

2021

## Ministry matters: A study of the relationship between campus ministry and socialization

Rachel Jean Kitrell  
*University of Northern Iowa*

*Let us know how access to this document benefits you*

Copyright ©2021 Rachel Jean Kitrell

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/hpt>

---

### Recommended Citation

Kitrell, Rachel Jean, "Ministry matters: A study of the relationship between campus ministry and socialization" (2021). *Honors Program Theses*. 472.

<https://scholarworks.uni.edu/hpt/472>

This Open Access Honors Program Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Work at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Program Theses by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@uni.edu](mailto:scholarworks@uni.edu).

**Offensive Materials Statement:** Materials located in UNI ScholarWorks come from a broad range of sources and time periods. Some of these materials may contain offensive stereotypes, ideas, visuals, or language.

MINISTRY MATTERS:  
A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CAMPUS MINISTRY AND  
SOCIALIZATION

A Thesis Submitted  
in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Designation  
University Honors with Distinction

Rachel Jean Kitrell  
University of Northern Iowa  
May 2021

This Study by: Rachel Kitrell

Entitled: Ministry Matters: A Study of the Relationship Between Campus Ministry and  
Socialization

has been approved as meeting the thesis or project requirement for the designation University  
Honors with Distinction

---

Date

Melissa Dobosh, Honors Thesis Advisor, Communication and Media

---

Date

Dr. Jessica Moon, Director, University Honors Program

## **Abstract**

The present study investigated the relationship between involvement in campus ministry and students' socialization to the university. Campus ministry participants (N=62) representing eight of eleven registered campus ministries completed an online 39-question Qualtrics survey that sought to evaluate their involvement in ministry activities, social involvement in their campus ministry, social involvement in their university, and socialization to the university through history, politics, and goals and values. A significant positive correlation was found between involvement in ministry activities and social involvement in campus ministry as well as between each of the three socialization variables. There were also significant positive correlations found between social involvement in the campus ministry and social involvement in the university as well as social involvement in the campus ministry and socialization through goals and values. These findings indicate involvement in campus ministry appears to facilitate socialization to the university.

*Keywords:* involvement, campus ministry, socialization, history, politics, goals, values

## **Ministry Matters: A Study of the Relationship Between Campus Ministry and Socialization**

“When freshmen arrive at college, they have many choices about how to spend their time and what communities to join. For those who are Christians, they are faced with the challenge of following God in a new context” (Foote, 2018, para. 1). This quote from an internationally recognized collegiate ministry, The Navigators, reflects the experience of many college students. Studies show that campus ministries impact their members emotionally, socially, and academically. These organizations can provide social structures and support groups that help students transfer from high school to college and move from being an outsider to an insider on campus.

Throughout my time in college, I have been a member of two different campus ministries; therefore, I had some personal motivations for choosing this specific topic. As an incoming freshman being involved in a campus ministry had a significant impact on my transition to college. Over the years some of my closest friends have come from campus ministries at UNI. Many of my friends have shared similar experiences and have credited their involvement in their campus ministry as the means by which their feelings of connection to the university grew. Thus, I wanted to dig deeper to determine if others involved in campus ministries at UNI shared my personal feelings and find a way to communicate the importance of campus ministry to incoming first year and transfer students, current students, and the staff who oversee these organizations.

The first year of college is a transformative time for many as they learn to navigate a new sense of independence. Previous literature explored how religious involvement impacts students' academics (e.g., De Soto et al., 2018), as well as how college affects religious involvement (e.g., Hartley, 2004). However, there are few studies on how religious involvement can contribute to

college students' sense of connection on campus. This thesis focuses on this question of how involvement in campus ministry impacts student socialization to the larger university.

This thesis sought to generate a better understanding of the way students are impacted by faith-based organizations. The knowledge gained from this research can be used to aid in future recruitment efforts and in exploring future focuses for study regarding campus ministry. It will also allow campus ministry directors and leaders to better understand what they can do to improve students' time in college and in their organization.

### **Literature Review**

In preparation for the study, research was done to explore the pre-existing literature regarding prevalence of campus ministry, impact of campus ministry, socialization, identification, and connection. Socialization is an important concept in Communication research that strongly conveys a person's sense of identification and connection to an organization. Also key in this sense of connection is student involvement. Previous research found involvement in faith-based organizations have a great impact on a student's college experience in multiple different ways. Thus, it makes sense campus ministry might impact students' ability to socialize to the university they attend as well.

### **Campus Ministry**

#### ***Prevalence of Campus Ministry***

Campus ministry is a wide-reaching branch of student involvement encompassing a variety of belief systems. Schmalzbauer (2007) argued for the continued prevalence of faith-based organizations on campus and against the idea of campuses functioning as exclusively secular territory. He began by acknowledging the origins of the secular narrative as a result of the decline of Protestant ministries throughout the 1960s and 1970s.

Schmalzbauer (2007) went on to present a statistical overview of campus ministry, arguing, “The sudden decline of mainline Protestant campus ministries after 1970 left a hole in the religious ecology of American higher education. Yet, instead of leading to the secularization of student life, the displacement of the mainline made room for a host of religious newcomers” (The expansion of campus evangelicalism section, para. 1). Schmalzbauer found evangelical parachurch groups such as InterVarsity Christian Fellowship, Campus Crusade, Great Commission Ministries, the Fellowship of Christian Athletes, the Navigators, and Victory Campus Ministry were the most successful of these newcomers with over 210,000 students. He went on to explore other areas of growth such as Catholic and Jewish groups and immigrant/alternative religions. Based on the participation in the variety of faith-based organizations studied, it can be argued involvement in campus ministry impacts the post-secondary education experience.

### ***Impact on Higher Education***

Involvement in campus ministry influences the college experience in a variety of ways. One impact of involvement in these organizations is on academics. De Sota et al. (2018) explored how religious involvement affects the academic ethic of college students. They found students who scored higher on religiosity also scored higher in academic ethic. Similarly, Li and Murphy (2017) found, “religiosity positively moderates the relationship between being a Christian and academic performance” (p. 13). Since faith seems to play a role in the academic ethics and performance of students, it raises the question of whether or not campus ministry involvement would show similar correlations.

Another area of impact of campus ministries centers on students’ mental health. Bryant (2007) revealed students involved in religious organizations may experience slight declines in

their emotional well-being. Likewise, Winterowd et al. (2005) found higher levels of spirituality appeared to be associated with higher levels of anger and stress. In each of these two studies, spirituality appeared to negatively affect the mental health of students. Bryant (2007) believed this to be due to the idea of religious discussions leading students vulnerable to questions centered around the idea of truth and existence. In these studies, it was found mental health concerns increased in campus ministry groups.

Involvement in campus ministry can often influence students' sense of identity. When identity is confirmed through the group, campus ministry groups can be helpful to the emotional well-being of their members. Mankowski and Thomas (2000) studied personal and collective identity and discovered religious discussions could contribute positively to emotional well-being through stories from multiple members of a campus ministry. They found when students' own life stories aligned with the values and beliefs of the campus ministry students were able to feel more at home in the organization. This indicates the potential for campus ministries to positively influence the means in which students are able to become socialized to the campus environment.

Campus Ministry involvement also has an influence on student retention. Rasor (2017) found involvement in the Baptist Campus Ministry positively impacted retention and completion at the two-year college involved in the study. However, he discovered this did not carry over when students then transferred to a four-year institution. As this study of a two-year institution is one of the few studies specifically focused on campus ministry and retention, not enough research exists to support whether this is also true of students who attend four-year institutions from the start.

Campus ministry involvement appears to have a variety of effects on student experiences. Little research has been conducted on campus ministries and thus little is known about how



campus ministries might affect students. Past research has shown potential impacted areas include academics, well-being, and retention. However, similar results were hard to come by in these studies and it is therefore difficult to make generalizable conclusions. For many, it can be said a relationship exists but not whether it is positive or negative. Additionally, there are many areas of potential impact research has not yet evaluated in regard to campus ministry.

## **Socialization**

### *Socialization Phases*

One such gap in research around campus ministry is socialization. Chao (2012) defined organizational socialization as “a learning and adjustment process that enables an individual to assume an organizational role that fits both organizational and individual needs” (Abstract section). It is the process of moving from being an outsider in an organization to an insider. Miller (2014) broke the concept of socialization into three distinct phases.

The first is anticipatory socialization which occurs prior to entering the organization. The second is encounter socialization which occurs when an individual first enters an organization. The third is metamorphosis socialization which occurs when an individual is now an insider in the organization. While each of these phases are important to this study, the primary focus is the movement from the encounter phase to the metamorphosis phase.

**Encounter Socialization.** Encounter socialization is focused on the transition into an organization and centered around values and connection. Miller (2014) defined the encounter stage as, “[The] sensemaking stage that occurs when a new employee enters the organization. The newcomer must let go of old roles and values in adapting to the expectations of the new organization” (p. 121). This act of adapting to new expectations and working through roles and

values is key in the transition process. Thus, it can be determined values play a key role in encounter socialization.

**Metamorphosis Socialization.** If encounter socialization is about transition, then metamorphosis socialization is about integration and connection. Sandor (2014) explained, “Metamorphosis represents an individual’s absorption into the culture of the organization” (p. 12). In order to experience this cultural integration, one must identify with the organization. In her research on turning points of socialization, Bullis (1989) stated, “Identification, then, as a fundamental process of relational development and as a product involving feelings of similarity, belonging, and membership, is integrally related to the socialization process” (p. 275). She went on to explain those who are able to successfully become members would have higher identification with the organization. When one identifies with a group, they will begin to use terms indicative of the group to which they belong. Ashforth and Mael (1989) explained:

Identification with the organization provides (a) a mechanism whereby the individual can reify the organization and feel loyal and committed to it per se (i.e., apart from its members) and (b) an indirect path through which socialization may increase the internalization of organizational values and beliefs (p. 29).

As an individual joins a new group or organization, socialization can occur. Individuals begin to identify with the goals and values of an organization and feel they are a valuable and embedded part of the group. In metamorphosis socialization an individual is able to identify with the values and beliefs the group holds and find a sense of connection. This connection allows the individual to become an integrated member of the organization.

### ***Embeddedness and Socialization***

One key component in socialization is embeddedness. Ng and Feldman (2007) defined organizational embeddedness as “the totality of forces (fit, links, and sacrifices) that keep people in their current organizations” (p. 336). Ng and Feldman (2007) had three components to embeddedness. Fit is an alignment of requirements, rewards, and interests. Links are the ties people have with others in their organization. Sacrifices are the losses that would come from leaving the organization. Allen (2006) studied the way socialization tactics influence newcomers. He found the socialization tactics studied had a significant positive correlation with embeddedness. This means those who are more socialized to their organization also experience greater fit, stronger links, and higher sacrifices.

### ***Socialization Within the College Campus***

Most socialization research is tied to jobs or business organizations; however, the components and effects of socialization can also be seen on college campuses. Tieu and Pancer (2009) found participation in quality extracurriculars could be linked to positive adjustment to the university. They found successful adjustment was higher if the student felt the activity was important and allowed them to connect to other students. In this study, religious activities were rated as one of the most important. Likewise, it was found “students who participated in extracurricular activities exhibited more attachment to school and more adherence to school norms than students who did not” (Flores-Gonzalez, 2002, as cited in Dagaz, 2012). Attachment and identification are key components of socialization.

While socialization has been widely studied by communication theorists over the years, little specific research can be found on how it relates to higher education. When socialization is evaluated, it is often in the context of one specific organization or occupation. This is most often employment organizations with secular ideologies. Research has shown involvement in

extracurricular activities correlates to greater adjustment to the university, indicating involvement in student organizations can contribute to student socialization. Additionally, there has been some indication that type of student organization may influence the way students become insiders. While research on socialization through student organizations and to the campus environment exists, there is no evidence of any specific research centered on campus ministry and socialization within the university.

### **Summary**

While literature has shown involvement in faith-based organizations does have an impact on various aspects of the college experience in general, little research has been done on the specific concept of socialization. It has been shown campus ministry involvement can affect students in the context of academics, mental health, identity, and retention. It is also known college is a transition period that requires students to go through the process of socialization. Yet little research has been done on college campuses and in faith-based organizations. Involvement in campus ministry could influence the process of socialization for students as they transition into college and evaluate their sense of connection to the university. Thus, the following research question is proposed:

**RQ:** What is the relationship between involvement in a campus ministry and socialization to the university?

### **Methodology**

#### **Participants**

Participants included 62 college students at a mid-sized midwestern university representing eight different campus ministries. Approximately 500 people were reached out to regarding participation indicating a 12.4% response rate. This was a lower response rate than

desired. Of the participants, 69.4% of participants were female, 19.4% were male, and the other 11.2% identified as non-binary or did not respond. Participants included members of any organization falling under the category of “religious organization.” The participants’ mean year in school was 2.62 (SD= 1.35, N=55) indicating the average participant was in their sophomore or junior year. The average length of involvement was 2.53 years (SD= 1.31, N=62) showing most of the participants had been involved in their ministry for the length of their time in college. Participants indicated a high level of involvement in religious organizations prior to college (M= 4.45, SD=1.03, N=56), high religiosity (M=4.59, SD=.781, N=56), and most grew up in a Christian home (M=4.34, SD=1.23, N=56). The inclusionary criteria for this study were that participants must be UNI students and must be involved in campus ministry.

Each participant remained anonymous and basic demographic information (year in school, gender identity, and which campus ministry they participated) was collected for purposes of comparison and analysis. The only potential risk of this study was inconvenience of time. All risks were minimal and not out of the ordinary of normal, daily life. The survey was anonymous and voluntary, and a participant could choose to not take or stop taking the survey whenever they wished. There was not compensation for participation in this research.

## **Procedure**

The eleven campus ministries listed under the category of “religious organization” within the UNI campus organization list serv were approached and asked for permission for the study to be conducted within their organization. Of these eleven, eight were represented in the results. Each campus ministry contact then forwarded an email containing a link to an online Qualtrics survey designed to measure involvement in campus ministry and socialization to the university. Additional responses were gained through the use of convenience/snowball sampling. Potential

participants were emailed an explanation of the research and a link to the online Qualtrics survey. IRB approval was obtained for this study and was revised when the use of convenience/snowball sampling was required.

## **Measures**

The survey consisted of 38 multiple choice questions and one open ended question (“How has the COVID-19 pandemic impacted your involvement with campus ministry and UNI”). The purpose of the open-ended question was to gain clarifying information to help better understand the results.

*Involvement in campus ministry* was operationalized as involvement in campus ministry activities and social involvement. *Involvement in campus ministry activities* was measured with six items adapted from the Student Involvement in Baptist Collegiate Ministry, Enrollment Status and Academic Success (Rasor, 2018, pp. 97-101). This was assessed using a 5-point scale where 5= strongly agree and 1= strongly disagree. Sample items included “When I attend my campus ministry, I am an active participant (engage in conversation, participate in worship and fellowship, join in games, etc.),” “I serve in a leadership position within my campus ministry,” and “I am involved in a church affiliated with my campus ministry.” Participant scores were averaged so higher scores indicated higher level of involvement in activities (M=4.29, SD=.69, N=60). Cronbach’s alpha ( $\alpha = .65$ ) indicated minimally acceptable reliability.

*Social involvement* was assessed with seven items adapted from the 2008 version of the Your First College Year Survey (HERI, 2008 as cited in Sharkness & DeAngelo, 2010). Using various 5-point Likert-type scales (where higher scores indicated positive responses), participants answered questions about their involvement with campus ministries (M=4.40, SD=.65, N=60). Sample items included “Since entering your campus ministry, how often have

you felt isolated from your campus ministry” (5= always and 1=never) and “Please rate your satisfaction with your campus ministry in terms of your social life” (5= extremely satisfied and 1=extremely dissatisfied.” Reliability was excellent ( $\alpha = .90$ ).

*Socialization to the university* was operationalized as social involvement and with three conceptual factors of socialization (history, politics, and organizational goals and values). *Social involvement* was assessed with seven items adapted from the Your First College Year Survey (HERI, 2008 as cited in Sharkness & DeAngelo, 2010). Using various 5-point Likert-type scales (where higher scores indicated positive responses), participants answered questions about their socialization to the university (M=3.66, SD= .74, N=54). Sample items included “Since entering UNI, how often have you felt isolated from campus life” (5= always and 1=never) and “Please rate your satisfaction with UNI in terms of your social life” (5= extremely satisfied and 1=extremely dissatisfied). Cronbach’s alpha ( $\alpha = .86$ ) indicated good reliability.

*The three conceptual factors of socialization* were assessed with 15 items adapted from the Organizational Socialization Index (Chao, O’Leary-Kelly, Wolf, Klein, & Gardner, 1994). Of these seventeen items, five assessed history (M=2.27, SD=.91, N=55), three assessed politics (M=2.84, SD=1.09, N=55), and seven assessed organizational goals and values (M=3.40, SD=.65, N=55). These were assessed using a 5-point scale where 5= strongly agree and 1= strongly disagree. Five questions were reverse scored. Sample items included “I know very little about the history behind UNI” (reverse scored), “The goals of UNI are also my goals,” and “I believe I fit in well at UNI.” Cronbach’s alpha for socialization through history ( $\alpha = .87$ ), politics ( $\alpha = .83$ ), and goals and values ( $\alpha = .81$ ) all indicated good reliability.

## **Results**

Correlations between involvement in campus ministry activities, social involvement in campus ministry, social involvement in the university, and the three factors of socialization were computed to answer the research question about the relationship between involvement in campus ministry and socialization to the campus. As indicated in Table 1, there was a statistically significant relationship between involvement in campus ministry activities and social involvement in campus ministry ( $r=.32$ ,  $p=.01$ ) indicating both measures of involvement in campus ministry were correlated. Similarly, as seen in Table 1, there was a statistically significant relationship between each of the three factors of socialization: history and politics ( $r=.45$ ,  $p=.001$ ), history and goals ( $r=.59$ ,  $p<.001$ ), and politics and goals ( $r=.42$ ,  $p=.001$ ). Additionally, as Table 1 shows, a statistically significant relationship was found between social involvement in campus ministry and social involvement in the campus as a whole ( $r=.59$ ,  $p<.001$ ) and between social involvement in the campus ministry and socialization to the university through goals and values ( $r=.324$ ,  $p=.02$ ).



**Table 1***Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Between Study Variables*

| Variable  | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | 1    | 2      | 3   | 4      | 5     | 6 |
|---|----------|----------|-----------|------|--------|-----|--------|-------|---|
| 1. Involvement<br>in Campus<br>Ministry<br>Activities | 60       | 4.29     | .69       | —    | —      | —   | —      | —     | — |
| 2. Social<br>Involvement in<br>Campus Ministry        | 60       | 4.40     | .65       | .32* | —      | —   | —      | —     | — |
| 3. Social<br>Involvement in<br>the University         | 54       | 3.66     | .73       | 1.77 | .59*** | —   | —      | —     | — |
| 4. Socialization-<br>History                          | 55       | 2.27     | .91       | -.01 | .14    | .21 | —      | —     | — |
| 5. Socialization-<br>Politics                         | 55       | 2.84     | 1.09      | .17  | .11    | .18 | .45**  | —     | — |
| 6. Socialization-<br>Goals and Values                 | 55       | 3.40     | .65       | .05  | .32*   | .26 | .59*** | .42** | — |

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \*\*\* $p < .001$

## Discussion

This thesis sought to evaluate how involvement in campus ministries influences students' socialization to the university. The results indicate there is a positive correlation between being involved in a campus ministry and students' socialization to the university. There are four key findings to this study. The first is a positive correlation between involvement in campus ministry activities and social involvement in the ministry. This indicates the more involved students are in the ministry the more they feel connected to the people within their ministry. Students who attend more events and are more actively involved in their campus ministry seem to also be more involved socially. This shows a correlation between the various aspects of involvement showing that these two measures both explored student involvement. Students more involved in activities are also more involved socially demonstrating the importance of being involved in both manners.

A second key finding is a positive correlation between all three factors of socialization. This means students who are socialized to the university through history are likely also socialized through politics and goals. Likewise, those socialized through politics are also socialized through goals and history and those socialized through goals are also socialized through politics and history. This is important because it demonstrates all three of these are key aspects of socialization. This shows that socialization through one of these areas can act as a gateway to being socialized in the other two.

A third finding is a positive correlation between social involvement in the campus ministry and social involvement on campus. This suggests individuals who experience greater levels of social connection and engage in more social activities in their ministry also do the same within their campus community. The relationship between social involvement in these two different environments indicates being socially involved in campus ministries can also translate

to being socially involved on campus. As such, involvement in campus ministry can be a helpful way to make connections within the university. Tieu and Pancer (2009) found adjustment to college life was more successful if a student was involved in meaningful organizations that aid in forming a sense of connection. The results of this study support this finding with the indicated positive relationship between social involvement in the ministry and social involvement in the campus.

The fourth key finding of this research is a significant positive correlation between social involvement in the campus ministry and socialization through organizational goals and values. Those who experience greater social involvement within their campus ministry are more likely to feel like their personal goals and values align with those of the university. Ashforth and Mael (1989) explained, "Identification with the organization provides... an indirect path through which socialization may increase the internalization of organizational values and beliefs" (p. 29). As such, the correlation between social involvement in campus ministry and identification with the organizational goals and values of the university supports the idea that involvement in campus ministry positively affects students' socialization to the university. This finding is extremely important because it indicates being involved in campus ministry can help students in the transition process of moving from high school to college.

Leaving home and moving to college for the first time is a big change. The process of socialization is key to this transition. As students first enter college, encounter socialization takes place. Students are trying to figure out how to incorporate their values into those of their campus community. The findings of this study support the idea that getting involved in a campus ministry can aid students in this process of encounter socialization. Prior research (e.g., Allen, 2006) has shown feeling connected is an important part of encounter socialization. The positive

correlation between social involvement in campus ministries and social involvement in the university indicates connection to those in the ministry often leads to connection to the campus. Students are able to join a faith-based organization where they can make friends and develop social connections to students who already have similar values and beliefs to them. This familiarity can then help them move through encounter socialization and into the metamorphosis stage. As this happens, shared values and goals become important. The results of this study showed social involvement in campus ministries is positively correlated with socialization through organizational values and goals. The sense of shared values and goals students have within their ministry helps them start to feel like insiders within the university.

### **Limitations and Future Research**

As the present study was exploratory in nature, it creates a foundation for future study, as well as room to address limitations. The first of these limitations is response rate. Due to the small sample size, it is difficult to determine completely accurate findings. The low response rate may mean the results are not completely representative of the entire population. The estimates from this study may be conservative and not fully evaluate the full extent of existing correlations. It is possible stronger correlations could be found with a larger sample size. Another limitation would be the methods of sampling used in this study. Due to lack of participation, it was necessary to rely on snowball sampling. This potentially skewed the results as it led to more participants from the campus ministries, I was most acquainted with. A third limitation could be seen in the measures used. The scale used to measure involvement in campus ministry activities was not as reliable as initially desired. Instead of using a Likert type scale indicating agreement, it might have been better to ask something like “How often have you participated in \_\_\_\_\_ in the last month.” Questions such as these might have resulted in greater reliability. A fourth limitation

was the fact the only campus ministries listed on the list serv were Christian organizations and therefore only Christian organizations were explored in this research. A final limitation was the use of a self-report method. Due to the self-report nature of the survey, it is possible participants did not answer honestly or accurately.

If, as the present study suggests, a positive relationship between involvement in campus ministry and socialization to the university exists, it indicates need for research exploring the extent of this relationship. Future research should examine cause and effect of the relationship between campus ministry and socialization to the university. While there does seem to be a positive relationship between involvement in campus ministry and university socialization, it remains unclear whether campus ministry involvement leads to socialization to the university, socialization to the university leads to greater involvement, or some other moderating variable is present. Although this study demonstrates a relationship between involvement in campus ministries and socialization, future research should compare responses of students who are not involved in campus ministry with those who are. This later research could investigate whether campus ministry has a greater correlation to socialization than other student organizations found on campus. It could also be useful to look at other important aspects of socialization such as commitment, satisfaction, and identification in future studies to determine the extent of the relationship between ministry involvement and university socialization.

### **Conclusion**

This research can be seen as a first step towards integrating two lines of research, impact of involvement in campus ministry and student socialization to university life that do not appear to have been previously directly linked. This study sought to evaluate the relationship between involvement in campus ministries and students' socialization to the universities. Prior research

indicated involvement in campus ministry had a profound impact on student lives in multiple ways. It also indicated socialization to the university is often facilitated through involvement in campus organizations. Thus, this study aimed to determine what the relationship was between involvement in campus ministry and students' socialization to the university. Results indicated students who were more involved and felt more connected to their campus ministry were also more socially involved in the university and were able to better identify with the goals and values of the university. This is important because it shows students more benefits of joining a campus ministry group. This benefits new students and transfer students in the encounter socialization phase looking for a means of building relationships with other students and finding a sense of belonging on campus. This research supports the idea that joining a campus ministry can help facilitate that. For current students in the metamorphosis stage of socialization, this research allows them to recognize a positive relationship between social involvement in campus ministry and identifying with the goals and values of the university. Finally, for current and future campus ministry staff, these findings are important because they indicate the importance of campus ministry. Data indicates students who participate in more activities within their campus ministry experience greater social involvement in their campus ministry. This social involvement in campus ministry is positively related to social involvement in the university and socialization to the university through goals and values. This is vital to student success and retention for years to come.

## References

- Allen, D.G. (2006). Do organizational socialization tactics influence newcomer embeddedness and turnover? *Journal of Management*, 32(2). [PDF file]. 237-256.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305280103>
- Ashforth, B.E. & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *The Academy of Management Review*, 14(1). [PDF file]. 20-39. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/258189>
- Bryant, A.N. (2007). The effects of involvement in campus religious communities on college student adjustment and development. *Journal of College and Character*, 8(3). [PDF file].  
<https://doi.org/10.2202/1940-1639.1178>
- Bullis, C. & Bach, B.W. (1989). Socialization turning points: An examination of change in organizational identification. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 53(3). [PDF file]. 273-293. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10570318909374307>
- Chao, G. T. (2012). Organizational socialization: Background, basics, and a blueprint for adjustment at work. [Abstract]. *Oxford library of psychology. The Oxford handbook of organizational psychology*, 1. 579–614.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199928309.013.0018>
- Dagaz, M. C. (2012). Learning from the Band: Trust, Acceptance, and Self-Confidence. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 41(4), 432–461. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891241612447813>
- De Soto, W., Tajalli, H., Pino, N., & Smith, C. L. (2018). The effect of college students' religious involvement on their academic ethic. *Religion & Education*, 45(2). [PDF file]. 190-207.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15507394.2018.1425077>

- Foote, C. (2018). The importance of community in college. *Ministry Impact Stories, The Navigators*. <https://www.navigators.org/the-importance-of-community-in-college/>
- Hartley, H. V. (2004). How college affects students' religious faith and practice: A review of research. *The College Student Affairs Journal*, 23(2). [PDF file]. 111-129.  
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ956982.pdf>
- Li, N. & Murphy, W. (2018) Religious affiliation, religiosity, and academic performance of university students: Campus life implications for U.S. universities. *Religion & Education*, 45(1). [PDF file]. 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15507394.2017.1398561>
- Mankowski, E.S. & Thomas, E. (2000). The relationship between personal and collective identity: A narrative analysis of a campus ministry community. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 28(5). [PDF file]. 517-28. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1520-6629\(200009\)28:5<517::AID-JCOP5>3.0.CO;2-A](https://doi.org/10.1002/1520-6629(200009)28:5<517::AID-JCOP5>3.0.CO;2-A)
- Miller, K. (2014). *Organizational communication: Approaches and processes* (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Ng, T.W.H. & Feldman, D.C. (2007). Organizational embeddedness and occupational embeddedness across career stages. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 70(2). [PDF file]. 336-351. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2006.10.002>
- Rasor, R.M., (2018). *Assessing the impact of student involvement in campus ministry on retention and academic success: A mixed method study* (Publication No. 10280555) [Doctoral dissertation, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.



Sandor, K.S., (2014). *Understanding Work Socialization: A Qualitative Study of a Youth Employment Program* [Master's Thesis, Western Michigan University].

[https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters\\_theses/479](https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses/479)

Schmalzbauer, J. (2007, February 6). Campus ministry: A Statistical Portrait. [PDF file].

<http://religion.ssrc.org/reforum/Schmalzbauer.pdf>

Sharkness, J. & DeAngelo, L. (2010, November 30). Measuring student involvement: A comparison of classical test theory and item response theory in the construction of scales from student surveys. *Research in Higher Education*, 52. 480-507.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-010-9202-3>

Tieu, T.T. & Pancer, S. (2009). Cocurricular involvement and first-year students' transition to university: Quality vs. quantity of involvement. *Journal of the First-Year Experience & Students in Transition*, 21(1), [PDF file]. 43-64.

<https://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/fyesit/fyesit/2009/00000021/00000001/art00003?crawler=true&mimetype=application/pdf>

Winterowd, C., Harrist, S., Thomason, N., Worth, S., & Carlozzi, B. (2005). The relationship of spiritual beliefs and involvement with the experience of anger and stress in college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 46(5). [PDF file]. 515-529.

<https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2005.0057>

### Appendix: Survey Questions

1. Are you currently involved in a campus ministry at the University of Northern Iowa? Yes or No.
2. How long have you attended your campus ministry?
  - A. <1 year
  - B. 1-2 years
  - C. 2-3 years
  - D. 3-4 years
  - E. 4+ years

*The following questions are adapted from Robert Mark Rasor's 2018 Study and designed to evaluate involvement in campus ministry. Answers fall on a 5 point Likert-type scale where 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree, and 5=strongly agree.*

3. When I attend my campus ministry, I am an active participant (engage in conversation, participate in worship and fellowship, join in games, etc.)
4. I serve in a leadership position within my campus ministry.
5. I am involved in a church affiliated with my campus ministry.
6. I participate in a bible study through my campus ministry.
7. I meet one on one with a member of my campus ministry (in a discipleship or mentorship capacity).
8. I attend conferences and/or retreats with my campus ministry.

*The following questions are taken from the 2008 Your First College Year (YFCY) survey to measure social involvement in campus ministry.*

9. Since entering your campus ministry, how often have you felt isolated from your campus ministry.

Always, often, sometimes, rarely, never

10. Since entering your campus ministry, how easy has it been to develop close friendships with others.

Very easy, somewhat easy, average, somewhat difficult, very difficult

11. Please rate your satisfaction with your campus ministry in terms of... (very satisfied, satisfied, neutral, dissatisfied, very dissatisfied, can't rate/no experience)

- a. Your interaction with other members of your campus ministry
- b. The availability of social activities
- c. Your social life
- d. Overall sense of community among members of your campus ministry

12. Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement... I see myself as part of my campus ministry community

Strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree

*The following questions are taken from the 2008 Your First College Year (YFCY) survey to measure social involvement in the campus community.*

13. Since entering UNI, how often have you felt isolated from campus life.

Always, often, sometimes, rarely, never

14. Since entering UNI, how easy has it been to develop close friendships with others.

Very easy, somewhat easy, average, somewhat difficult, very difficult

15. Please rate your satisfaction with UNI in terms of... (very satisfied, satisfied, neutral, dissatisfied, very dissatisfied, can't rate/no experience)

- a. Your interaction with other students
  - b. The availability of social activities
  - c. Your social life
  - d. Overall sense of community among students
16. Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement... I see myself as part of the campus community

Strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree

*The following questions are adapted from Chao's Organizational Socialization Scale. Answers fall on a 5 point Likert-type scale where 1= strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree, and 5=strongly agree.*

- 17. I know very little about the history behind UNI. (R)
- 18. I am not familiar with UNI's customs, rituals, ceremonies, and celebrations. (R)
- 19. I know UNI's long-held traditions.
- 20. I would be a good resource in describing the background of UNI.
- 21. I am familiar with the history of UNI.
- 22. I have learned how things "really work" on the inside of UNI.
- 23. I know who the most influential people are at UNI.
- 24. I can identify the people at UNI who are the most important in getting the work done.
- 25. I would be a good representative of UNI.
- 26. The goals of UNI are also my goals.
- 27. I believe I fit in well with UNI.
- 28. I do not believe in the values set by UNI. (R)
- 29. I understand the goals of UNI.

30. I would be a good example of someone who represents UNI's values.

31. I support the goals set by UNI.

32. I do not consider any of my fellow students as my friends. (R)

33. I am usually excluded in social get-togethers given by other people at UNI. (R)

*The following are demographic questions.*

34. What year are you at UNI?

A. First year

B. Second year

C. Third year

D. Fourth year

E. Fifth year +

35. What is your gender?

A. Female

B. Male

C. Non-Binary

D. Other

36. I was involved in a church prior to entering college. (Strongly agree to strongly disagree)

37. I consider myself to be religious. (Strongly agree to strongly disagree)

38. I grew up in a Christian home.

39. Open Ended Question: How has the COVID-19 pandemic impacted your involvement with campus ministry and UNI?