, 1991) than students whose parents attended college. In addition, researchers also have indicated that first-generation students perceive their parents to be less supportive of their decision to attend college and less encouraging than their second-generation peers perceive their parents to be (TERI & IHEP, 1997; Hsiao, 1992; Terenzini et al., 1996; York-Anderson & Bowman, 1991). A lower percentage of first-generation students than second-generation students indicate their parents think college is important (Pratt & Skaggs, 1989).

Conclusion

In terms of actual performance, previous studies have shown that first-generation college students may not fit the model of ideal students as being well prepared, having earned good grades in high school, and having the self-esteem and self-efficacy to succeed in becoming a well-rounded graduate. In contrast, the results of this study seem to indicate that first-generation college students as opposed to non-first-generation college students were more motivated in achieving a specific goal and wanted to accomplish something in life. Possible implications of this study's findings could indicate that increasingly, first-generation college students realize that they are at a disadvantage when it comes to preparing for and attending college. First-generation college students are eager to get more out of life and obtain a college degree. More importantly, after recognizing this disadvantage, the first-generation college student is becoming more aware and knowledgeable of the academic, personal, and social expectations needed to attend and persist in college, and they have begun to seek additional educational paths and resources to help guide them with college related activities. Therefore, the findings of this study may have significant implications for college orientation, college admissions, and high school personnel. Hicks (2003), for instance, suggested that given the academic, personal, and social needs of first-year, first-time precollege students who may be first-generation or non-first-generation, college orientation and admissions personnel can play a pivotal role in expanding awareness at the junior and senior high school levels of the academic demands of postsecondary education.

It is also important to emphasize that not all first-generation college students will be ready for the academic, personal, and social demands of college. As a preventive measure, an effective transition or summer bridge program aimed at first-generation college students, which focuses on enhancing those essential skills, would be beneficial. Hicks (2005a) notes that although the summer programs could be a good idea for all students, the structured summer program approach is particularly helpful for students

considered at risk. Furthermore, Hicks (2005b) emphasizes that summer programs are designed to help students understand their cognitive abilities, academic skills, and what it takes to excel in college. In addition, the summer programs' atmosphere is surrounded with positive early academic components, such as initial course selection, intrusive advising, developmental instruction, study groups, tutoring, and labs.

The results of this study indicate that the first-generation students seemed to be more academically motivated than the non-first-generation students. There are other important questions that remain unanswered. It is important to acknowledge that nonacademic attributes could play a significant role in the success of at-risk students at the college level. It would be important to examine what other academic and non-academic variables play a role in the success of the first-generation college student. Finally, since the groups in this study were predetermined by virtue of parents' college attendance status, special care should be taken not to generalize the findings of this study to other student populations. The findings may hold true only if the populations are similar in nature. Therefore, it is advisable to carry out a similar longitudinal study at other college institutions.

References

Bassoff, E. (1988). *Mothers and daughters: Loving and letting go*. New York: Penguin Books.

Benson, P. L. (2002, November). *Spiritual development in childhood and adolescence*. Paper presented at the meeting of Tufts University Center for Children, Medford, MA.

Billson, J. M., & Brooks-Terry, M. (1982). In search of the silken purse: Factors in attrition among first-generation students. *College and University, 58*, 57-75.

Billson, J. M., & Brooks-Terry, M. (1987). A student retention model for higher education. *College and University, 62*, 290-305.

Brooks-Terry, M. (1988). Tracing the disadvantages of first-generation college students: An application of Sussman's option sequence model. In S.K., Steinmetz (Ed.), *Family and support systems across the life span* (pp. 121-134). New York: Plenum Press.

Chattes, L. M., Taylor, R. J., & Lincoln, K. D. (1999). African American religious participation: A multi-sample comparison. *Journal of the Scientific Study of Religion, 38*, 132-145.

Christie, N. G., & Dinham, S. M. (1991). Institutional and external influences on social integration in the freshman year. *Journal of Higher Education, 62*(4), 412-436.

Compas, B. E., Wagner, B. M., Slavin, L. A., & Vannatta, K. (1986). A prospective study of life events, social support, and psychological symptomatology during the transition from high school to college. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 14*(3), 241-257.

Cross, K. P. (1990). Transfer: Major mission of community colleges? Paper presented at the Annual International Conference on Leadership Development of the League for Innovation in Community Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED322972)

Dennis, D. L., Muller, S. M., Miller, K., & Banerjee, P. (2004). *Spirituality among a college student cohort: A quantitative analysis, American Journal of Health Education, 35* (4), 220-227.

Dougherty, K. J. (1994). The contradictory college: *The conflicting origins, impacts, and futures of the community college*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Education Resources Institute, & Institute for Higher Education Policy. (1997). *Missed opportunities: A new look at disadvantaged college aspirants*. Boston and Washington, DC: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED420257)

Felner, R. D., Farber, S. S, & Primavera, J. (1983). Transitions and stressful life events: A model for primary prevention. In R. D. Felner, L. A. Jason, J. N. Moritsugu, & S. S. Farber (Eds.), *Preventive Psychology: Theory, research and practice* (pp. 199-215). New York: Pergamon.

Hellman, C. (1996). Academic self-efficacy: Highlighting the first-generation student. *Journal of Applied Research in the Community College, 4*(1), 69-75.

Hicks, T. (2002). Assessing parental involvement of first-generation and second-generation college students. *The ACT 101 Journal, 9*(1), 12-16.

Hicks, T. (2003). First-generation and non-first-generation pre-college students' expectations and perceptions about attending college. *Journal of College Orientation and Transition, 11*(1), 5-17.

Hicks, T. (2004, September 28). "A" for motivation. *USA Today*, p.12A.

Hicks, T. (2005a). Assessing the academic, personal and social experiences of pre-college students. *Journal of College Admission, 186*(1), 19-24.

Hicks, T. (2005b, February 8). Community college play vital role. *USA Today*, p. 12A.

Hsiao, K. P. (1992). *First-generation college students*. ERIC Digest. Los Angeles, California: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED351079)

Inman, W E. & Mayes, L. (1999). The importance of being first: Unique characteristics of first generation community college students. *Community College Review, 26*(4), 3-22.

Jagers, R. J., & Smith, P. (1996). Further examination of the spirituality scale. *Journal of Black Psychology, 22*(4), 429-442.

Karp, D. A., Holmstrom, L. L., Gray, P. S. (1998). Leaving home for college: Expectations for selective reconstruction of self. *Symbolic Interaction, 21*(3), 253-276.

London, H. B. (1989). Breaking away: A study of first-generation college students and their families. *American Journal of Education, 97*(2), 144-170.

McGreggor, L. M., Mayleben, M. A., Buzzanga, V. L., Davis, S. F., & Becker, A. H. (1991). Selected personality characteristics of first-generation college students. *College Student Journal, 25*(2), 231-234.

Noel, L., Levitz, R., Saluri, D., & Associates. (Eds.). (1985). *Increasing student retention*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Nunez, A., & Cuccaro-Alamin, S. (1998). First-generation students: *Undergraduates whose parents never enrolled in postsecondary education*. (Report No. NCES-98-082). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED420235).

Pratt, P. A., & Skaggs, C. T. (1989). First generation college students: Are they at greater risk for attrition than their peers? *Research in Rural Education, 6*(2), 31-34.

Reker, G. T. (1999). *Life attitude profile-revised manual*. Peterborough, Ontario: Student Psychologists Press.

Reker, G. T., & Peacock, E. J. (1981). The life attitude profile (LAP): A multidimensional instrument for assessing attitudes toward life. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 13*, 264-273.

Riehl, R. J. (1994). The academic preparation, aspirations, and first-year performance of first-generation students. *College and University, 70*(1), 14-19.

Ross, K. (1990). Eight myths about minorities in higher education. *The College Board Review, 155*, 12-19, 45-47.

Schlossberg, N. K. (1981). A model for analyzing human adaptation to transition. *The Counseling Psychologist, 9*(2), 2-18.

Terenzini, P. T., Rendon, L. I., Upcraft, M. L., Millar, S. B., Allison, K. W., Gregg, P. L., et al. (1994). The transition to college: Diverse students, diverse stories. *Research in Higher Education, 35*(1), 57-73.

Terenzini, P. T., Springer, L., Yeager, P. M., Pascarella, E. T, & Nora, A. (1996). First generation college students: Characteristics, experiences, and cognitive development. *Research in Higher Education, 37*(1), 1-22.

Tinto, V. (1985). Dropping out and other forms of withdrawal from college. In L. Noel, R. Levitz, D. Saluri, & Associates (Eds.), *Increasing student retention* (pp. 28-43). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tinto, V. (1988). Stages of student departure: Reflections on the longitudinal character of students leaving. *Journal of Higher Education, 59*(4), 438-455.

Tulsa Junior College. (1995). *New student inventory survey results FY 1995*. (Research Monograph No. 2). Tulsa, OK: Tulsa Junior College, Office of Institutional Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED388343)

Weiss, R. S. (1990). Losses associated with mobility. In S. Fisher & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *On the move: The psychology of change and transition* (pp. 3-12). New York: Wiley.

Willet, L. H. (1989). Are two-year college students first-generation college students? *Community College Review, 17*(2), 48-52.

York-Anderson, D. C., & Bowman, S. L. (1991). Assessing the college knowledge of first-generation and second-generation college students. *Journal of College Student Development, 32*, 116-122.

TABLE 1

Overall Mean Dimension and Composite Scores for Current Study

LAP-R Dimensions	Mean (SD) This Study	Mean (SD) 1981 Nat'l Norms
Purpose in Life (PU)	43.14 (7.31)	40.03 (8.44)
Coherence (CO)	42.38 (6.71)	38.40 (8.30)
Choice/Responsibleness (CR)	45.33 (6.44)	44.94 (6.52)
Death/Acceptance (DA)	36.53 (9.25)	36.13 (9.45)
Existential Vacuum (EV)	30.65 (8.49)	25.92 (8.70)
Goal Seeking (GS)	44.29 (5.61)	41.15 (7.74)
Composite Scales		
Personal Meaning Index (PMI)	85.52 (12.91)	78.43 (15.86)
Existential Transcendence (ET)	92.44 (25.15)	92.47 (31.18)

TABLE 2

Dimension Item-Wise First-Generation and Non-First-Generation Differences

LAP-R Questions Dimension (Items)	First-Generation (N=156)	Non-First-Generation (N=274)	P-value
Purpose in Life (PU)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	
Past achievements give my life meaning	6.09 (1.30)	6.22 (0.99)	.239
I have clear goals and aims	6.05 (1.18)	6.11 (1.06)	.593
I have discovered a satisfying life purpose	5.52 (1.39)	5.43 (1.41)	.545
I live the kind of life I want to live	4.86 (1.82)	4.92 (1.69)	.726
I know where my life is going	4.82 (1.64)	4.95 (1.66)	.459
In achieving life's goals, I have felt fulfilled	4.59 (1.78)	4.49 (1.66)	.547
My mission in life gives me direction	5.90 (1.24)	5.98 (1.15)	.519
Life runs over with exciting good things	4.99 (1.55)	5.16 (1.49)	.260
Coherence (CO)			
The meaning of life is evident in the world around us	4.92 (1.66)	4.75 (1.66)	.331
I am aware of a powerful purpose toward which my life has been directed	5.47 (1.24)	5.43 (1.26)	.729
My life philosophy gives significance to my life	5.22 (1.48)	5.51 (2.14)	.146
Thinking of my life, I see a reason for my being here	5.98(1.49)	6.02 (1.15)	.708
A framework helps me understand life	5.10 (1.47)	5.22 (1.40)	.409
Parts of my life fit in a unified pattern	5.24 (1.27)	5.17 (1.29)	.579
I have a clear understanding of the ultimate meaning in life	5.20 (1.42)	4.89 (1.66)	.058
My personal existence is orderly and coherent	5.35 (1.20)	5.30 (1.26)	.692
Choice/Responsibleness (CR)			
Directing life is important	6.05 (1.40)	6.06 (1.36)	.948
My accomplishments are my effort	6.10 (1.27)	6.35 (0.92)	.023*
I determine what happens in my life	5.48 (1.80)	5.30 (1.68)	.291
I am free to make all life choices	5.73 (1.45)	5.45 (1.53)	.059
I can live my life the way I want to	5.77 (1.26)	5.48 (1.32)	.030*
My life is in my hands, I am in control	5.02 (1.87)	4.71 (1.92)	.117
Regarding important life matters, I make my own choices	5.77 (1.25)	5.35 (1.33)	.002**
I accept personal responsibility for my own life	6.23 (1.05)	6.14 (1.02)	.399

Death/Acceptance (DA)

I am less concerned about death than others	4.15 (1.88)	4.27 (1.79)	.508
Death makes little difference to me	3.48 (2.07)	3.20 (2.06)	.189
I am not concerned about the inevitability of death	4.54 (1.92)	4.47 (1.82)	.711
I neither fear death nor welcome it	5.05 (1.76)	5.09 (1.60)	.820
There is no sense in worrying about death	5.22 (1.76)	5.24 (1.66)	.906
I am not frightened of death like others	4.55 (1.75)	4.49 (1.76)	.731
The thought of death seldom enters my mind	4.61 (1.88)	4.32 (1.85)	.115
I accept death as another life experience	5.17 (1.74)	5.25 (1.54)	.640

Existential Vacuum (EV)

I seem to change my main objectives in life	3.76 (1.80)	3.62 (1.72)	.490
Something is missing from my life	4.58 (1.97)	4.48(1.86)	.617
I feel a lack of and a need to find real meaning in my life	3.62 (1.89)	3.51 (1.81)	.569
New activities soon lose their attractiveness	4.16 (1.63)	4.03 (1.72)	.444
I am destined to accomplish something important, but I cannot put my finger on it	4.87(1.70)	4.74(1.80)	.469
I daydream of finding a new place for my life and a new identity	4.23(1.91)	4.02(1.95)	.272
I find myself withdrawing from life with an "I don't care attitude"	3.34(1.93)	3.13(2.00)	.278
Life to me seems boring and uneventful	2.88(1.91)	2.65(1.76)	.213

Goal-Seeking (GS)

New and different things appeal to me	6.04 (1.04)	6.14 (0.97)	.311
I would enjoy breaking loose from the routine of life	4.94 (1.58)	4.91 (1.74)	.854
I am restless	3.83 (1.92)	4.04 (1.84)	.266
I feel the need for adventure and "new worlds to conquer"	5.28 (1.51)	5.34 (1.52)	.695
A new challenge in my life would appeal to me now	5.10 (1.39)	4.92 (1.55)	.242
I hope for something exciting in the future	6.50 (.981)	6.47 (.911)	.777
I am eager to get more out of my life than I have so far	6.25 (1.14)	5.94 (1.43)	.025*
I am determined to achieve new goals in the future	6.45 (.993)	6.41 (1.00)	.722

t-test significant at *p<.05; **p<.01