



FORMAN CHRISTIAN COLLEGE

(A CHARTERED UNIVERSITY)

Influence of Social and Cultural Capital on the Institutional Identity of

Undergraduate Students at FCCU

Shanzeh Ahmad

241545881

Thesis Supervisor: Dr. Mohammad Vaqas Ali

Forman Christian College

(A Chartered University)

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	1
Abstract	2
Acknowledgement	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Introduction	4
Conceptual Definitions.....	5
Significance of Study	6
Theoretical Framework	6
Literature Review	8
Identity Formation in Higher Educational Institutions	8
Institutional Identity.....	10
Social Capital	10
Cultural Capital.....	11
Underrepresented student populations.....	11
Research Gaps	12
Methodology	13
Research Design	13
Sampling Design	13
Data Collection	14
Measurements.....	14
Data Analysis	24
Results	25
Descriptive Statistics	26
Independent Sample T-tests.....	32
Multiple Linear Regression Analysis	41
Discussion	49
Conclusion	54
Implications and Further Research	54
References	56
Appendices	59
Appendix A: Informed Consent Form.....	59
Appendix B: IRB Certificate	60
Appendix C: Survey Questionnaire.....	61

Abstract

The study aimed to explore if there is a relationship between social and cultural capital with institutional identity among FCCU undergraduate students through a quantitative cross-sectional survey. The significance of this study is that it will look into environmental and social factors that develop a sense of belonging in their institution. The study hypothesizes that undergraduate students with higher social and cultural capital are more likely to develop a strong institutional identity. The Institutional Identity Scale will be used to measure the dependent variable, and the Scale of Cultural Capital and Personal Social Capital Scale will be used to measure the independent variables. 157 responses were collected through a convenience sampling method. Data analysis was conducted on SPSS v.25 using Factor Analysis for validity and consistency of data, the Cronbach Alpha Test for reliability, T-tests for bivariate analysis, and multiple linear regression to test the relationship of the variables. The hypothesis was partially true, in that cultural capital had a significant relationship with Institutional Identity while social capital did not. The implications imply that the institution should facilitate the cultural capital of the students by introducing more out-of-classroom activities to improve Institutional Identity. Further research can be conducted on studying specific ethnic or religious minorities and their Institutional Identity and developing culturally specific scales for increasing the validity of research.

Keywords: Institutional identity, Social capital, Cultural capital, University students

Acknowledgment

I would like to express gratitude towards my supervisor, Dr. Mohammad Vaqas Ali, for guiding me throughout my thesis journey and taking time out to answer all of my queries. I would also like to thank Dr. Sara Rizvi Jafree, HOD of the Department of Sociology for appointing me as a Thesis Representative which has taught me a lot about research and helping other students in their theses. I would also like to thank my sister, Alizeh Ahmad, who has helped me with data collection and providing support when I needed it. I would like to extend my gratitude to my friends for helping me with data collection and showing interest in my thesis: Zainab Nauman, Seerat Irfan, Hamza Tahir, Dawood Saleem, Muhammad Faleh, and Hareem Kamran. I would like to acknowledge my mother, Ayesha Waheed, for her unwavering support and encouragement that helped me throughout my academic and personal life.

Introduction

Universities are considered a hub for individual development due to the diversity of students and advanced curriculum that employs students with the necessary skills and knowledge for practical life (Byrom & Lightfoot, 2012). Thousands of students from all over Pakistan enroll themselves in higher education institutions, such as universities, for their undergraduate studies. It plays a functional role in disciplining and strengthening one's personal economic, cultural, and social development (Asuncion, 2021). However, developing an institutional identity allows students to successfully transition into university or higher education institutions. It is beneficial for the students to internalize the institutional values and develop an affinity with their university, as the manifestation of those values will allow them to easily achieve their academic and professional goals (Byrom & Lightfoot, 2012). This identity formation requires students to merge fundamental aspects of their identity with their institutional identity, which is aided by an interplay of agents such as social and cultural capital (Torres et al., 2009). It is theorized that students who have more social and cultural capital before entering university are more likely to navigate through the university's social environment and access facilities to their advantage (Jensen & Jetten, 2015).

The study aims to explore how the social and cultural capital of undergraduate students allows them to develop their institutional identity. It is hypothesized in this study that undergraduate students with higher social and cultural capital would be more likely to develop a strong institutional identity. The study will focus specifically on freshman, sophomore, and junior year students, as they are currently experiencing the formation of their institutional identity with the social and cultural capital that they acquired before entering university. The study uses the Institutional Identity Scale by Thomas et al. (2012), the Scale of Cultural Capital by Balboni and Cubelli (2016), and the Personal Social Capital Scale by

Chen et al. (2008).

Conceptual Definitions

Institutional Identity

According to Thomas et al. (2012), individuals associate themselves with other social groups that can either maintain or enhance their self-esteem. Institutional identity is the development of an association with one's academic institution, which can bring meaning to the individual's social identity (Thomas et al., 2012). The level of institutional identity of a university student can determine the student's journey through their undergraduate studies. A sense of connectedness to one's institution results in good attendance and a higher likelihood of achieving academic success (Bilal et al., 2021).

Social Capital

Social capital is interpreted as belonging to social groups or social networks in which individuals share cultural norms and shared purposes (Jensen & Jetten, 2015). The concept of social capital refers to the conscious and unconscious effort to achieve membership in institutionalized social groups or networks that reap material and symbolic benefits (Bourdieu, 2011). Social capital can influence a student's sense of belonging at university if they are capable of developing new connections there or have already developed a network before entering the university (Soria & Stebleton, 2013).

Cultural Capital

Cultural capital is associated with three categories: the institutionalized state (educational credentials), the objectified state (media and material objects such as books and music), and the embodied state (manners and linguistic skills taught by family) (Bourdieu, 2011). Cultural capital is defined as the knowledge of the dominant culture and the use of

cultural tools, which can also influence the student's sense of belonging at their university (Sullivan, 2001). Pishghadam (2023) argued that cultural capital can lead to literacy and cultural competence that can further result in higher education success.

The research question for this study is:

Whether an undergraduate student's social and cultural capital facilitate the development of their institutional identity?

Significance of Study

The transition into higher education institutions for undergraduate studies occurs along with the transition from adolescence into adulthood for several students, except for some who joined these institutions later in their adulthood (Bilal et al., 2021). This is a challenging period for many students. The constant interaction with numerous people from different backgrounds, from the student body and the faculty, and meeting the standards and rules set by the university itself can be an overwhelming experience (Bilal et al., 2021). The students are active social actors who actively engage themselves in developing their social and cultural capital, which determines their level of belonging and the inauguration of their institutional identity (Anheire et al., 1995). Therefore, it is vital to assess the way students from various backgrounds manage the transition into university during their initial years, as a lack of a sense of belonging can result in hardships such as lack of motivation, loneliness, and other negative emotions (Bilal et al., 2021).

Theoretical Framework

Karl Marx conceptualized capital under monetary practices, and Bourdieu further divided the concept into two other branches: social and cultural capital (Pishghadam et al., 2023). Bourdieu's (2011) theory on different forms of capital is related to the accumulation

of labor, which enables an individual to embody an identity that allows them to engage and merge in their social environment. The accumulation of social and cultural capital establishes the individual's position in a new social space, such as by joining a university (Ivemark & Ambrose, 2021).

Bourdieu defined cultural capital as encompassing long-held habits during the socialization process and the accumulation of valuable cultural practices (Anheirer et al., 1995). Cultural capital can be further divided into incorporated cultural capital and symbolic cultural capital, which often differentiates high-culture practices from low-culture practices (Anheier et al., 1995). For example, individuals who are more familiar with genres of high-culture literary works have high degrees of symbolic cultural capital. Social capital consists of mobilizing resources through membership in social networks (Anheier et al., 1995). Individuals with social connections before entering an institution may be more likely to build more social connections quickly.

Bourdieu's concept of "fields" is also relevant in understanding the relationship of the individual as a social actor with cultural and social capital. The "fields" are presented as arenas where social activity is played out (Anheier et al., 1995). In this case, the participation of individuals in "fields" before entering university aids in accumulating social and cultural capital. Henceforth, social capital and cultural capital are taken as independent variables that help develop the student's affinity with the university or their institutional identity.

In addition, various social settings and environments of the individuals, such as their socioeconomic status, education from secondary high school, and parents' educational level, also contribute to the accumulation of social and cultural capital. Human ecological theory centers on the environmental elements that affect an individual's development and the constant interaction with the environment results in a continuous evolution (Asuncion et al.,

2021). It consists of the microsystem (primary socialization and family structure), the mesosystem (secondary socialization at previous high school), the exosystem (the social environment's interaction with the individual, such as the student community and parent's socioeconomic status), and the macrosystem (cultural influences and beliefs), which impact an individual's identity (Asuncion et al., 2021). These systems will be considered control variables in determining how social and cultural capital is accumulated by the students after they enter university.

The study proposes the extent to which the social and cultural capitals develop an individual's affinity with their institutional identity. The research will be conducted on variables that test the relationship of an individual's social and cultural capital with their institutional identity. Focusing on the accumulation of social and cultural capital over some time through various social settings and whether it strengthens the individual's institutional identity after they enter the university.

Literature Review

Identity Formation in Higher Educational Institutions

Several studies have researched identity development and the forms of capital that specifically target university students. According to Torres et al. (2009), identity development is described as a means to meet social expectations in a given environment for the individual to achieve their possible potential and goals. There is a plethora of theories that explain how identity is formed and developed in disciplines such as psychology, sociology, social psychology, human ecology, and postmodern studies. The theories on identity development have evolved over the years, especially in the case of institutional identity in higher educational institutions, as identified by Torres et al. (2009).

Sociologists have also focused on the concept of identity about the individual's association with institutions of higher education. Higher educational institutions are considered spaces of identity development as they combine the individual's personality traits and their roles in the institution (Torres et al., 2009). Several researchers have employed Bourdieu's theories to explain the institutional identity development of university students. Byrom and Lightfoot (2012) divided how identity is maintained by the family and later develops after an accumulation of educational institution-related experiences, to which Jensen and Jetten (2015) further argued that social capital before entering a university creates a difference in developing a sense of institutional identity and belonging. While obtaining certain forms of capital before entering a university and how they may aid students in their institutional identity, Bilal et al. (2021) argued that institutional identity is a flexible occurrence that consists of factors that include the individual's efforts to create a sense of belonging in the institution.

Bilal et al., (2021) defined institutional identity as the individual's process of navigating towards the crisis and commitment of the institute that they are a part of. The author differentiated crisis as a state for individuals to explore and reassess their values and choices, while commitment is the state when the individual finds the answer to the assessment of their beliefs and values and becomes committed to following them (Bilal et al., 2021). Torres et al. (2009) discussed similar arguments under the psychological research on identity formation and how the identity of university students is an interaction of both genetic and environmental factors.

In addition, Tran and Defeo (2021) applied the human ecological theory, in which they asserted that the institution is also responsible for assisting the students in their institutional identity by aligning it with their individuality and personal values. Asuncion et al. (2021) proclaimed that some individuals are more prepared for transitioning into

universities due to their favorable environmental and social factors. Identities are then further developed after the joining university as individuals are in constant interaction with their surroundings, which changes their sense of self in context to the environment (Torres et al., 2009).

Institutional Identity

Institutional identity has been referred to as a feeling of connectedness and investment in an institute; in this case, it refers to connectedness in an institution of higher education (Bilal et al., 2021). Institutional identity has been defined as the extent to which one identifies with their academic institution and has a positive correlation to an individual's self-esteem (Thomas et al., 2012). The concept of institutional identity has been studied to determine how closely students associate themselves with their institution and to discuss how low levels of institutional identity may result in absenteeism and academic failure (Thomas et al., 2012).

Social Capital

Soria and Stebleton (2013) argued that an individual's social class operates depending on the individual's level of economic, social, and cultural capital; therefore, this may result in isolation for some individuals in university. The author conceptualizes social class as a student's expectations, role models, values, and social networks (Soria & Stebleton, 2013). It is considered useful as individuals can draw resources from the groups and networks they belong to, which can result in the social and economic well-being of individuals and develop a sense of commitment to their groups (Soria & Stebleton, 2013). In addition, Anheier et al. (1995) argued that social capital weakens hierarchical structure due to the flexibility of participation in groups and ranks but results in more segmentation among individuals due to differentiated groups.

Social capital has also been defined in terms of online networks, which are correlated

to an individual's ability to form connections online and increase social capital despite the individual's geographical location (Ellison et al., 2007). Ellison et al. (2007) studied the use of social networking sites that develop and maintain social connections online, with more emphasis on the use of Facebook by university students.

Cultural Capital

Cultural capital has been defined by Bourdieu as an accumulation of valued cultural objects and activities along with educational qualifications and this is divided into three types of cultural capital: embodied, objectified, and institutionalized (Bourdieu, 2011). Studies have argued that possessing a certain level of cultural capital can be associated with knowledge of high culture, for example, studying languages (Caregnato et al., 2022). Cultural capital is attained through socialization; hence, the parent's education of an individual and the type of high school the student attended are both major variables that can influence the level of cultural capital the individual possesses (Balboni et al., 2019).

Underrepresented student populations

Several studies have focused on underrepresented student populations, such as working class, minorities, or first-generation migrant children, in universities; as a means of comparing their experiences in developing their institutional identity as compared to other students. The working-class identity goes through a form of transformation or transgression in the middle-class field of education based on the perceptions of their primary family habitus (Byrom & Lightfoot, 2012). This study discusses that working-class students sometimes have difficulty developing a sense of belonging in their university and usually gravitate towards similar-minded individuals and networks that can ease their transition into the university (Byrom & Lightfoot, 2012). Ultimately, the students in the study were able to adapt to their institutional habitus and increase their institutional identity (Byrom & Lightfoot, 2012).

According to Soria and Stebleton (2013), while many universities do not check students' social class for admission, their social class plays a vital role in their identity development as it may support or hinder them from creating a sense of belonging and adapting their social capital into academic engagement. Many first-generation migrants and minority students face a lack of cultural and social capital that prevents them from developing an institutional identity and may result in low self-esteem for the students in the university (Thomas et al., 2012).

Research Gaps

Studies based on Bourdieu's theories on forms of capital have utilized qualitative research methods such as interviews and mixed methods, which include interviews and secondary quantitative data or questionnaires made by the researchers themselves. The questionnaires were based on various pre-existing scales, such as the Institutional Identity Scale.

Several studies have included socioeconomic class and parents' educational attainment, as they play an important role in developing an individual's social and cultural capital. The human ecological theory has been used in studies about post-secondary educational transition to develop control variables in questionnaires to examine various support systems (family, high school, friends, relatives, and advisors) that help students in their transition into universities (Kim et al., 2020).

Considering the literature, few studies have conducted research on social and cultural capital about institutional identity in the context of Pakistani university students. Therefore, institutional identity is the dependent variable of this study and the two independent variables are social capital and cultural capital. The control variables will measure the level of social and cultural capital attained in their environment before entering university, which may also

affect an individual's institutional identity. The control variables include the participant's secondary high school type (mesosystem), their parents' employment (exosystem), and their parent's level of education (macrosystem). Henceforth, a quantitative multi-dimensional approach is used to frame the institutional identity of undergraduate students and determine if the level of their social and cultural capital impacts their association and sense of belonging with their university.

Methodology

Research Design

This is a quantitative research design to examine whether social and cultural capital facilitates undergraduate students in strengthening their institutional identity. A cross-sectional survey was conducted on university students at FCCU after the IRB had provided permission for data collection.

The survey questions were aimed at testing the hypothesis that undergraduate students with higher social and cultural capital are more likely to develop a stronger institutional identity.

Sampling Design

The study population was undergraduate students of Forman Christian College (A Chartered University), situated in the metropolitan city of Lahore, Pakistan. FCCU consists of a diverse population of students from each province of Pakistan, originating from both rural and urban backgrounds. The sample of the study is undergraduate students of the university, and only freshmen, sophomore, and junior year students were counted in this study. The study only counted students in their 2nd (freshman), 3rd (sophomore), 4th (sophomore), 5th (junior), and 6th (junior) semesters and compared to what extent their

institutional identity has been affected by their social and cultural capital.

Data Collection

The sample for data collection was selected through convenience sampling, as it was difficult to obtain a list of students in specific semesters from the academic office. The questionnaire was distributed by the academic office to the student body via email and shared on WhatsApp (communication app) with student groups by the researcher. The survey was also distributed to professors of different departments and presidents of student societies to meet the required sample size.

Measurements

The control variables were age, gender, whether they were a hostelite or a day scholar, intended major (as some students may not have claimed their majors yet), and the semester they were in. Parents' education, parents' employment, and secondary high school of the participant were also included as control variables. In this study, social capital and cultural capital are the independent variables, while institutional identity is the dependent variable.

The control variables were dummy-coded into two category variables, such as Gender, which was coded as Male=0 and Female=1, Age, which was dummy-coded as 18-20=0 and 21 and above=1, Hostelites were coded as 0 and Day Scholars were coded as 1, Father's and mother's education, which was coded as Undergrad and below=0 and Postgrad and above=1, Father's employment, which was coded as Government job or Retired=0 and Private Job=1 and Mother's employment was coded as Housewife or retired=0 and Job sector=1. Three dummy variables were created for the Intended Major which coded them into the departments of the student's major and kept Natural Science as a reference category separately from Social Science, Humanities, and Business. Two dummy variables were

created for the Semester, and they were coded into three categories; 2nd and 3rd semesters, 4th and 5th semesters, and 6th semester. The 2nd and 3rd-semester categories were kept as reference categories separately from the 4th 5th semesters and 6th semesters.

Institutional Identity Scale

Institutional Identity is conceptualized as connectedness to one's academic institution and, in the case of this study, it will measure how closely connected the participants feel to their university (Thomas et al., 2012). The Institutional Identity Scale consists of five dimensions with a 7-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree (Thomas et al., 2012). The five dimensions measure public regard, private regard, centrality, belonging, and bonding and each consists of three questions. *Public regard* refers to how the student thinks others feel about their academic institution; *private regard* measures how the student feels positively about their academic institution; *centrality* assesses how being a part of the institution is central to their identity; *belonging* will assess the feeling of belonging in that institution and *bonding* will measure how connected the student is to others in their institution (Thomas et al., 2012). Factor Analysis was used to measure the internal consistency and validity of the scales. This helped in determining which variables and items were loading meaningfully together and which needed to be removed. Four items were dropped from the scale, which were mostly reverse-coded. The subscale questions and factor loadings are shared in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1

List of subscale questions and factor loadings in the Institutional Identity scale

Subscales	Questions	Factor Loadings
Public Regard	In general, my university is considered by others	0.850

	to be a good university.	
	People with whom I interact off campus respond positively when they find out about the college I attend.	0.850
Private Regard	In general, I am glad that I am attending my university.	0.868
	My university is not good.	0.823
	I am proud to be a student at my university.	0.849
Centrality	Being a student at my college is an important part of who I am.	0.913
	In general, being a student at my university is an important part of my self-image.	0.913
Belonging	I have a strong sense of belonging to my university.	0.797
	I feel accepted by other students in my university.	0.797
Bonding	I have a strong attachment to other students at my university.	0.787
	It is my responsibility to help other students at my university whenever I can.	0.787
Dropped items	In general, others do not respect my university.	0.387
	Overall going to my university has very little to do with how I feel about myself.	0.160
	I feel like a stranger when I am on my university	0.496

campus.

I do not feel a connection with students or alumni of my university when I meet them off campus.	0.493
---	-------

Cultural Capital Scale

Cultural capital is interpreted as the individual's knowledge and use of cultural codes within their community and it is further divided into 3 dimensions: cultural activities, cultural technical knowledge, and social activities (Balboni et al., 2019). The Scale of Cultural Capital is a 14-item scale that measures three dimensions: expert using, consuming, and participating (Balboni et al., 2019). *Expert-using* consists of five items that include the frequency of reading books for work, attending cultural courses, using foreign language, and practicing cultural activities such as art, writing, and many more (Balboni et al., 2019). *Consuming* consists of five items that measure the frequency of visiting museums, and galleries, reading books for pleasure, and attending exhibitions (Balboni et al., 2019). *Participating* consists of four items that assess the individual's involvement in social, religious, political, and cultural associations and groups (Balboni et al., 2019). Factor Analysis was used to measure the internal consistency and validity of the scales. This helped in determining which variables and items were loading meaningfully together and which needed to be removed. Out of 14 items, only eight were kept. Most of the expert-using items were removed due to the results not loading meaningfully and the items on books "Reading books for pleasure", "Reading books for study or work" and "How many books do you have on your shelf" were removed due to a lack of validity with the entire scale. The subscale questions and factor loadings can be seen in Table 1.2.

Table 1.2

List of subscale questions and factor loadings of Cultural Capital Scale

Subscales	Questions	Factor Loadings
Expert using	How many times a year do you attend courses, conventions, conferences, or seminars on cultural themes?	0.542
Consuming	How many times a year do you attend theatrical performances?	0.741
	How many times a year do you visit art museums, museums, exhibitions or galleries?	0.773
	How many times a year do you attend concerts, music festivals, or other musical events?	0.826
Participating	Do you usually participate in the activities of social associations/groups (volunteer groups that offer caregiving, assistance and solidarity, environmental protection, women's groups, local tourism promotion, student unions)?	0.746
	Do you usually participate in activities of religious or political associations/groups?	0.748
	Do you usually participate in the activities of cultural associations/groups? (for example, theater or dance groups, bands, arts and crafts groups, traditional folk groups, promotional associations for cultural events, youth-oriented cultural associations, and online cultural associations)	0.827
	Considering all these types of associations/groups, how much time do you spend on these activities altogether?	0.887
Dropped items	On average, how many books do you read for	0.42

pleasure?	
On average, how many books do you have in your house?	0.223
On average, how many books a year do you read for study/work?	0.274
How often do you use the Internet to stay informed or learn more about something?	0.283
Do you use languages other than your own for fun/pleasure or work/study?	0.038
Which of the following cultural activities do you practice?	0.090

Personal Social Capital Scale

Social capital will be defined as a social resource that determines the way an individual integrates with others and their social environment (Chen et al., 2008). Social capital will be divided into two dimensions: bonding capital and bridging capital (Chen et al., 2008). *Bonding capital* refers to an individual's network connections that are formed based on mutual interests and attraction and *bridging capital* refers to the network connections that link the individual to different kinds of people (Chen et al., 2008). The Social Capital Scale is a 10-item scale with 42 sub-items that measures two dimensions through a 5-point Likert scale (Chen et al., 2008). The bonding capital is reflected in Cap1 to Cap5 items and the bridging capital is reflected in Cap6 to Cap10 items (Chen et al., 2008). Factor Analysis was used to measure the internal consistency and validity of the scales. This helped in determining which variables and items were loading meaningfully together and which needed

to be removed. A few sub-items had to be removed, such as “family”, which did not load with the other sub-items such as relatives, friends, neighbors, coworkers, and country fellows.

The subscale questions and factor loadings can be viewed in Table 1.3.

Table 1.3

List of subscales and questions of the Personal Social Capital Scale

Subscales	Questions	Factor Loadings
Bonding Capital	How do you rate the number of people in each of the six categories?	
	Your coworkers	0.565
	Your county fellows/ old classmates	0.568
	With how many people in each of the following categories do you keep routine contact?	
	Your relatives	0.644
	People in your neighborhood	0.634
	Your friends	0.567
	Your coworkers	0.690
	Your country fellows	0.670
	Among the people in each of the six categories, how many can you trust?	
Your relatives	0.695	

People in your neighborhood	0.707
-----------------------------	-------

Your friends	0.544
--------------	-------

Your coworkers	0.754
----------------	-------

Your country fellows	0.726
----------------------	-------

Among the people in the six categories, how many will help you upon your request?

Your relatives	0.624
----------------	-------

People in your neighborhood	0.747
-----------------------------	-------

Your friends	0.580
--------------	-------

Your coworkers	0.755
----------------	-------

Your country fellows	0.750
----------------------	-------

When people in all six categories are considered, how many possess the following assets and resources?

Certain political power	0.551
-------------------------	-------

Wealth or owners of an enterprise or company	0.505
--	-------

Broad connections with others	0.532
-------------------------------	-------

High reputation/influential	0.607
-----------------------------	-------

Bridging Capital

How do you rate the number of the following types of groups/organizations in your community?

Governmental political, economic, and social groups/ organizations	0.599
Cultural, recreational, and leisure groups/organizations	0.568
Do you participate in activities for how many of each of these groups?	
Governmental, political, economic, and social groups/ organizations	0.794
Cultural, recreational, and leisure groups/organizations	0.755
Among each of the groups, how many represent your rights and interests?	
Governmental, political, economic, and social groups/ organizations	0.784
Cultural, recreational, and leisure groups/organizations	0.716
Among each of the groups, how many will help you upon your request?	
Governmental, political, economic, and social groups/ organizations	0.822
Cultural, recreational, and leisure groups/organizations	0.802
When the two categories are considered, how many possess the following assets/resources?	
Significant power for decision-making	0.589

	Solid financial basis	0.569
	Broad social connections	0.522
	Great social influence	0.542
<hr/>		
Dropped items	How do you rate the number of people in each of the six categories of family members	0.415
	How do you rate the number of people in each of the six categories- Your relatives	0.435
	How do you rate the number of people in each of the six categories in your neighborhood	0.397
	How do you rate the number of people in each of the six categories- Your friends	0.467
	With how many people in each of the following categories do you keep routine contact-Your family members	0.376
	Among the people in each of the six categories, how many can you trust? - Your family members	0.376
	Among the people in the six categories, how many will help you upon your request? -Your family members	0.375
	When people in all six categories are considered, how many possess the following assets and resources? - With high school or more education	0.225
	When people in all six categories are considered, how many possess the following	0.360
<hr/>		

assets and resources? - With a professional job

Data Analysis

The data analysis was conducted through SPSS, in which the Cronbach Alpha Test was used to measure the reliability of the scales. The results of the subscales of each scale can be seen in Table 2.1, Table 2.2, and Table 2.3, respectively.

Table 2.1

Cronbach Alpha values of the subscales of Institutional Identity

Scale	Items	A
Public Regard	2	.613
Private Regard	3	.803
Centrality	2	.800
Belonging	2	.419
Bonding	2	.374

Table 2.2

Cronbach Alpha values of the Cultural Capital Scale

Scale	Items	A
Consuming	3	.686
Expert using	1	

Participation	4	.814
---------------	---	------

Table 2.3

Cronbach Alpha values of the Personal Social Capital Scale

Scale	Items	A
Bonding Capital	21	.926
Bridging Capital	12	.893

Results

The research hypothesized that students with higher social and cultural capital are more likely to have a strong institutional identity. Descriptive statistics were used to provide the characteristics and demographics of the sample (Koyanagi et al., 2021). Table 4.1 consists of the descriptive statistics of the control variables, which were “gender,” “age,” “intended major,” “semester,” “hostelite or day scholar,” “secondary high school type,” “father’s educational level,” “mother’s educational level,” “father’s employment” and “mother’s employment.” The control variable “ethnicity” was removed due to incoherent responses that could not be easily coded and some respondents were not aware of the ethnicity of the individual. These variables have been dummy-coded, so several categories are now grouped into two categories for further statistical analysis. Table 4.2 consists of the descriptive statistics of the dependent variable, “Institutional Identity”, Table 4.3 consists of the descriptive statistics of the independent variable, “Cultural Capital” and Table 4.4 consists of the descriptive statistics of the second independent variable, “Social Capital”. Independent t-

tests were used to test each control variable with five dependent variable subscales for significance. Linear regression analysis was used to test five independent variables and 13 control variables against each of the five dependent variables of Institutional Identity. Table 5.1, Table 5.2, Table 5.3, Table 5.4, and Table 5.5 consist of the regression analysis of each dependent variable subscale with all of the independent variables and control variables. Statistical significance was placed at $p < 0.05$ for both independent T-tests and regression analysis.

Descriptive Statistics

Table 3.1

Frequencies of control variables (N=157)

Variable	Frequency	Percent
Gender		
Male	73	46.6
Female	84	53.5
N	157	100.0
Age		
20 and below	104	66.2
21 and above	53	33.8
N	157	100.0
Major in Social Science		

Others	81	20.4
Social Science	76	48.4
N	157	100.0

Major in Humanities

Natural Science	139	88.5
Humanities	18	11.5
N	157	100.0

Major in Business

Natural Science	130	82.8
Business	27	17.2
N	157	100.0

Students in 4th and 5th semester

2 nd , 3 rd and 6 th semester	99	63.4
4 th and 5 th semester	58	57.4
N	157	100.0

Students in 6th semester

2 nd , 3 rd , 4 th and 5 th semester	101	64.3
6 th semester	56	35.7

N	157	100.0
Hostelite or Day Scholar		
Hostelite	33	21.0
Day Scholar	124	90.4
Secondary High School Type		
Public/Government School	15	9.6
Private School	142	90.4
Father's Education Level		
Undergrad and below	75	47.8
Postgrad and above	82	52.2
Mother's Educational Level		
Undergrad and below	100	63.7
Postgrad and above	57	36.3
Father's Employment		
Government or Retired	31	19.7
Private job	126	80.3
Mother's Employment		
Housewife or Retired	103	65.6

As the control variables have been dummy-coded, the mode will be between 0 and 1. The mode of the Gender variable was 2.00, in which 46.6% were males and 53.5 % were females. The age variable's mode was 0.00, in which 66.2% were 20 years of age or below and 33.8% were 21 years of age or above. The three dummy variables of majors (Social Science, Humanities, and Business) had a mode of 0.00. In the Social Science major variable, 51.6% were non-Social Science majors and 48.8% were Social Science majors. In the Humanities major variable, 88.5% were non-Humanities majors and 11.5% were Humanities majors. In the Business major variable, 82.8% were non-business majors and 17.2% were Business majors. Semester 4th and 5th and Semester 6th variables had their modes at 0.00. In the Semester 4th and 5th variables, 63.4% were from other semesters and 57.4% were from the 4th and 5th semesters. In the Semester 6th variable, 64.3% were from other semesters and 35.7% were from the 6th semester. The Day scholar variable's mode was 1.00 in which 21% were Hostelites and 90.4% were Day Scholars. High school type mode was at 1.00, in which 9.6% were from public or government schools and 90.4% were from private schools. The father's education variable's mode was 1.00, in which 47.8% were those with an undergraduate degree and below and 52.2% were those with a postgraduate degree and above. Mother's education variable's mode 0.00, in which 63.7% were those with an undergraduate degree and below and 36.3% were those with a postgraduate degree and above. The father's employment variable's mode was 1.00, in which 19.7% worked in the government or retired and 80.3% worked in the private sector. The mother's employment variable's mode was 0.00 in which 65.6% were housewives and 34.4% were actively working.

Table 3.2

Frequencies of dependent variables

Variable	Range	Mean	Standard Deviation
Public Regard	12	9.90	2.51
Private Regard	18	15.80	3.93
Centrality	12	9.12	3.19
Belonging	12	9.72	2.51
Brotherhood	12	8.53	2.98

The range of Public Regard was from 2 to 14, the mean was 9.90, the standard deviation was 2.51, the median was 10.00 and the mode was 12.00. The skewness was slightly negative at -0.759 with a kurtosis of 0.659. The range of Private Regard was from 3 to 21, the mean was 15.80, the standard deviation was 3.93, the median was 17.00 and the mode was 18.00. The skewness was negative at -0.819 with a kurtosis of 0.462. The range of Centrality was from 2 to 14, the mean was 9.12, the standard deviation was 3.19, 10.00 was the median, and 11.00 was the mode. The skewness was -0.399 with a kurtosis of -0.571. The range of Belonging was from 2 to 14, the mean was 9.72, the standard deviation was 2.51, and the median and mode were 10.00. The skewness was -0.615 with a kurtosis at 0.618. The range of Bonding was from 2 to 14, the mean was 8.53, the standard deviation was 2.98, the median was 9.00 and the mode was 11.00. The skewness was -0.193 with a kurtosis at -0.601.

Table 3.3

Frequencies of independent variables of Cultural Capital

Variable	Range	Mean	Standard Deviation
----------	-------	------	--------------------

Consuming	10	5.78	2.07
Expert using	4	2.33	1.13
Participating	13	7.04	3.08

The range of Consumption was from 3 to 13, the mean was 5.78, the standard deviation was 2.07, median and mode were 6.00. The skewness was 0.632 with a kurtosis at -0.013. The range of Expert using was from 1 to 5, the mean was 2.33, the standard deviation was 2.00, and the median and mode were 2.00. The skewness was 0.662 with a kurtosis at -0.229. The range of Participating was from 4 to 17, the mean was 7.04, the standard deviation was 3.08, the median was 6.00 and the mode was 4.00. The skewness was positive at 1.290 with a kurtosis of 1.411.

Table 3.4

Frequencies of independent variables of Social Capital

Variable	Range	Mean	Standard deviation
Bonding capital	79	57.07	14.94
Bridging capital	46	33.87	9.57

The range of Bonding capital was from 26 to 105, the mean was 57.07, the standard deviation was 14.94, the median was 56.00 and the mode was 38.00 (smallest value of multiple modes). The skewness was 0.194 with a kurtosis of 0.195. The range of Bridging capital was from 14 to 60, the mean was 33.87, the standard deviation was 9.57, the median was 33.00 and the mode was 28.00. The skewness was 0.381 with a kurtosis at -0.78.

Independent Sample T-tests

Table 4.1

Significance T-test table for Public Regard dependent variable

						<i>CL</i>	
	<i>Variable</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Standard deviation</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>Mean Difference</i>	<i>LL</i>	<i>UP</i>
Father's Education	Undergrad and below	10.40	2.39	2.396	0.948	0.166	1.731
	Postgrad and above	9.45	2.54				
Mother's Employment	Housewife or retired	10.18	2.49	1.943	0.814	-0.136	1.641
	Job Sector	9.37	2.49				

Table 4.2

Significance T-test table for Private Regard dependent variable

						<i>CL</i>	
	<i>Variable</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Standard deviation</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>Mean Difference</i>	<i>LL</i>	<i>UP</i>
Mother's Employment	Housewife or retired	16.37	3.69	2.578	1.674	0.391	2.958
	Job Sector	14.70	4.17				

Table 4.3*Significance T-test table for Belonging dependent variable*

						<i>CL</i>	
	<i>Variable</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Standard deviation</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>Mean Difference</i>	<i>LL</i>	<i>UP</i>
Gender	Male	10.26	2.53	2.582	0.998	0.218	1.778
	Female	9.26	2.41				

Table 4.4*Significance T-test table for Bonding dependent variable*

						<i>CL</i>	
	<i>Variable</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Standard deviation</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>Mean Difference</i>	<i>LL</i>	<i>UP</i>
Gender	Male	9.06	3.14	2.113	0.997	0.064	1.929
	Female	8.07	2.77				
Age	20 and below	8.19	2.95	-2.038	-1.015	-1.999	-0.310
	21 and above	9.20	2.95				
Father's Employment	Government job or retired	9.45	2.95	1.927	1.142	-0.286	2.312
	Private Job	8.30	2.95				

Gender

A bivariate analysis was conducted to compare the subscales of the Institutional Identity (Public Regard, Private Regard, Centrality, Belonging, and Bonding) in males and females of FCCU undergraduate students. There was a significant difference in Belonging between males ($M=10.26$, $SD=2.53$) and females ($M=9.26$, $SD=2.41$); $t(155) = 2.582$, $p = 0.012$. There was a significant difference in Bonding between males ($M=9.06$, $SD=3.14$) and females ($M=8.07$, $SD=2.77$); $t(155) = 2.113$, $p = 0.036$. There was no significant difference in Public Regard between males ($M=10.19$, $SD=2.59$) and females ($M=9.65$, $SD=2.43$); $t(155) = 1.337$, $p = 0.183$. There was no significant difference in Private Regard between males ($M=16.16$, $SD=3.84$) and females ($M=15.48$, $SD=4.00$); $t(155) = 1.074$, $p = 0.284$. There was no significant difference in Centrality between males ($M=9.38$, $SD=3.29$) and females ($M=8.90$, $SD=3.11$); $t(155) = 0.936$, $p = 0.351$.

Age

The subscales of Institutional Identity were tested based on age (0=18-20, 1=21 and above) and the results indicated that there was a significant difference in Bonding between students aged 20 and below ($M=8.29$, $SD=2.95$) and students aged 21 and above ($M=9.20$, $SD=2.95$); $t(155) = 2.038$, $p = 0.043$. There was no significant difference in Public Regard between students aged 20 and below ($M=9.70$, $SD=2.52$) and students aged 21 and above ($M=10.30$, $SD=2.50$); $t(155) = 1.417$, $p = 0.158$. There was no significant difference in Private Regard between students aged 20 and below ($M=15.45$, $SD=4.13$) and students aged 21 and above ($M=16.49$, $SD=3.45$); $t(155) = 1.571$, $p = 0.118$. There was no significant difference in Centrality between students aged 20 and below ($M=8.82$, $SD=3.07$) and students aged 21 and above ($M=9.71$, $SD=3.36$); $t(155) = 1.659$, $p = 0.099$. There was no significant difference in Belonging between students aged 20 and below ($M=9.48$, $SD=2.55$)

and students aged 21 and above ($M=10.20$, $SD=2.37$); $t(155) = 1.726$, $p = 0.086$.

Major in Social Science

There was no significant difference between Public Regard of students from other majors ($M=9.79$, $SD=2.59$) and students majoring in Social Science ($M=10.02$, $SD=2.43$); $t(155) = -0.587$, $p = 0.558$. There was no significant difference between Private Regard of students from other majors ($M=15.622$, $SD=4.17$) and students majoring in Social Science ($M=16.22$, $SD=3.64$); $t(155) = -1.301$, $p = 0.195$. There was no significant difference between the Centrality of students from other majors ($M=9.09$, $SD=3.25$) and students majoring in Social Science ($M=9.15$, $SD=3.15$); $t(155) = -0.155$, $p = 0.908$. There was no significant difference between Belonging of students of other majors ($M=9.72$, $SD=2.62$) and students majoring in Social Science ($M=9.72$, $SD=2.39$); $t(155) = 0.012$, $p = 0.991$. There was no significant difference between Bonding of students of other majors ($M=8.51$, $SD=2.93$) and students majoring in Social Science ($M=8.55$, $SD=3.04$); $t(155) = 0.071$, $p = 0.943$.

Major in Humanities

There was no significant difference between Public Regard of students from other majors ($M=9.75$, $SD=2.51$) and students majoring in Humanities ($M=10.83$, $SD=2.38$); $t(155) = 1.674$, $p = 0.098$. There was no significant difference between Private Regard of students from other majors ($M=15.69$, $SD=3.38$) and students majoring in Humanities ($M=16.66$, $SD=4.29$); $t(155) = 0.990$, $p = 0.324$. There was no significant difference between the Centrality of students from other majors ($M=8.97$, $SD=3.15$) and students majoring in Humanities ($M=10.33$, $SD=3.37$); $t(155) = 1.712$, $p = 0.089$. There was no significant difference between Belonging of students from other majors ($M=9.69$, $SD=2.45$) and students majoring in Humanities ($M=9.94$, $SD=2.99$); $t(155) = 0.039$, $p = 0.696$. There was no

significant difference between Bonding of students from other majors ($M=8.48$, $SD=2.93$) and students majoring in Humanities ($M=8.88$, $SD=3.41$); $t(155) = 0.534$, $p = 0.594$.

Major in Business

There was no significant difference between the Public Regard of students from other majors ($M=9.83$, $SD=2.61$) and students majoring in Business ($M=10.25$, $SD=1.95$); $t(155) = 0.804$, $p = 0.422$. There was no significant difference between Private Regard of students from other majors ($M=15.73$, $SD=4.01$) and students majoring in Business ($M=16.14$, $SD=3.60$); $t(155) = 0.500$, $p = 0.618$. There was no significant difference between the Centrality of students from majors ($M=8.99$, $SD=3.30$) and students majoring in Business ($M=9.77$, $SD=2.54$); $t(155) = 1.163$, $p = 0.246$. There was no significant difference between Belonging of students from other majors ($M=9.57$, $SD=2.63$) and students majoring in Business ($M=10.44$, $SD=1.67$); $t(155) = 1.643$, $p = 0.102$. There was no significant difference between Bonding of students from majors ($M=8.46$, $SD=3.06$) and students majoring in Business ($M=8.85$, $SD=2.56$); $t(155) = 0.605$, $p = 0.546$.

4th and 5th Semester

There was no significant difference between Public Regard of students from other semesters ($M=9.87$, $SD=2.68$) and 4th and 5th-semester students ($M=9.94$, $SD=2.22$); $t(155) = 0.116$, $p = 0.868$. There was no significant difference between Private Regard of students from other semesters ($M=16.11$, $SD=4.06$) and 4th and 5th-semester students ($M=15.27$, $SD=3.67$); $t(155) = 1.286$, $p = 0.200$. There was no significant difference between the Centrality of students from other semesters ($M=9.41$, $SD=3.17$) and 4th and 5th-semester students ($M=8.63$, $SD=3.20$); $t(155) = 1.474$, $p = 0.142$. There was no significant difference between Belonging of students from other semesters ($M=9.69$, $SD=2.56$) and 4th and 5th-semester students ($M=9.77$, $SD=2.42$); $t(155) = 0.189$, $p = 0.850$. There was no significant

difference between Bonding of students from other semesters ($M=8.69$, $SD=3.06$) and 4th and 5th-semester students ($M=8.25$, $SD=2.83$); $t(155) = 0.888$, $p = 0.376$.

6th Semester

There was no significant difference between the Public Regard of students from other semesters ($M=10.01$, $SD=2.33$) and 6th-semester students ($M=9.69$, $SD=2.82$); $t(155) = 0.770$, $p = 0.442$. There was no significant difference between Private Regard of students from other semesters ($M=15.85$, $SD=3.78$) and 6th-semester students ($M=15.71$, $SD=4.22$); $t(155) = 0.209$, $p = 0.835$. There was no significant difference between the Centrality of students from other semesters ($M=9.10$, $SD=3.20$) and 6th-semester students ($M=9.16$, $SD=3.21$); $t(155) = 0.097$, $p = 0.923$. There was no significant difference between Belonging of students from other semesters ($M=9.89$, $SD=2.31$) and 6th-semester students ($M=9.42$, $SD=2.83$); $t(155) = 1.107$, $p = 0.270$. There was no significant difference between Bonding of students from other semesters ($M=8.56$, $SD=2.98$) and 6th-semester students ($M=8.48$, $SD=3.00$); $t(155) = 0.165$, $p = 0.869$.

Hostelite or Day Scholar

This is a two-category variable (0=Hostelite, 1=Day Scholar) that is tested with the subscales of the dependent variable to find significance. There was no significant difference in Public Regard of Hostelites ($M=10.39$, $SD=2.37$) and Day Scholars ($M=9.77$, $SD=2.54$); $t(155) = 1.260$, $p = 0.210$. There was no significant difference between Private Regard of Hostelites ($M=15.75$, $SD=4.19$) and Day Scholar ($M=15.81$, $SD=3.88$); $t(155) = 0.074$, $p = 0.941$. There were no significant differences between Centrality of Hostelites ($M=9.60$, $SD=3.44$) and Day Scholar ($M=9.00$, $SD=9.00$); $t(155) = 0.968$, $p = 0.335$. There were no significant differences between Belonging of Hostelites ($M=9.75$, $SD=2.73$) and Day Scholars ($M=9.71$, $SD=2.45$); $t(155) = 0.081$, $p = 0.936$. There were no significant

differences between Bonding of Hostelites ($M=8.66$, $SD=3.18$) and Day Scholars ($M=8.50$, $SD=2.93$); $t(155) = 0.285$, $p = 0.776$.

Secondary High School Type

There were no significant differences in Public Regard of Public School students ($M=10.06$, $SD=3.12$) and Private School students ($M=9.88$, $SD=2.45$); $t(155) = 0.262$, $p = 0.794$. There were no significant differences in Private Regard of Public School students ($M=16.73$, $SD=3.30$) and Private School students ($M=15.70$, $SD=3.99$); $t(155) = 0.963$, $p = 0.337$. There was no significant difference in Centrality between Public School students ($M=9.93$, $SD=2.54$) and Private School students ($M=9.04$, $SD=3.25$); $t(155) = 1.027$, $p = 0.306$. There was no significant difference in Belonging between Public School students ($M=9.73$, $SD=2.18$) and Private School students ($M=9.72$, $SD=2.54$); $t(155) = 0.012$, $p = 0.991$. There was no significant difference in Bonding between Public School students ($M=8.53$, $SD=2.69$) and Private School students ($M=8.53$, $SD=3.01$); $t(155) = 0.002$, $p = 0.998$.

Father's Educational level

This variable was dummy coded into Undergrad and below=0 and Postgrad and above=1. Students whose fathers had an undergraduate degree or below ($M=10.40$, $SD=2.39$) had significantly higher Public Regard than students whose fathers had a postgraduate degree or above ($M=9.45$, $SD=2.54$); $t(155) = 2.396$, $p = 0.018$. There was no significant difference between Private Regard of students whose fathers had an undergraduate degree or below ($M=16.21$, $SD=3.76$) and students whose father had a postgraduate degree and above ($M=15.42$, $SD=4.07$); $t(155) = 1.253$, $p = 0.212$. There was no significant difference between

the Centrality of students whose fathers completed undergraduate and below studies (M=9.18, SD=3.24) and students whose fathers completed postgraduate and above studies (M=9.07, SD=3.16); $t(155) = 0.222, p = 0.825$. There was no significant difference between the Belonging of students whose fathers completed their undergraduate and below studies (M=9.81, SD=2.39) and students whose fathers had completed postgraduate and above studies (M=9.64, SD=2.62); $t(155) = 0.415, p = 0.679$. There was no significant difference between the Bonding of students whose fathers completed undergraduate and below studies (M=8.44, SD=3.14) and students whose fathers completed postgraduate and above studies (M=8.62, SD=2.83); $t(155) = 0.381, p = 0.704$.

Mother's Educational level

This variable is also dummy coded to Undergrad and below=0 and Postgrad and above=1. There was no significant difference between Public Regard of students whose mothers completed undergraduate studies and below (M=10.05, SD=2.47) and students whose mothers completed their postgraduate and above studies (M=9.64, SD=2.58); $t(155) = 0.960, p = 0.339$. There was no significant difference between Private Regard of students whose mothers had an undergraduate degree or below (M=15.800, SD=4.11) and students whose mothers had a postgraduate degree and above (M=15.807, SD=3.63); $t(155) = 0.011, p = 0.991$. There was no significant difference between the Centrality of students whose mothers completed their undergraduate and below studies (M=9.17, SD=3.34) and students whose mothers completed their postgraduate studies and below (M=9.05, SD=2.93); $t(155) = 0.221, p = 0.826$. There was no significant difference between Belonging of students whose mothers completed their undergraduate and below studies (M=9.68, SD=2.48) and students whose mothers completed their postgraduate and above studies (M=9.80, SD=2.57); $t(155) = 0.304, p = 0.762$. There was no significant difference between Bonding of students whose mothers completed their undergraduate and below studies (M=8.56, SD=3.06) and students

whose mothers completed their postgraduate and above studies ($M=8.49$, $SD=2.84$); $t(155) = 0.139$, $p = 0.890$.

Father's Employment

Students whose fathers work in the government or retired ($M=9.45$, $SD=2.95$) had significantly higher Bonding than students whose fathers work in private jobs ($M=8.30$, $SD=2.95$); $t(155) = 1.927$, $p = 0.056$. There was no significant difference between Public Regard of students whose fathers work in the government or retired ($M=10.48$, $SD=3.11$) and students whose fathers work in private jobs ($M=9.76$, $SD=2.33$); $t(155) = 1.436$, $p = 0.153$. There was no significant difference between Private Regard of students whose fathers work in the government or retired ($M=16.09$, $SD=4.90$) and students whose fathers work in private jobs ($M=15.73$, $SD=3.67$); $t(155) = 0.463$, $p = 0.644$. There was no significant difference between the Centrality of students whose fathers work in the government or retired ($M=10.00$, $SD=3.07$) and students whose fathers work in private jobs ($M=8.91$, $SD=3.20$); $t(155) = 1.707$, $p = 0.090$. There was no significant difference between Belonging of students whose fathers work in the government or retired ($M=10.06$, $SD=2.87$) and students whose fathers work in private jobs ($M=9.64$, $SD=2.41$); $t(155) = 0.837$, $p = 0.404$.

Mother's Employment

There was a nearly significant difference between Public Regard of students whose mothers are housewives or retired ($M=10.18$, $SD=2.49$) and students whose mothers are actively working ($M=9.37$, $SD=2.49$); $t(155) = 1.943$, $p = 0.054$. Students whose mothers are housewives or retired ($M=16.37$, $SD=3.69$) had significantly higher Private Regard than students whose mothers are actively working ($M=14.70$, $SD=4.17$); $t(155) = 2.578$, $p = 0.011$. There was no significant difference between Belonging of students whose mothers are housewives or retired ($M=9.97$, $SD=2.53$) and students whose mothers are actively working

($M=9.25$, $SD=2.42$); $t(155) = 1.697$, $p = 0.092$. There was no significant difference between the Centrality of students whose mothers are housewives or retired ($M=9.30$, $SD=3.18$) and students whose mothers are actively working ($M=8.79$, $SD=3.22$); $t(155) = 0.940$, $p = 0.349$. There was no significant difference between Brotherhood of students whose mothers are housewives or retired ($M=8.80$, $SD=3.01$) and students whose mothers are actively working ($M=8.01$, $SD=2.87$); $t(155) = 1.579$, $p = 0.116$.

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Table 5.1

Linear Regression analysis of Public Regard subscale

Variable	Beta	SE	95% CI	
			LL	UL
Consuming of cultural capital	0.054	0.125	-0.192	0.301
Expert use of cultural capital	-0.139	0.215	-0.564	0.286
Participation in the cultural capital	0.127	0.079	-0.029	0.284
Bonding capital	0.014	0.018	-0.021	0.050
Bridging capital	-0.027	0.029	-0.085	0.031
Gender	-0.584	0.441	-1.457	0.289
Age	0.358	0.488	-0.607	1.323
Major Social Science	1.257*	0.525	0.218	2.296
Major Humanities	1.802*	0.767	-0.287	3.318

Major Business	1.238	0.652	-0.051	2.527
Semester 4 th and 5 th	0.072	0.514	-0.944	1.088
Semester 6 th	-0.172	0.607	-1.372	1.028
Hostelite or Day Scholar	-0.368	0.520	-1.397	0.661
High School type	-0.166	0.723	-1.597	1.264
Father education	-0.742	0.433	-1.599	0.114
Mother education	-0.041	0.476	-0.981	0.900
Father Employment	-0.680	0.526	-1.721	0.361
Mother Employment	-0.531	0.467	-1.454	0.392

*Note: $p < 0.05$

The adjusted R square was 0.062 which shows that there is a 6 percent variation in the independent and control variables on Public Regard. There is slight significance in the model at 0.075. The independent variables did not appear significant, but Expert using ($B = -0.139$, $p = -0.139$) and Bridging Capital ($B = -0.027$, $p = 0.356$) were negatively related while Consuming ($B = 0.054$, $p = 0.665$), Participating ($B = 0.127$, $p = 0.110$) and Bonding capital ($B = 0.014$, $p = 0.428$) were positively related to Public Regard. The only control variables that appeared significant were Major Social Science ($B = 1.257$, $p = 0.018$) and Major Humanities ($B = 1.802$, $p = 0.20$).

Table 5.2

Linear Regression analysis of Private Regard subscale

95% CI

Variable	Beta	SE	LL	UL
Consuming of cultural capital	0.092	0.189	-0.283	0.466
Expert use of cultural capital	0.448	0.327	-0.197	1.094
Participation in the cultural capital	0.236*	0.120	0.002	0.474
Bonding capital	0.013	0.027	-0.040	0.067
Bridging capital	-0.007	0.044	-0.094	0.081
Gender	-0.519	0.671	-1.846	0.807
Age	0.670	0.742	-0.796	2.136
Major Social Science	1.911*	0.798	0.332	3.490
Major Humanities	1.932	1.165	-0.372	4.235
Major Business	1.786	0.991	-0.173	3.745
Semester 4 th and 5 th	-0.862	0.781	-2.406	0.682
Semester 6 th	-0.264	0.992	-2.087	1.560
Hostelite or Day Scholar	0.694	0.791	-0.870	2.258
High School type	-1.093	1.099	-3.267	1.081
Father education	-0.499	0.659	-1.801	0.803
Mother education	0.440	0.723	-0.989	1.870
Father Employment	-0.165	0.800	-1.747	1.417

Mother Employment	-0.990	0.710	-2.393	0.413
-------------------	--------	-------	--------	-------

*Note: $p < 0.05$

The adjusted R square value was 0.115, which indicated that there was around 11 percent variation in the independent and control variables with Private Regard and the regression model was significant at 0.08. The Participating in Cultural Capital variable ($B = 0.236$, $p = 0.052$) was the only independent variable that was significant. All of the independent variables were positively related to Private Regard except Bridging capital ($B = -0.07$, $p = 0.883$). The only significant control variable was Major in Social Science ($B = 1.911$, $p = 0.018$).

Table 5.3

Linear Regression analysis of the Centrality subscale

Variable	Beta	SE	95% CI	
			LL	UL
Consuming of cultural capital	-0.040	0.151	-0.338	0.257
Expert use of cultural capital	0.571*	0.259	0.058	1.084
Participation in the cultural capital	0.280*	0.096	0.091	0.469
Bonding capital	0.020	0.022	-0.023	0.063
Bridging capital	-0.001	0.035	-0.071	0.069
Gender	-0.149	0.533	-1.203	0.905
Age	0.503	0.589	-0.662	1.668
Major Social Science	1.062	0.634	-0.193	2.316

Major Humanities	1.519	0.926	-0.311	3.349
Major Business	1.694*	0.787	0.138	3.251
Semester 4 th and 5 th	-0.715	0.620	-1.942	0.511
Semester 6 th	-0.280	0.733	-1.728	1.169
Hostelite or Day Scholar	0.061	0.628	-1.182	1.303
High School type	-0.787	0.874	-2.514	0.940
Father education	0.330	0.523	-0.704	1.365
Mother education	-0.330	0.574	-1.466	0.805
Father Employment	-0.899	0.636	-2.156	0.358
Mother Employment	0.270	0.564	-0.844	1.385

*Note: $p < 0.05$

The adjusted R square was at 0.152, which indicated that there was a 15 percent variation in the independent and control variables with Centrality and the model was significant at 0.01. Expert using ($B = 0.571$, $p = 0.030$) and Participating ($B = 0.280$, $p = 0.04$) in Cultural capital had a positively significant relationship with Centrality while Consuming variable ($B = -0.040$, $p = 0.790$) was negatively related and insignificant. Bonding capital ($B = 0.020$, $p = 0.356$) and Bridging capital ($B = -0.001$, $p = 0.979$) were insignificant independent variables. Major Business had a positively significant relationship with Centrality ($B = 1.694$, $p = 0.033$).

Table 5.4

Linear Regression analysis of Belonging subscale

Variable	Beta	SE	95% CI	
			LL	UL
Consuming of cultural capital	-0.045	0.121	-0.285	0.194
Expert use of cultural capital	0.414*	0.209	0.002	0.827
Participation in the cultural capital	0.211*	0.077	0.059	0.363
Bonding capital	0.021	0.017	-0.014	0.055
Bridging capital	-0.028	0.028	-0.084	0.028
Gender	-0.616	0.429	-1.463	0.232
Age	0.430	0.474	-0.507	1.367
Major Social Science	0.731	0.510	-0.277	1.740
Major Humanities	0.515	0.744	-0.957	1.986
Major Business	1.243*	0.633	-0.009	2.494
Semester 4 th and 5 th	0.133	0.499	-0.854	1.119
Semester 6 th	-0.019	0.589	-1.185	1.146
Hostelite or Day Scholar	0.278	0.505	-0.721	1.278
High School type	0.156	0.703	-1.233	1.545
Father education	0.065	0.421	-0.767	0.897
Mother education	0.126	0.462	-0.788	1.039

Father Employment	-0.612	0.511	-1.623	0.399
Mother Employment	-0.457	0.453	-1.353	0.440

Note: $p < 0.05$

The adjusted R square was 0.112, which indicated an 11 percent variation in the independent and control variables with the Belonging variable and the model was significant at 0.009.

Expert using ($B = 0.414$, $p = 0.049$) and Participation ($B = 0.211$, $p = 0.007$) of the cultural capital scale had a positively significant relationship with Belonging. Bonding capital ($B = 0.021$, $p = 0.233$) was positively related, but it was insignificant. Consuming ($B = -0.045$, $p = 0.710$) and Bridging capital ($B = -0.028$, $p = 0.330$) were negatively related and insignificant. The only control variable that appeared significant was Major Business ($B = 1.243$, $p = 0.052$).

Table 5.5

Linear Regression analysis of Bonding subscale

Variable	Beta	SE	95% CI	
			LL	UL
Consuming of cultural capital	0.038	0.145	-0.248	0.324
Expert use of cultural capital	0.366	0.249	-0.127	0.860
Participation in the cultural capital	0.162	0.092	-0.019	0.344
Bonding capital	0.037	0.021	-0.005	0.078
Bridging capital	-0.012	0.034	-0.079	0.055
Gender	-0.660	0.512	-1.673	0.352

Age	0.943	0.566	-0.176	2.063
Major Social Science	0.586	0.610	-0.619	1.792
Major Humanities	0.360	0.889	-1.399	2.119
Major Business	0.557	0.756	-0.939	2.053
Semester 4 th and 5 th	-0.156	0.596	-1.335	1.023
Semester 6 th	0.287	0.704	-1.106	1.679
Hostelite or Day Scholar	0.126	0.604	-1.068	1.320
High School type	0.285	0.840	-1.375	1.945
Father education	0.612	0.503	-0.382	1.606
Mother education	-0.180	0.552	-1.272	0.911
Father Employment	-1.108	0.611	-2.316	0.099
Mother Employment	-0.386	0.542	-1.457	0.686

*Note: $p < 0.05$

The adjusted R square was 0.101, which indicated 10 percent variation in independent and control variables and the model was significant at 0.015. There were no significant relationships with Bonding as a dependent variable. The independent variables Consuming ($B = 0.038$, $p = 0.793$), Expert using ($B = 0.366$, $p = 0.144$), Participating ($B = 0.162$, $p = 0.79$), and Bonding capital ($B = 0.037$, $p = 0.081$) were positively related but were insignificant. Bridging capital ($B = -0.012$, $p = 0.719$) was negatively related and insignificant.

Discussion

This study hypothesized that the undergraduate students of FCCU who had higher levels of cultural and social capital were more likely to develop a stronger Institutional Identity. Therefore, if the students scored high on the cultural capital and social capital scales, they would also score high on the Institutional Identity scale.

The hypothesis was proven to be partially true, as only cultural capital influenced Institutional Identity while social capital did not affect it to a significant extent. Specifically, the Participating independent variable and Expert using independent variables of cultural capital were significant with Centrality and Belonging dependent variables, while the Participating variable was only significant with Private Regard.

The results indicated that those who major in Social Science and Humanities are more likely to have high Public Regard which means that they believe that others view their university more positively. The results also indicated that those who major in Social Sciences are more likely to attain high Private Regard as they view their university more positively. Majoring in Business has a significantly positive association with Centrality; hence, this can lead to students making their institutional identity central to their overall identity. Similarly, majoring in Business also had a significant positive association with Belonging which meant this could result in a higher sense of belonging at the university. There were no significant results in the Bonding subscale.

The independent variable, Consumption, in cultural capital was negatively associated with Centrality and Belonging. However, this was positively related to Public Regard, Private Regard, and Bonding but was not significant. Therefore, consuming cultural knowledge or activities may, to some extent, allow students to view their university positively and connect with others in the university. Bridging capital was the only independent variable that was

negatively associated with all of the dependent variables, which meant that the student's connections with larger groups (cultural, political, and social groups) did not have a significant effect on their Institutional Identity. Gender, Father's employment, and the semester of the students were variables that were negatively associated with all of the dependent variables. This suggests that they do not affect the Institutional Identity of the student. Age was positively associated with all of the dependent variables, which suggests that age does have some effect on Institutional Identity. The Hostelite or Day Scholar variable was only negatively associated with Public Regard while it was positively associated with the rest of the dependent variables. This indicated that, to some extent, it may affect the Institutional Identity of the students.

The results expected from the research were partially met. It was expected that bonding and bridging capital would appear significant and positively related to the dependent variables, but bridging capital appeared negatively associated, and bonding and bridging capital were not significant in the results. Gender was expected to be significant in the Belonging and Bonding dependent variables due to the significant results in the bivariate analysis. The father's education and father's employment were also expected to appear significant, but they were not significant and negatively associated with some dependent variables. The student's semester and major variables were not expected to be significant in the regression model due to insignificant results in the bivariate analysis.

The results can be linked to the theories that this study was based on. The theory of capitals by Bourdieu supported the hypothesis regarding cultural capital, as Bourdieu considered it one of the most important forms of capital. This is largely due to the notion that cultural capital can be acquired consciously and unconsciously (Bourdieu & Richardson, 1986). A culturally diverse university such as FCCU would have students who engage in various cultural activities of their liking, which not only attracts people with similar interests

but also those who wish to acquire more cultural knowledge. Bourdieu and Richardson (1986) have discussed the institutionalized state of cultural capital, which emphasizes that academic qualifications result in cultural competency. Hence, as most university students have acquired some academic qualifications, such as graduating from high school, it has provided them with cultural knowledge and practices that could aid their institutional identity.

The student's major is a form of academic qualification that falls under the institutionalized state of cultural capital; hence, it has some effect on the student's Institutional Identity (Bourdieu & Richardson, 1986). The data suggested that students who majored in Humanities, Social Science, and Business subjects had significantly higher public regard, private regard, centrality, and sense of belonging at the university. This indicated that students who major in Natural Science and Technology (which was a reference category) are least likely to develop a strong Institutional Identity. This may be due to the rigorous environment and restrictive schedule that Science students have, while Social Science, Humanities, and Business majors may have more knowledge of human interaction and work in a more interactive and discursive environment in their classes.

The human ecological system theory also solidified the influence of the student's major on their Institutional Identity as it falls under the mesosystem category, which refers to activities and interactions that have a direct effect on the students (Bronfenbrenner, 2005). Asuncion et al.'s study mentioned how STEM high school graduates were more college-ready due to their critical and analytical skills, while in this study, STEM students have lower levels of Institutional Identity as they may be more focused on their academics than social interactions and they prefer to be in universities that have better facilities for their STEM research.

Bronfenbrenner's (2005) human ecological theory was proven in this study, as gender, father's education, father's employment, and mother's employment were significant in the bivariate analysis. They were not significant in the multivariate analysis, as their effect decreased after the independent variables were introduced. Gender was an individual factor that caused differential results in Institutional Identity (Bronfenbrenner, 2005). Asuncion et al.'s (2021) study discussed how females were more college-ready than males, while this study indicated that males had a higher sense of belonging in the university and bonding with others, while it was lower for females. This may be largely due to the FCCU's intermediate studies section being only for males who later join the university, which further enhanced their Institutional Identity.

In addition, the exosystem of the students (father's employment and mother's employment) also provided variant results on their Institutional Identity (Asuncion et al., 2021). Father's employment had a variance on the bonding in the university, as students whose fathers work in the government or social sector or have retired were more likely to develop close bonds with others in the university. Mother's employment had a variance on the public and private regard of Institutional Identity as students whose mothers were housewives or have retired were more likely to view their university positively in terms of the public's perception and their perception. Asuncion et al.'s (2021) study also mentioned how fewer college-ready students had mothers who were working abroad, so they were unable to emotionally support them. This study proved that students whose mothers are not actively working were able to provide emotional support for the students, which may increase their Institutional Identity.

Father's educational level was a macrosystem factor that had a variance in the public regard of the university. The students whose fathers had attained an undergraduate degree or below were more likely to view their university more positively. It is related to Asuncion et

al.'s (2021) theory that parents are the main role models and motivators of students; hence, the university that their fathers view the best was more likely to feel a sense of belonging in that university.

The influence of social capital on Institutional Identity was not found to be significant. Jensen and Jetten (2015) also had similar findings: there was no significant link between bridging social capital and a student's identity formation. This study indicated that bonding social capital was more likely to increase a student's Institutional Identity than bridging social capital, but it was not significant. The research conducted by Jetsen and Jetten (2015) did prove a significantly positive association between social capital and a sense of belonging; however, in this research, social capital did not come out as a significant independent variable in comparison to cultural capital in regards to its influence on Institutional Identity. This may be due to the differences in culture and the type of students that attend FCCU in Pakistan compared to universities in the USA.

One of the limitations of the research is that the sample was not randomly selected due to the inaccessibility of the student list from the Academic Office; therefore, convenience sampling was employed to meet the sample size requirements. This also led to issues with linearity; therefore, some responses caused problems with validity and reliability, which led to the removal of some items. The survey was also too long, so it became difficult to reach 200 responses, but 157 responses were collected at the end.

The research also did not study the university's culture or the individual's agency to shape their Institutional Identity. This research theorized that the individual's sense of community is directly linked to the accumulation of social and cultural capital, which develops their Institutional Identity.

Conclusion

Several studies have emphasized researching the social capital or cultural capital of university students regarding their sense of belonging or connection to others in their institution. This study tested the hypothesis of the influence of social and cultural capital on undergraduate students at FCCU. The importance is to explore if social and cultural capital aid in facilitating the student's association with their institution, as a lack of a sense of belonging can result in loneliness, academic failure, and other negative emotions that may hinder the individual's academic and professional progress. After testing the hypothesis, the results revealed that cultural capital influenced Institutional Identity while social capital did not have any effect. Specifically, participating in cultural groups and utilizing cultural knowledge and activities professionally were significant in the results. Amongst the control variables, the majors of the students had a significant relationship with Institutional Identity which meant that students of particular majors may have a higher Institutional Identity than others.

Implications and Further Research

The studied institute should facilitate the cultural capital of its students, as the research suggests that it creates a stronger Institutional Identity. This can be practiced by engaging students in more interactive and out-of-classroom activities. The more students can utilize and practice their cultural knowledge, the more likely they will be able to develop a stronger Institutional Identity.

Further research can be conducted on the Institutional Identity of ethnic or religious minorities in Pakistani universities to determine if they face any institutional issues while studying in universities in another city. There can be further development of social and cultural capital scales that are culturally specific to the people of Pakistan to ensure the

validity of the results. Qualitative research can be conducted to further analyze the effects of cultural capital on Institutional Identity in Pakistani universities, especially about the technological advancements that may also aid in the cultural capital of students.

References

- Anheier, H. K., Gerhards, J., & Romo, F. P. (1995). Forms of Capital and Social Structure in Cultural Fields: Examining Bourdieu's Social Topography. *American Journal of Sociology*, 100(4), 859–903. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2782154>.
- Asuncion, J. E. L., Tamayao, A. I., Vecaldo, R. T., Mamba, M. T., Paat, F. M. G., Pagulayan, E. S., & Utrela, J. U. (2021). Human Ecological Systems Shaping College Readiness of Filipino K-12 Graduates: A Mixed-Method Multiple Case Analysis. *Humanities and Social Sciences Letters*, 9(1), 34–49. <https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.73.2021.91.34.49>.
- Balboni, G., Menardo, E., & Cubelli, R. (2019). Development and validation of the Scale of Cultural Capital. *TPM - Testing*, 26(1), 149-175. doi:10.4473/TPM26.1.8. Bilal, Z., Ghayas, S., Naeem, T., Kayani, S., Xie, R., & Biasutti, M. (2021). Construction and validation of Institutional Identity Scale for university students. *Children*, 8(8), 665. <https://doi.org/10.3390/children8080665>.
- Bourdieu, P. (2011). The Forms of Capital. In Mark Granovetter (Eds), *The Sociology of Economic Life*. (3rd ed. pp.15-29). Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P., & Richardson, J. G. (1986). Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education. *The forms of capital*, 241, 258.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (2005). Making human beings human: Bioecological perspectives on human development. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Byrom, T. & Lightfoot, N. (2012). Transformation or Transgression? Institutional Habitus and Working Class Student Identity. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(2), 126-134. <https://doi.org/10.3844/jssp.2012.126.134>.
- Caregnato, C. E., Miorando, B. S., & Baldasso, J. C. (2022). Undergraduate students'

academic socialization at a public research university: variations of student experience about cultural capital. *Educar Em Revista*, 38.

<https://doi.org/10.1590/1984-0411.85949-t>

Chen, X. R., Stanton, B. A., Gong, J., Fang, X., & Li, X. (2008). Personal Social Capital Scale: an instrument for health and behavioral research. *Health Education Research*, 24(2), 306–317. <https://doi.org/10.1093/her/cyn020>.

Ellison, N. B., Steinfield, C., & Lampe, C. (2007). The Benefits of Facebook “Friends:” Social Capital and College Students’ Use of Online Social Network Sites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 12(4), 1143–1168.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00367.x>.

Ivemark, B., & Ambrose, A. (2021). Habitus Adaptation and First-Generation University Students’ Adjustment to Higher Education: A Life Course Perspective. *Sociology of Education*, 94(3), 191–207. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00380407211017060>.

Jensen, D. L., & Jetten, J. (2015). Bridging and bonding interactions in higher education: social capital and students’ academic and professional identity formation. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00126>.

Kim, Y., Mok, S. Y., & Seidel, T. (2020). Parental influences on immigrant students’ achievement-related motivation and achievement: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 30, 100327. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100327>.

Koyanagi, Y., Aung, M. N., Yuasa, M., Sekine, M., & Takao, O. (2021). The Relation between Social Capital and Academic Motivation of Students: A Study of Health Professional Education in Japan. *European Journal of Investigation in Health, Psychology and Education*, 11(1), 129–141. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ejihpe11010011>.

Pishghadam, R., Meidani, E. N, Momenzadeh, S. M. E., Hasanzadeh, S., and Miri, M. A.

(2023). Economic, social, and cultural capital and ESQ in academic achievement: A comparison of Afghan and Iranian students. *Frontiers in Psychology, 14*.

<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1087480>.

Soria, K. M., & Stebleton, M. J. (2013). Social Capital, Academic Engagement, and Sense of Belonging Among Working-class College Students. *College Student Affairs Journal, 31*(2)(2), 139–153.

Sullivan, A. (2001). Cultural Capital and Educational Attainment. *Sociology, 35*(4), 893-912.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0038038501008938>.

Thomas, D., Smith, C. W., Marks, B. T., & Crosby, B. (2012). Institutional Identity and Self Esteem among African American Males in College. *Journal of African American Males in Education (JAAME), 3*(1), 1–11.

<http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED573777.pdf>.

Torres, V., Jones, S., & Renn, K. A. (2009). Identity Development Theories in Student Affairs: Origins, Current Status, and New Approaches. *Journal of College Student Development, 50*(6), 577–596. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.0.0102>.

Tran, T. C., & DeFeo, D. J. (2021). Rural student's postsecondary transitions: A human ecological perspective. *Journal of College Student Development, 62*(4), 455-468.

Appendices

Appendix A: Informed Consent Form

The survey will examine the influence of social and cultural capital on the institutional identity of students at FCCU. There are different scales to measure the student's institutional identity, cultural capital, and personal social capital.

This survey is being conducted for research purposes. You are invited to participate in this survey which will not take more than 15 minutes of your time. Participation in this survey is completely voluntary and you can choose not to participate in this survey or you can withdraw from this study at any time. You can also choose not to respond to any question(s) that you do not feel comfortable to answer. The data will be collected anonymously and results will be reported in aggregate. Any information that you provide will remain confidential.

If you have any queries, you can email the researcher at
241545881@formanite.fccollege.edu.pk.

Thank you for taking the time out to participate in this survey.

Appendix B: IRB Certificate



FORMAN CHRISTIAN COLLEGE
(A CHARTERED UNIVERSITY)

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL CERTIFICATE

IRB Ref: IRB-461/6-2023

Date: 22-06-2023

Project Title: Influence of Social and Cultural Capital on Institutional Identity of Undergraduate Students at FCCU

Principal Investigator: Shanzeh Ahmad

Supervisor: Dr Mohammad Vaqas Ali

The Institutional review board has examined your project in IRB meeting held on 22-06-2023 and has approved the proposed study. If during the conduct of your research any changes occur related to participant risk, study design, confidentiality or consent or any other change then IRB must be notified immediately.

Please be sure to include IRB reference number in all correspondence.

Dr. Sharoon Hanook
Convener - IRB
Chairperson, Department of Statistics
Forman Christian College
(A Chartered University)
Lahore

For Further Correspondence:

📍 Ferozpur Road, Lahore-54600
📞 042-99231581-8 Ext: 504 & 531
✉ irb@fccollege.edu.pk
🌐 www.fccollege.edu.pk

Appendix C: Survey Questionnaire

Socio-Demographic Variables

Gender	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Male ● Female ● Prefer not to say
Age	
Ethnicity	
Intended Major	
Semester	
Hostelite or Day Scholar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hostelite ● Day Scholar
Secondary High School type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Public/Government School ● Private School ● Homeschool
Father's educational level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● High school/Intermediate ● Undergraduate ● Postgraduate ● PhD/Doctoral degree ● Other_____
Mother's educational level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● High school/Intermediate ● Undergraduate ● Postgraduate ● PhD/Doctoral degree ● Other_____
Father's Employment	
Mother's Employment	

Institutional Identity Scale

Select from range of 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree).

<p>In general, my university is considered by others to be a good university.</p> <p>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</p>
<p>I feel like a stranger when I am on my university campus.</p> <p>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</p>

<p>In general, I am glad that I attend my university.</p> <p>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</p>
<p>Being a student at my college is an important part of who I am.</p> <p>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</p>
<p>I have a strong attachment to other students at my university.</p> <p>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</p>
<p>In general, others do not respect my university.</p> <p>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</p>
<p>I have a strong sense of belonging to my university.</p> <p>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</p>
<p>My university is not a good university.</p> <p>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</p>
<p>Overall, going to my university has very little to do with how I feel about myself.</p> <p>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</p>
<p>I do not feel a connection with students or alumni of my university when I meet them off campus.</p> <p>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</p>
<p>People with whom I interact off campus respond positively when they find out about the college that I attend.</p> <p>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</p>
<p>I feel accepted by other students in my university.</p> <p>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</p>
<p>I am proud to be a student in my university.</p> <p>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</p>
<p>In general, being a student at my university is an important part of my self-image.</p> <p>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</p>
<p>It is my responsibility to help another student at my university whenever I can.</p> <p>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</p>

Scale of Cultural Capital Scale

On average, how many books a year do you read for pleasure?

- None
- Between 1 and 3
- Between 4 and 7
- Between 8 and 12
- 13 or more

On average, how many books a year do you read for study/work?

- None
- Between 1 and 3
- Between 4 and 7
- Between 8 and 12
- 13 or more

How many books do you have in your home? (*Consider that each meter of shelving can contain almost 40 books.*)

- Between 0 and 20
- Between 21 and 50
- Between 51 and 200
- Between 201 and 500
- More than 500

How often do you use the Internet to stay informed or to learn more about something?

- Never
- Only occasionally
- Not more than once a week
- Several times a week
- Everyday

Do you use languages other than your own for fun/pleasure or work/study? (Please mark each activity in which you use foreign languages or leave blank.)

- I watch films in foreign languages
- I read in foreign languages
- I write in foreign languages
- I speak in foreign languages

How many times a year do you attend theatrical performances?

- Never
- Once or twice a year
- Between 3 and 4 times a year
- Between 5 and 6 times a year
- 7 or more times a year

How many times a year do you visit art museums, museums, exhibitions or galleries?

- Never
- Once or twice a year
- Between 3 and 4 times a year
- Between 5 and 6 times a year
- 7 or more times a year

How many times a year do you attend concerts, music festivals or other musical events?

- Never

- Once or twice a year
- Between 3 and 4 times a year
- Between 5 and 6 times a year
- 7 or more times a year

How many times a year do you attend courses, conventions, conferences or seminars on cultural themes?

- Never
- Once or twice a year
- Between 3 and 4 times a year
- Between 5 and 6 times a year
- 7 or more times a year

Which of the following cultural activities do you practice? (Please mark all that apply or leave blank).

- I create art (for example painting, drawing, sculpture, photography, carving, restoration)
- I write music or texts (for example narratives, poets, scripts, satire, articles)
- I perform in concerts, plays or dance productions

Do you usually participate in the activities of social associations/groups (volunteer groups which offer caregiving, assistance and solidarity, environmental protection, women's groups, local tourism promotion, student unions)?

- I do not participate in any of these groups
- I participate in some public events offered by these groups
- I am an active member in at least one of these groups
- I am on the board of one of these groups
- I am on the board of more than one of these groups

Do you usually participate in the activities of religious or political associations/groups?

- I do not participate in any of these groups
- I participate in some public events offered by these groups
- I am an active member in at least one of these groups
- I am on the board of one of these groups
- I am on the board of more than one of these groups

Do you usually participate in the activities of cultural associations/groups? (for example, theater or dance groups, bands, arts and crafts group, traditional folk groups, promotional associations for cultural events, youth oriented cultural associations, online cultural associations)

- I do not participate in any of these groups
- I participate in some public events offered by these groups
- I am an active member in at least one of these groups
- I am on the board of one of these groups
- I am on the board of more than one of these groups

Considering all these types of associations/groups, how much time do you spend for these activities altogether?

- I do not participate in any of these groups
- I participate in some public events offered by these groups
- I am an active member in at least one of these groups
- I am on the board of one of these groups
- I am on the board of more than one of these groups

Personal Social Capital Scale

How do you rate the number of people in each of the six categories?	A lot	More than average	Average	Less than average	A few
Your family members	5	4	3	2	1
Your relatives	5	4	3	2	1
People in your neighborhood	5	4	3	2	1
Your friends	5	4	3	2	1
Your coworkers/fellows	5	4	3	2	1
Your country fellows/old classmates	5	4	3	2	1
With how many people in each of the following categories do you keep routine contact?	All	Most	Some	Few	None
Your family members	5	4	3	2	1
Your relatives	5	4	3	2	1
People in your neighborhood	5	4	3	2	1
Your friends	5	4	3	2	1
Your coworkers/fellows	5	4	3	2	1
Your country fellows/old classmates	5	4	3	2	1
Among the people in each of the six categories, how many can you trust?	All	Most	Some	Few	None
Your family members	5	4	3	2	1
Your relatives	5	4	3	2	1
People in your neighborhood	5	4	3	2	1
Your friends	5	4	3	2	1

Your coworkers/fellows	5	4	3	2	1
Your country fellows/old classmates	5	4	3	2	1
Among the people in the six categories, how many will definitely help you upon your request?	All	Most	Some	Few	None
Your family members	5	4	3	2	1
Your relatives	5	4	3	2	1
People in your neighborhood	5	4	3	2	1
Your friends	5	4	3	2	1
Your coworkers/fellows	5	4	3	2	1
Your country fellows/old classmates	5	4	3	2	1
When people in all six categories are considered, how many possess the following assets and resources?	All	Most	Some	Few	None
Certain political power	5	4	3	2	1
Wealth or owners of an enterprise or a company	5	4	3	2	1
Broad connections with others	5	4	3	2	1
High reputation/influential	5	4	3	2	1
With high school or more education	5	4	3	2	1
With a professional job	5	4	3	2	1
How do you rate the number of the following two types of groups/organizations in your community?	A lot	More than average	Average	Less than average	A few
Governmental, political, economic and social groups/organizations (political parties, women's groups, village committees, trade union, corporate associations, volunteer groups etc.)	5	4	3	2	1

Cultural, recreational and leisure groups/organizations (religious, country fellows, alumni, sport, music, dances, crafts, games etc.)	5	4	3	2	1
Do you participate in activities for how many of each of these two groups?	All	Most	Some	Few	None
Governmental, political, economic and social groups/organizations (political parties, women's groups, village committees, trade union, corporate associations, volunteer groups etc.)	5	4	3	2	1
Cultural, recreational and leisure groups/organizations (religious, country fellows, alumni, sport, music, dances, crafts, games etc.)	5	4	3	2	1
Among each of the two groups, how many represent your rights and interests?	All	Most	Some	Few	None
Governmental, political, economic and social groups/organizations (political parties, women's groups, village committees, trade union, corporate associations, volunteer groups etc.)	5	4	3	2	1
Cultural, recreational and leisure groups/organizations (religious, country fellows, alumni, sport, music, dances, crafts, games etc.)	5	4	3	2	1
Among each of the two groups, how many will help you upon your request?	All	Most	Some	Few	None
Governmental, political, economic and social groups/organizations (political parties, women's groups, village committees, trade union, corporate associations, volunteer groups etc.)	5	4	3	2	1
Cultural, recreational and leisure groups/organizations (religious, country fellows, alumni, sport, music, dances, crafts, games etc.)	5	4	3	2	1
When the two categories are considered, how many possess the following assets/resources?	All	Most	Some	Few	None
Significant power for decision making	5	4	3	2	1
Solid financial basis	5	4	3	2	1
Broad social connections	5	4	3	2	1
Great social influence	5	4	3	2	1