COMPARING FRESHMAN ORIENTATION PROGRAMS ON INITIAL CAMPUS INTEGRATION

By

NANCY RUZICKA CHILDRESS

Bachelor of Science
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona
1968

Master of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1979

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
December, 1984

COMPARING FRESHMAN ORIENTATION PROGRAMS

ON INTITIAL CAMPUS INTEGRATION

Thesis Approved:

Judith E. Dobson
Thesis Adviser

Dianna L. Newman

Don Wesley

Ernest E. VanDenburgh

J. Ann Dillard

Norman N. Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

To the memory of my mother.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My sincere appreciation for the genuine kindness and continued encouragement shown to me by my major adviser, Dr. Judith Dobson, throughout my graduate experience. I also wish to thank the members of my doctoral committee, Dr. Dan Wesley, Dr. Dianna Newman, Dr. John Dillard, and Dr. Frank McFarland for the kind assistance and friendship demonstrated to me.

A special note of appreciation for the love and support of my husband, Don, and children Allyson and John.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Research has indicated that the initial interface between the student and the institution has crucial impact on the student's integration into the campus environment (Wigent, 1971). Typically, beginning students feel lost and perceive the new environment as being threatening and overwhelming. Freshman orientation programs have been designed to ease the stress this transition often brings by providing incoming students with a series of experiences that are intended to enable new students to define their academic and social needs, and then identify the resources available on campus that can satisfy those needs (Mathews, 1974).

Entering a new collegiate environment, whether it is a junior college, a comprehensive university, or a small, private, liberal arts college, holds many of the same dimensions as traveling or living in a foreign land. The geography, folkways, and mores of the new culture need to be learned in order to survive. In addition, an individual needs to come to terms with the new environment in a real and personal sense. Orientation programs are charged with the responsibility of aiding students in this transition (Barr, 1974).

Institutions vary in their approach to orientation. Kronvet (1969) reported that 92.4% of institutions surveyed have an orientation program of some type. At one large southwestern university, a freshman orienta-

tion program, entitled Alpha, is conducted in the Fall preceding the beginning of classes. The main purpose of the Alpha program is to provide varied activities and experiences that will facilitate integration into the total campus environment for all new students. As with most orientation programs of this type, Alpha attempts to meet the needs of students across a wide spectrum.

Sagaria, Higginson, and White (1980) identified three basic areas that most traditional orientation programs address. These areas are those of academic, social and personal involvement. The academic domain includes course scheduling, academic advisement, choice of major, and other academic information. The social area encompasses those areas primarily concerned with the development of interpersonal relationships, and the personal domain addresses those issues such as housing, money, and employment.

Although orientation programs include academic and nonacademic matters, they have traditionally emphasized cocurricular matters at the expense of academic concerns. This emphasis may occur because program planners perceive cocurricular topics as important to incoming students, or such topics may represent the primary areas of expertise of student personnel workers who usually coordinate orientation programs (Sagaria, Higginson, & White, 1980).

It is generally accepted that the pattern of integration and growth in college is largely set in the first few months of college (Heath, 1968; Katz, 1968; Rootman, 1972). In light of this, it seems reasonable to assume that freshman orientation activities and programs have the opportunity to make a significant impact on students both intellectually

and personally. Nelson and Murphy (1980) conclude that recruitment, admissions, and orientation programs and services are deemed essential for the modern university that must deal with the problems of budget reductions, attrition, and declining enrollments.

Significance of the Study

According to Rootman (1972) attrition is heaviest during the freshman year. Tinto (1975) found that less than one-half of those who enter college, successfully complete their studies within four years. Of these, 28% withdraw before completing the freshman year. An additional 15% withdraw between the end of the freshman and sophomore years. In a study conducted jointly by the University of Iowa, Iowa State University, and Northern Iowa University for the Iowa State Board of Regents, similiar statistics of student persistence in college were reported. A total of 20% of new freshman in the years 1965-66 did not return for a second year, and the rate of persistence to the degree for this class of freshman was 50%. For the freshman class of 1971 at the University of Iowa, 26% did not return for their sophomore year (Demitroff, 1974).

In their exploration of a theoretical model of student attrition, Terenzini & Pascarella (1977) report that students who persist in college have significantly more positive perceptions of both their academic and nonacademic lives than those who leave. Also, those who stayed reported significantly more contacts with faculty members and viewed their nonacademic lives to be more challenging than did those who left the institution.

The involvement of students with persons in the institution has several important consequences. Kegan (1976) comments that not feeling

isolated from other people at college has been found to make an important contribution toward satisfaction with one's college experience. Almost all universities are concerned about the problem of alienation and take various steps to integrate students into their desired social systems. Freshmen boards, residence counseling, and student-faculty retreats are utilized to decrease or prevent student alienation. However, the largest and most extensive attempts to prevent isolation and alienation are those institutional programs dealing with orientation, or the initial integration of the student into the system of higher education (Bakas, 1974).

An institution's orientation program is the first picture new students have of what they can expect of the institution and what is expected of them. Effective orientation should present an accurate picture and objective information both of academic and nonacademic life (Bakas, 1974). Orientation should not simply provide fun and games for several days in an attempt to anesthetize the reality of campus life.

Although traditional orientation programs have attempted to address the needs of freshmen students, studies directed towards assessing the effects of orientation upon students have been rather limited in scope and content. No significant difference was found among students who were exposed to traditional pre-class freshmen orientation programs than those who did not participate (Foxley, 1969; Herron, 1974; Rothman & Leonard, 1967).

O'Banion (1969), however, reported favorable student response to an orientation process that supplemented the traditional pre-class program. Kopecek (1971) found it is possible to design an orientation program that results in a higher level of knowledge about a campus as well as

demonstrating higher grade point averages in those students who underwent an eight-week supplemental orientation program when compared to groups who did not.

This causal-comparative study consists of a comparison of three different groups. One group is composed of 21 freshmen students enrolled in the College of Arts and Sciences who received the Alpha orientation program prior to the beginning of classes. A second group of 21 Arts and Sciences freshmen received a Freshman Seminar Class, A & S 1111, during their initial semester at the university. The third group of 21 students received both. The effects of this treatment were measured on the basis of three criteria: a) Grade Point average (GPA); b) Retention, or, whether students continued enrollment the following semester; c) A survey measuring students' perceptions of the campus environment.

The results of this study could be useful to counselors, student personnel workers, and administrators who work with freshmen students at the university. This research could suggest possibilities for supplemental orientation programs that could be developed and implemented with all freshmen students.

Statement of the Problem

Research conducted by (Foxley, 1976; Herron, 1972; Rothman & Leonard, 1976; Sagaria, Higginson & White, 1980) has suggested that traditional freshman orientation programs have little effect on new entry students' attrition levels, adjustment to campus or grade-point-averages. In Herron's (1972) study of student alienation, he found orientation programs made minimal difference in the integration of the new student to the university community. Sagaria et al (1980) indicated from their

research in assessing the needs of freshman students, that a restructuring of the traditional orientation program is needed. Therefore, this study is designed to answer the following question: Is there a difference in the mean grade point average, retention, and perceptions of the campus environment among freshman students who experience either the Alpha program, A & S 1111, or both, during their initial semester at one large southwestern university?

Development of the Program

A review of the literature on freshman orientation programs shows a lack of research on the effectiveness of such programs. Of the studies that do address whether or not these programs are effective, few show little positive change among students who are exposed to these programs (Foxley, 1969; Rothmanand & Leonard, 1967).

There is a growing need among student personnel professionals for assessment of freshman orientation efforts due to the rather large sums of money and manpower used in carrying out these programs. Along with the areas of retention and enrollment of new students, efforts in improving orientation are becoming priorities for many universities today.

For this study, a semester long Freshman Seminar orientation process was conceived as a possible method for supplementing the effectiveness of pre-class freshman orientation. The Freshman Seminar has the potential to increase contact with faculty, staff, older students, and peers during those first crucial months in college and, therefore, may help integrate freshmen to the total campus environment. The traditional pre-class orientation, Alpha, often is over before students have had the opportunity to identify areas of concern that they are experiencing.

Definition of Terms

The Alpha Program is a four-day process involving formal and informal interaction with faculty and staff as well as socials and academic meetings. It has as its purpose the aiding of new students in their transition to a new environment.

The College and University Environment Scales (CUES II) is a testing instrument appropriate for college freshman which defines their perception of the intellectual-social-cultural climate of the campus. A student perceived measurement of the environment is provided along five scales:

(a) Practicality: this scale describes an environment characterized by enterprise and organization.

(b) Community: a perception of the congeniality and cohesiveness of the campus measured by this scale.

(c) Awareness: the level of personal, political and poetic awareness is measured by this scale.

(d) Propriety: these items reflect a perception of the campus atmosphere as mannerly and considerate.

(e) Scholarship: the items in this scale describe a campus characterized by intellectuality and scholastic discipline.

Freshman Seminar is a continuing orientation program taken for credit during the first semster, which provides the arena for the sharing of needed academic information while facilitating an awareness of options available on campus to aid the students in their adjustment to a new environment.

The Grade Point Average (GPA) refers to the grades reported for the Fall semester, 1983, by participants in this study.

Orientation is the organizational process the institution provides incoming students that provides the opportunity for them to recognize their academic and social needs and to identify the means available on campus to deal with these needs.

Retention refers to continued enrollment the second semester of the freshman year at the university.

For purposes of this study, integration refers to students' perceived integration to the campus environment as measured by their Grade-Point-Average (GPA), whether or not they return to campus the following semester, and their scores on their CUES II, a test measuring students' perceptions of the campus environment.

Limitations

This study is limited to a specific population, a selected number of randomly assigned freshman students experiencing either the Alpha orientation Program or a Freshman Seminar course, A & S 1111, or both, during the Fall, 1983 semester at one land grant university campus. Therefore, the results may not necessarily be generalizable to other populations.

The type of orientation suggested in this study, the methods of presentation and the evaluation have been considered in view of limitations and restrictions concerning the number of students enrolled in the College of Arts & Sciences who experience Alpha, and/or A & S 1111, as well as the number of staff available to implement and evaluate the program.

Hypotheses

The .05 level of confidence was specified as necessary in rejecting the following null hypotheses:

1. There is no difference in Grade Point Average (GPA) for the initial semester at a large southwestern university among the three groups of selected students who experience Alpha or A & S 1111 or both types of orientation.
2. There is no difference in retention between the three groups participating in this study.
3. There is no difference between the three groups in their perceptions of the intellectual-social-cultural environment of the campus as measured by the College and University Environment Scales (CUES II).

Organization of the Study

This chapter has introduced the topic under investigation. Also included in this chapter was the Significance of the Study, Statement of the Problem, the Development of the Program, Definition of Terms, Limitations and the Hypotheses. Chapter II contains a Review of Related Literature and Research. Chapter III, Design and Methodology, includes a discussion of the subjects, the data gathering procedure, traditional freshman orientation procedures, experimental orientation procedures, the instrument utilized, and the methodology and statistical analysis of the data. The findings and results of the study are contained in Chapter IV. Chapter V presents the Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Chapter II presents information and findings from the literature that appear to enhance understanding of the factors involved in the study. The first section deals with the goals and objectives of freshman orientation, the population served, and the developmental tasks of these students. The second section addresses the impact of the environment on new students as well as the concept of alienation and degree of campus involvement. The final area is concerned with evaluation of orientation programs, implications for retention and the need for continuing orientation programs.

Goals and Objectives of Orientation

The desirability, if not necessity, of orientating new students to their first experience in college came into vogue about 1920. Since that time, various authors have contributed to the literature attempting to describe and analyze the various components that comprise the orientation process (Rothman & Leonard, 1967).

Moore, Pappas and Vinton (1979) report the goals of orientation are: (a) to facilitate the mechanics of entry such as placement tests, advisement and registration; (b) to assist students gain a realistic assessment of campus life; and (c) to acquaint students with the services of the Student Affairs Division of the university. Hurst and Smith

(1974) list four basic objectives that freshman orientation should address: (a) orientation to academic demands, (b) orientation to non-academic demands, (c) orientation to resources available, and (d) orientation to the process of selecting an academic major and developing career awareness.

Strang (1951) suggests that an orientation program should acquaint students with the physical plant, college curricular and extracurricular programs, study skills and the world of work. Somewhat more ambitiously, Capole (1964) contends that orientation should focus on the four broad areas of the college as a social institution, the process of learning, the various aspects of personal and extracurricular living, and a personal self-assessment by all students as to their strengths and liabilities.

At the University of Florida, the goals of the orientation program are: (a) to help students make an easier transition from high school to the university environment; (b) to help students develop positive attitudes about this environment; (c) to help students learn the location of various offices that provide services for them; and (d) to aid them in meeting the various university personnel who are available for assistance (McDavis & Mingo, 1980).

Barr (1974) believes that the goals for orientation polarize into two main areas: institutional goals and personal growth goals of those being oriented. Institutional goals vary greatly with the size, purpose and particular academic emphasis of the college or university. It is essential for administrators to ascertain, when setting institutional goals for orientation, what individual or personal growth goals should be built into the program. In order to facilitate these goals within

the framework of orientation, it is important to utilize all the resources available such as the counseling center, academic departments, current students, student service deans and others who may have valuable input.

The structure of the modern university is complex. It is comprised of specialized departments and programs, complex and computerized scheduling and registration procedures and vast networks of learning opportunities. It is no surprise that students need help adapting to this new environment. Orientation is charged with the responsibility of finding the means of meeting the needs of incoming students and the institution simultaneously (Menning, 1974).

The Population

Orientation programs are designed to facilitate a smooth transition for all types of students into the campus environment. Therefore, it is a crucial part of the institutional planning process to define the constituencies (Barr, 1974).

The population which is served by orientation is rapidly changing. Traditional definitions of the new student no longer are completely applicable. Increased access to higher education for older students, veterans and ethnic minorities have radically changed the overall profile of a "new" student on the campus (McGee, 1974).

Menning (1974) states that one of the first decisions that an institution must make when designing its orientation program is a determination of which groups may require special attention as well as the proper manner to respond to these special needs. Often it is extremely difficult to satisfactorily respond to all students' needs without

special consideration for particular groups. Transfer students, veterans, international students, returning adults and minority groups are examples of subgroups that should receive special attention in the total orientation program.

Some authorities (Barr, 1974; Houston, 1971; Ottoson, 1968; Palladino & Tryon, 1978) agree that it is essential for orientation planners to sharpen their sensitivity and deal with the various subgroups of new entry students in a realistic and appropriate manner. This suggests a consideration of each aspect of the overall orientation program for its relative worth and utility to each diverse group.

Developmental Tasks

Havinghurst (1953) defines a developmental task as

> . . . a task which arises at or about a certain period in the life of the individual, successful achievement of which leads to his happiness and to success with later tasks, while failure leads to unhappiness in the individual, disapproval by society, and difficulty with later tasks (p. 2)

Barr (1974) states that the most unique feature of the undergraduate experience is that it coincides with a critical stage in the life of a young person--the transition into adulthood. The students know that they come to college as adolescents and leave as adults, and that there is a difference between the two that they are supposed to discover while in college.

Using the terms of Erikson (1959), it can be said that since college spans the years of late adolescence to young adulthood, it is a time when the young person is seeking identity and intimacy. The boundaries of the core of the personality are being firmed up, and young persons are striving to determine who they are.

Achieving an ego identity is closely related to the capacity for intimacy (Buckely, 1982). Lidz (1968) further supports the belief that ego identity involves the feelings of completion that come from feeling loved and needed, from being able to share the self with another.

Psychological separation and individuation from the family of origin is another central task of late adolescence (Buckely, 1982). This is a universal conflict situation which as Mann (1973) has pointed out, involves the achievement of psychological independence versus dependency.

Piaget (Infhelder & Piaget, 1958), in his studies of cognitive development through childhood and adolescence demonstrates how adolescent modes of thought should move from what he calls "egocentrism" to "decentering." This egocentrism is seen in adolescent narcissism with its preoccupation with the self to the exclusion of others. To overcome these narcissistic tendencies, the young student must learn to communicate with others, both verbally, in writing and in deed. Sanford (1976) states that students must become convinced that they can love and are worthy of being loved.

As White (1974) and Grant (1974) reiterate, American higher education has failed to recognize explicitly that cognitive development which is not integrated into the quest for identity and intimacy deals only with a fraction of the human personality and that this fraction is of secondary importance to the young person arriving at chronological adulthood.

Grant (1974) postulates that orientation should be seen as assisting with the development of the total person, yet his belief is that this is seldom mentioned in the goals of most orientation programs.

Heath (1964) concludes from his research that the pattern of the freshman's growth in college is largely set in the first few months of college; much of the student's later growth represents a further stabilization and integration of that growth.

Continuity in College Student Characteristics

Sanford (1976) claims that certain developmental tasks remain constant over generations of college students, regardless of the changing times. These problems, preoccupations and concerns mainly deal with establishing independence, maintaining self-esteem while achieving a more or less accurate assessment of oneself, deciding upon a vocation, and learning to relate to members of the opposite sex as individuals. Sanford's formulation of the issues facing college students is highly consistent with other developmental theorists who focus upon this population.

Classic studies Chickering, (1969); Heath, (1964); Katz, (1968); Kohlberg, (1958) are major resources that have traditionally helped prepare student personnel administrators to work with college students. However, these authors reported on student samples composed primarily of white, 18-22 year old middle and upperclass youth. Today's student personnel workers often find themselves working with more diverse student populations in institutional settings vastly different from those reflected in the literature traditionally used as a reference base (Stodt, 1982).

Changes in Student Characteristics

In recent years two phenomena have emerged among student characteristics--marked increases in vocationalism and in narcissism (Stodt,

1982). According to the Carnegie Council Surveys of 1976 and a study done at UCLA in 1979, career objectives represent the major motive for attending college.

Palladino and Tryon (1978) conducted a study to determine if the problems facing entering college students in 1976 differed significantly from those problems endorsed by freshman in 1969. The purpose of the study was to determine what changes, if any, were evident seven years after the days of campus unrest, and, subsequently to ascertain if programmatic changes were evident to respond to any changes. The results of the study indicated significantly more total problems reported by the freshmen of 1976 as compared to those who matriculated in 1969. Three problem areas reported for both sexes in the freshmen class of 1976 were financial concerns, vocational and career questions and living conditions. These three areas were not rated as priorities by the class of 1969. However, the highest priority for both the class of 1969 and that of 1976 was one and the same. Entering college students are still primarily concerned with problems involving social and personal relationships. The college years have long been seen as a period in which to iron out difficulties in personal and interpersonal areas (Katz, 1975).

Buckely (1982) is of the opinion that there is a prolongation of late adolescence among the contemporary student which has as one of its results conflict over career choice. The bulk of students that he counsels are men and women in their mid-twenties. One would assume that by this stage of their life the developmental tasks of adolescence would have been accomplished; however, frequently this has not been the case. One of the chief manifest concerns takes the form of confusion and dissatisfaction over career choice. The students he sees are having

difficulties separating from their families of origin, becoming independent, and assuming a career identity.

Lidz (1968) explicates the importance of occupational choice in determining the future course of personality development and has highlighted the important function of an occupation in the emotional and physical well-being of those who pursue it. From a developmental standpoint, career choice requires the giving up of limitless possibilities and on an unconscious level, the repudiation of one aspect of infantile omnipotence--that any career role is possible.

According to Stodt (1982), the strong vocational motivation present in today's college students has diminished the cognitive and affective benefits of a liberal education as well as detracted from completion of the other developmental tasks of optimum importance at this stage of life. Strong vocationalism has created intense competition among students for grades and career advantages which in turn has had deleterious effects upon the quality of student life.

Levine (1980) describes the current era as one of individual ascendance over a sense of community ascendance. The emphasis is on the primacy of duty to one's self, on one's rights rather than on one's responsibilities. Blaine and MacArthur (1971), Hendin (1975), and Lasch, (1979) confirm an extreme degree of narcissistic behavior on college campuses and the ineffectiveness of our traditional methods in dealing with this kind of behavior.

Obviously, students who are well past adolescence, if not middle-aged, or who are members of minority groups, live at home, work and attend school part-time differ from the traditional college student in significant ways. For example, mature women students confront develop-

mental issues in very different ways from the traditional student that student personnel workers have served. "Going to college" still reflects a struggle for identity, not through separation from parents but by expanding one's social role (Apps, 1981).

Most college administrators have limited understanding of these new subgroups of college students. Not only did most experience only a traditional professional education, but also few persons have close contact with the diverse subpopulations who compose the current student body on many campuses. These challenges presented by the students of the 80's prompt new role definitions by student personnel workers as well as programmatic changes (Stodt, 1982).

Freshman orientation must be planned in a way that will fully integrate student and academic life. Programs that only operate for three or four days prior to initial classes cannot sufficiently meet the diverse needs of a changing population. Often needs cannot possibly even be identified until students have been on campus for awhile and can better assess their position. A continuing orientation program which utilizes informal and formal contact with faculty, staff and peer groups, one that is not voluntary, one that is conducted during those first crucial months in college has the promise of improving student life in measurable ways such as grade point achievement, retention, and participation in campus activities.

Impact of the Environment on the New Student

Exploratory work (Pace & Stern, 1958; Pervin, 1967; Pervin & Rubin, 1967) indicates that each college campus has a unique climate and that all individuals cannot adapt to all climates. One of the key variables

that determine the fit or compatibility of students and the environment is the degree of harmony that they perceive between themselves and the institution (Cope & Hannah, 1975).

Morstain (1972) notes that the pattern of the freshman's growth in college is primarily set in the first few months of college. This phenomena can be attributed to what Katz (1975) calls the "psychological potency" of freshmen entering college. That is, the excitement and uncertainty of beginning a new experience can create an atmosphere in which freshmen are able to examine a wide range of attitudes and orientations.

Within this context, the attitudes and orientations students have at entry to college influence the manner and degree they interact with that environment (Morstain, 1972). More specifically, if students feel integrated into the social and academic systems of a college or university, then those students are more likely to participate more extensively in social activities, and perform at a higher level of academic achievment than less fully integrated students (Tinto 1975).

Other investigators point to degree of integration into the academic and social systems of the university as positively correlated with continued enrollment (Baumbart & Johnstone, 1977; Herron, 1974; Terenzini & Pascarella, 1977). So it is to the benefit of both the institution and the student to make their initial encounter one which enhances the fit between them. The growing body of research on this "fit" between student and institution and its importance to persistence has sharpened interest in procedures that enhance not impede this special relationship (Kramer 1980). Wigent (1971) has stated that the orientation process (the initial interface between the student and the institution) has

critical implications for a student's integration into the environment of the institution.

Alienation

Counselors have long been interested in the problems and pressures affecting entering college students. Entrance into college can be viewed as a transition point that causes stress. In fact, freshman have been found to experience more problems that first year than they do the remaining three years in college (Houston 1971; Ottoson 1968). The transition into a new environment calls for a repertoire of coping behaviors which take into consideration new intellectual, social, and personal demands. Frew (1980) is of the opinion that the most pressing and poignant of these issues is the students' experiences of separation and isolation as they break familiar ties with family and friends and struggle to form new alliances. Knott and Daher (1978) feel that the most pressing and immediate needs take form around leaving parents, siblings, and peers at home.

Kegan (1976) comments that not feeling isolated from other people at college has been found to make an important contribution toward satisfaction with one's college experience. Findings described by Terenzini and Pascarella (1977) suggest that increased informal interaction between faculty and students is associated not only with more positive expectations about students' intellectual interests but also with the degree of satisfaction they feel towards college life in general.

Definition and Measurement of Alienation

Baker and Siryk (1980) view alienation as synonomous with a lesser degree of compatibility in the person-environment relationship. Another view is that alienation involves an estrangement or apartness from society, (Netter, 1957). Srole (1956) defines alienation as being a pessimistic view of human nature, a rejection of the traditional culture, mistrust of commitment in life, and a rejection of interpersonal orientation. Perhaps the most succinct definition of alienation comes from Dean's (1961) in depth study of the concept of alienation as having three major components; powerlessness, normlessness, and social isolation. Seeman (1959) expands on this by classifying alienation as being comprised of five parts: powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, isolation, and self-estrangement.

The term "powerlessness" is described by Kris and Leites (1950) as that feeling that individuals have little understanding or influence over the very events upon which their life and happiness is known to depend. Dean (1961) describes powerlessness as the feeling of being unable to control one's life circumstances or destiny.

The second component to be considered here, that of normlessness, is a concept which involves three characteristics; a painful uneasiness or anxiety, a feeling of separation from group standards, a feeling of pointlessness or that no certain goals exist. Dean (1961) elaborated on this definition of the term "normlessness" as a perception of the environment as lacking rules, values, and predictibility.

A third component, social isolation, means a sense of isolation from group standards. Dean describes social isolation as a lack of good integration between self and others; a sense of dissonance with other people.

Baker and Siryk (1980) in their study of alienation and freshman transition into college found that the degree of alienation has readily discernible implications for effective transition into a new environment. They discovered that alienation, no matter how developed, was one factor influencing the effectiveness of freshman transition into college.

Research evidence indirectly supports this hypothesized relationship. Astin (1975) identified degree of involvement in campus life, very possibly a manifestation of degree of alienation, as one variable affecting transition. Wright (1973) reports that the establishment of social ties to an academic institution (i.e. the opposite of alienation) is associated with fewer leaves of absence. Terenzini and Pascarella (1977) cite a positive relationship between the amount of freshman interaction with faculty on the one hand, and the self-ratings of adjustment in the academic situation.

Research on Alienation

Baker and Siryk (1980) conducted research on the relationship between alienation and the effectiveness of transition into college. A critical componenet of their findings indicate that the more alienated the student, the less likely that student is to be involved with campus organizations and activities. In addition, these same researchers discovered that the better adjusted the student feels (as measured on a self-report adjustment to college scale) the less likely that student is to discontinue the educational process at the place of original enrollment.

Baker and Siryk (1980) attempted to address the relationship between alienation and effective transition into college with the addition of a

supplemental orientation process involving small counseling groups. This innovative approach was designed to attempt to ease the transition of freshmen students to a new environment by offering an additional orientation after the completion of the traditional pre-class program.

They reported that this program was largely unsuccessful due to the voluntary nature of the program. They concluded that students often feel alienated in a new environment and have difficulties with adjustment, yet are not willing to voluntarily enroll in a program that attempts to provide effective aid.

Research conducted by Herron (1974) also addresses the relationship between student alienation and orientation. Herron is supportive of the idea that alienation occurs, not so much as a dysfunction within the individual, but rather is due to structual changes within the system of higher education. The immense growth and rapid development of most universities and colleges have transformed once intimate and closely-knit structures into large scale bureaucracies. Other researchers also concur that the increased bureaucratic organization of higher education leads to a minimization of students' roles and contributes to feelings of alienation and lack of integration into the very system the student has recently become a part of (Kerr, 1964; Wallis, 1966; Warner & Hanson, 1970).

Many universities are concerned with problems of alienation and take various steps to deal with this problem. The most extensive attempts to prevent alienation are usually those dealing with orientation (Herron, 1974).

The relationship between alienation and participation in orientation programming prior to the beginning of freshmen classes was the

subject of a study conducted by Herron (1974). The expected finding was that there would be a decline in the degree of alienation with increasing participation in the orientation activities and progamming. The results showed minimal support for this hypothesis. Herron reported that the relationship between pre-matriculation freshman orientation programming and alienation does not approach the level that might be expected. He argues persuasively that in light of the immense allocation of time and funds to such programs, it would seem wise to re-examine their methodology and content.

In summary, research (Baumbart & Johnstone, 1977; Herron, 1972; Terenzini & Pascarella, 1977; Tinto, 1975) has shown that if a student feels integrated into the social and academic systems of a university, that student is more likely to attain higher grades, participate more extensively in school activities and persist at that university. Studies (Kegan, 1976; Terenzini & Pascarella, 1977) also demonstrate that increased informal involvement of faculty with students, and the establishment of social ties leads to less alienation and better adjustment at that university. Continuing contact with faculty, staff and peers available through the vehicle of a freshman seminar class the first semester in college offers an opportunity for students to become more fully integrated into the particular campus environment.

Evaluation of Orientation

Evaluative information concerning the effectiveness of freshman orientation programs is not prolific in the literature. Although evaluation is increasingly a major topic of concern to counseling professionals, the systematic application of program evaluation strategies has not been made manifest to the area of freshman orientation programs.

Response to accountibility demands has been a strong impetus for the proliferation of the development of program evaluation technology (Burck & Peterson, 1975; Humes, 1972; Warner, 1975). In the past, counselors and student personnel administrators were typically accountable primarily to clients or supervisors; however, with expanding counselor roles and services, closer scrutiny from program administrators, service consumers, legislative bodies, and the general public has necessitated the implementation of new evaluation models (Krause & Howard, 1976).

Logic requires that needs be identified prior to the design of programs and services to meet those needs. Failure to do so institutionalizes ineffectiveness (Gill & Fruehling, 1979). Numerous professionals in the field concerned about this state of affairs have urged new efforts in the area of needs assessment (Drum & Figler, 1973; Gill & Fruehling, 1979; Goldston, 1977; Krumboltz, 1974; Stufflebeam, 1971; Warner, 1975).

In order to evaluate the impact freshman orientation programs have on students, it is necessary to ascertain if the needs of new entry students are being addressed, or if their needs are being considered secondary to the needs of the institutional administration. Gill and Fruehling (1979) state that the assessment of the needs of those to be served is fundamental to the development of any program that expects to have a measurable amount of success in meeting the needs of students. There is a critical necessity for student personnel administrators to identify the needs of students and provide effective programmatic responses to those needs. Needs assessment is perhaps the single most important part of program planning (Higginson, Moore & White, 1981).

Utilization of needs assessments by freshman orientation program planners has been minimal. The literature reveals little research reported on in this area. Further, few orientation planners have evaluated the effectiveness of their programs (Warner, 1975).

Sagaria, Higginson, and White (1980) found that academic issues were the prime concern of entering freshmen. The purpose of their study was to investigate the needs and interests of new entry students, expressed prior to their first orientation and enrollment in a college setting.

The students were administered the Freshmen Issues and Concerns Survey (FICS) in an attempt to elicit the students' own perceptions of their academic and personal needs prior to beginning college. The results of this study indicated that freshmen consider academic and personal topics to be important but academic categories have primacy. Unlike most research on freshmen, this data represents the needs and concerns of entering freshmen themselves rather than the perceptions of their needs by student personnel staff or older students. The emphasis on the academic domain by the incoming freshmen provides a clear focus for orientation planners.

The implications of Sagaria, Higginson and White's (1980) research parallels Tinto's (1975) study regarding the relative importance of academic and personal domains for student persistence. Although entering freshmen are concerned about both academic and non-academic matters, Tinto's (1975) research indicates they assign higher priority to academics.

The direct approach of identifying freshmen needs by asking the freshmen themselves is mentioned infrequently in orientation literature. When freshmen needs are measured directly, the results reveal the common

theme that entering students are concerned primarily with their academic adjustment (Celio & Sedlacek, 1976; Drake, 1966; Higginson, Moore & White, 1981; Tautfest, 1961). Current studies of non-traditional students also support the primacy of academic needs for new students (Lance, Lourie, & Mayo, 1979; Smallwood, 1980; Wallace, 1979).

These findings are in marked contrast with a study conducted by Palladino and Tryon (1978). Freshmen students were administered the Mooney Problem Checklist (MPCL) in an attempt to determine the priority of problems facing students upon entry to college. The results indicated that students are primarily concerned with problems involving social and personal relationships. Katz (1975), also had reported that entering college students are still primarily concerned with problems involving social and personal relationships.

That existing research assessing the needs of new entry students includes conflicting testimony as to the primacy of academic and personal concerns, and also implies the importance institutional programs should give to both the psychological as well as the cognitive needs of students. The designation of special services and the provision of quality counseling can do much to supplement the intellectual process. Freshman orientation as an adjunctive procedure in the development of the college student can assist in that development and thereby stands or falls on its effectiveness (Rothman & Leonard, 1967).

Retention

Persistence in college is an old issue with a new focus. In the past, the term most often used was "attrition", and the emphasis was upon the students dropping out, implying deficiencies in the selection

process. More recently, "retention" has been used to describe the problem, and implicit is a change in focus from the student to the institution (Lea, Sedlacek, & Stewart, 1979).

In a span of two decades, higher education has moved from an emphasis upon education for those who can meet institutionally imposed standards, to the necessity for many institutions to adapt their programs to the educational needs of a greater diversity of students. The impetus currently and increasingly for the future will be focused not only upon education for all but, more importantly, education for each (Cross, 1976).

In the past, when there was an oversupply of students, retention was mainly an ethical issue involving questions concerning equal opportunity and access to higher education, or loss of talent and student time and effort. However with the enrollment trends that have been developing over the past few years, the picture is changing dramatically. No longer is there an unending supply of new students. No longer can budget increases be defended on the basis of increased enrollment. No longer are universities concerned with growth beyond capacity, but rather with maintaining enrollment to the capacity for which the institution was built. Perhaps it is important to look with concern not only at attracting new students, but also at better serving the needs of those students who have already enrolled (Demitroff, 1974).

Shulman (1978) states that since the pool of college-age students has diminished, retention has become a practical issue involving the survival of many institutions of higher education. If students drop out of college, they may not be replaced as in the past. Along with a limited number of students there is a shortage of resources, which makes

cost a primary determinant of educational policy. Overall, retention may be more cost effective than recruitment (Astin, 1975).

A perusal of the literature demonstrates that administrators and their insitutions now want to "understand" the factors that link a student to the college or university and hopefully forestall voluntary attrition (Kramer, 1980). In an exploration of a theoretical model of student attrition, Terenzini and Pascarella (1977) reported that stayers had significantly more positive perceptions than leavers of both their academic and nonacademic lives. Also, those who stayed reported significantly more contacts with faculty members and viewed their nonacademic lives to be more challenging than did those who left the institution.

The involvement of students with persons in the institution has several important consequences. Kegan (1976) comments that an important contributor to satisfacton with one's college experience is a feeling that one is not isolated from others at that institution. Kramer (1980) reported a link between social isolation and a specific proportion of the withdrawals that occurred.

Although the importance and urgency of the retention issue has changed, the rate of student attrition seems to have remained at about 50-60% over four-year spans for the past fifty years (Astin, 1972; Summerskill, 1962). However, institutional variations may range from 15% to 80% (Summerskill, 1962). Since many students do go on and finish a degree after the four-year time span is over, the research using retention statistics is often conflicting and confusing, as well as difficult to assess (Lea, Sedlacek, & Stewart, 1979).

Astin (1975) describes retention research as being large in volume, poor in design, and limited in scope. Early writings are generally

demographic studies, while later work centered on examination of characteristics of students as they related to attrition. More recently, emphasis has been on the interaction of student characteristics in an environmental context (Smith, 1976).

Some of the more frequently mentioned factors in the literature related to the retention/attrition problem have been high school grade point average and rank in class, first semester college grades, study habits, motivational level and commitment, student-faculty relationships (including counseling and advising), and the fit between the college and the student (Cope & Hannah, 1975).

It has been suggested that personal commitment to either an academic or occupational goal is the single most important determinant of college persistence (Rayman, Bryson, & Day, 1978; Cope & Hannah, 1975; Rose & Elton, 1971). Hauckman & Dysinger (1970) hypothesized that strength of commitment to persistence in college is the most critical variable. Educational goal commitment and the expectations an individual brings to the college experience are important variables in analyzing college attrition (Tinto, 1975).

Research by Muskat (1979), conducted during freshman orientation to assess student priorities for college attendance and to measure commitment to completing college, reveals that a relationship exists between academic decision-making and attrition. Her research supports the need for a systematized information network that does more than simple academic advice-giving; academic counseling is vital to assist students in identifying the relationship between college courses and their own aspirations. She continues that the best method of implementing this type of counseling is through freshman orientation seminars.

Recent research reveals that one of the most extensively discussed contributors to the research on retention/attrition has been that of Terenzini and Pascarella (1978) who used multiple regression to demonstrate that the largest unique contribution to the prediction of attrition was the frequency of the student's interactions with faculty outside the formal classroom. A study conducted by Kramer (1980) confirms these conclusions drawn by Terenzini and Pascarella (1978) that freshmen reports of involvement with academia was the single largest contributor to their first semester grade average and persistence in school.

A longitudinal study of student retention was conducted by Astin (1975) and revealed that out of the 53 personal variables that contributed significantly to the likelihood of retention, previous academic attainment followed by educational aspirations were the chief factors contributing to student persistence. Morgan (1974), in her study of factors which contribute to persistance in college used multiple discriminat analysis to statistically separate persisters, withdrawers, and dropouts and accounted for 62% of the variance in her study. She reported the most powerful discriminator was overall academic ability.

Tinto (1975) developed a model to interpret the myriad of variables involved in attempting to explain student persistence. The Tinto model conceptualizes dropping out of college as a process rather than an event. In his view, persistence is a function of a goal and/or institutional commitment resulting from an integrative interaction process between the individual and institutional environment. The individual enters the college environemnt with a certain degree of both goal commitment and institutional commitment, reflecting expectations and motivations molded by family and school background as well as by individual

attributes. Thus, the degree of these dual commitments influences, but does not completely determine the likelihood of student persistence. After entry, the student confronts the task of becoming integrated into the academic and social systems of the college environment. The degree of success of academic and/or social integration will alter one's persistence or lack of persistence at the institution. Tinto notes that other external factors such as family tragedies and financial emergencies can alter components of the model. Also, individual perceptions of this process may vary, leading to different outcomes.

The research on the retention/attrition problem suggests that (a) the trend in college attrition/retention research is clearly in the direction of mulitvariate rather than univariate research designs, and (b) variables other than pre-college academic measures have been shown to be related to college student attrition and retention (Hutchison & Johnson, 1980).

Continuing Orientation Programs

A perusual of the literature pertaining to freshman orientation reveals that a majority of large universities conduct a traditional Freshman Week orientation prior to Fall classes (VanEaton, 1974). Of these larger universities who conduct the traditional Freshman Week orientation, most do not have a continuing orientation program (VanEaton, 1974).

Authorities on the subject of freshman orientation are writing extensively on the need for a restructuring of traditional orientation methods to better meet the needs of both student and institution (Baker & Siryk, 1980; Capole, 1964; Chickering, 1969; Herron, 1974; Higginson,

Moore, & White, 1981; Muskat, 1979; Nelson & Murphy, 1980; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1977; Sagaria, Higginson, & White, 1980; and Stodt, 1981).

Bloom (1971) suggests that institutions of higher learning must take a proactive rather than reactive approach to dealing with the multiple problems freshmen face in the transition to college. Because of the unusual vulnerability to stresses that freshmen encounter the first few months of college, Bloom (1971) states that freshmen constitute a specific high-risk group that need to be dealt with in specialized ways. He developed a program based on an "anticipator guidance" approach which has as its objectives: (a) providing membership in a group which help psychologically to reduce feelings of isolation; (b) giving group members some reference facts to which they cam compare themselves, thus reducing feelings of uniqueness; (c) providing an avenue to express their reactions to the university; (d) giving them some intellectual tools by which they might better understand the stresses acting on them, and their reactions to their stresses; (e) providing formalized opportunities (through completing questionnaires) to think through their beliefs; and (f) providing additional resource persons with whom to talk in the event of a crisis.

Other researchers share the belief that action-oriented preventive approaches to the problems college students face could be checked by thoughtful programs from the moment a freshman enters the college doors. Colleges must design and implement effective intervention programs if they hope to minimize the attrition potential of their students (Pantages & Creedon, 1978). They suggest that colleges provide students with more comprehensive orientation programs.

Daher and Weisinger (1979) state that there is a growing recognition that initial freshman orientation interventions can produce only limited information retention levels and that subsequent programming is needed to support a student's successful integration into the college environment. Capole (1964) has called for better guidance for freshmen and stated that orientation courses are the primary vehicle to deliver such guidance. He cites the power of the peer group to induce change in ways harmonious with educational objectives as one of the key resources available through orientation courses.

Studies reveal that traditional freshmen orientation has offered little significant change in its participants (Foxley, 1969; Herron, 1974; Rothman & Leonard, 1967). Yet at the same time, the research offers few alternatives in terms of methodology, design of new strategies or programming to effectively deal with the transitional difficulties freshmen encounter adjusting to college. Student problems with alienation, lack of involvement, and identity concerns as well as academic problems are well documented as key variables that need to be addressed that freshmen year. Authorities are writing on the need for a restructuring of traditional orientation methods to better meet the needs of both student and institution, yet offer few alternatives. This study hypothesizes that the addition of a continuing freshman seminar during the first crucial semester in college as a supplement to the traditional pre-class orientation, will be a viable alternative.

Summary

The population which is served by orientation is rapidly changing. Increased access to higher education for older students, veterans and

ethnic minorities have radically changed the overall profile of a "new" student on the campus (McGee, 1974).

Although (Stodt, 1982) reports marked increases in vocationalism and in narcissism among current college students, other researchers (Katz, 1968; Sanford, 1976) claim that certain developmental tasks remain constant over generations of college students regardless of the changing times. These problems mainly deal with establishing independence, deciding upon a vocation and learning to relate to others.

One of the key variables that determine the fit of students and the environment is the degree of harmony that they perceive between themselves and the institution (Cope & Hannah, 1975). If students feel integrated into the social and academic systems of a college, then those students are more likely to participate more extensively in social activities, and perform at a high level of academic achievment than less fully integrated students (Tinto, 1975).

The involvement of students has several important consequences. Kegan (1976) reports that an important contribution to satisfaction with one's college experience is a feeling that one is not isolated from others at that institution. Kramer (1980) reports a link between social isolation and withdrawal from school. Shulman (1978) states that since the pool of college-age students has diminished, retention has become a practical issue involving the survival of many institutions of higher education. Astin (1975) says that retention may be more cost effective than recruitment.

It has been suggested by Bloom (1971) that institutions start taking a proactive rather than reactive approach to dealing with the transition to college issues today. One such approach is a continuing

orientation program which utilizes formal and informal contact with faculty, staff, and peer groups. This freshman seminar approach would be conducted during those first crucial months in college with the hope of improving student life in measurable ways, such as grade point achievement, retention, and participation in campus activities.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents a description of a comparison of orientation programming, the rationale for such programs, and a discussion of the methods of implementation. It concludes with a discussion of the procedures for evaluating the effectiveness of these treatments.

Subjects

The subjects for this study were Arts & Sciences freshman students enrolled at a large southwestern university for the 1983-84 school year. Permission to use these students was obtained from the students, the Vice-President for Student Services, and the university human subjects committee.

A total of 63 Arts and Sciences freshmen comprised the sample. Because a comparison of subgroups according to the type of freshman orientation undertaken was desired, stratified sampling was employed. Stratification was based on orientation procedure. The first group experienced Alpha, the second Arts and Sciences 1111 and the third experienced both types of freshman orientation. Table I presents a description of the three groups.

Random selection of participants consisted of using a table of random numbers (Gay, 1976) to select a sample from each of the three existing subgroups. This ensured that each member had an equal and independent probability of selection from that group.

The number of students selected for the sample, 21 in each of the three groups, was based on an alpha level of .05 with the power set at .80, assuming a large difference between groups (effect = .40) (Cohen, 1975). Due to mortality, or participants who dropped below full-time status being dropped from the study, a final sample size of 56 occurred (n=18 Group 1; n=18 Group 2; n=20 Group 3).

TABLE I

FRESHMEN ARTS AND SCIENCES STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN THE ALPHA PROGRAM, ARTS AND SCIENCES 1111, OR BOTH TYPES OF ORIENTATION PROGRAMS

	ALPHA Group I	A & S 1111 Group II	ALPHA AND A & S 1111 Group III
n	18	18	20
median age	18	18	18
mean age	19.0	18.3	18.1
percent male	41%	56%	35%
percent female	59%	44%	65%

Instrumentation

The College and University Environment Scales (CUES II)

When indices that measure perceptions of the college environment were reviewed, the College and University Environment Scales (CUES II) was selected as a dependent variable because it is a reliable and valid means of obtaining an estimate of students' perceptions of degree of compatibility in the person-environment relationship. This instrument contains items that are appropriate for college freshmen in a university setting if the results obtained are compared only with the scores of other freshmen.

The CUES II was first published by Education Testing Service in 1963, and the author is Robert Pure (1963). The instrument was revised in 1969 and consists of 100 statements about college life--features and facilities of the campus, rules and regulations, faculty, curricula, student life, extracurricular organizations, and other aspects of the institutional environment that help to define the atmosphere of the college as students perceive it. The CUES II provides a measure of students' perceptions of the campus environment along the following dimensions, or scales. The 20 items that contribute to the Practicality scale describe an environment characterized by enterprise, organization, and social activities. The Community scale describes a campus atmosphere that is congenial; the campus is a community that is friendly, cohesive and group-oriented. The Awareness scale reflects a concern about the degree to which a campus promotes self-understanding, reflectiveness and the search for personal meaning. An environment perceived as one that encourages expressiveness and enrichment of the individual would rate

high on this scale. The Propriety items describe an environment and campus atmosphere that is mannerly, considerate and conventional. The Scholarship items describe a campus characterized by intellectuality and scholastic discipline.

Reliability. Buros (1972) reports the reliability of CUES II scores as determined by means of Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha to range from .89 to .94.

The CUES II Technical Manual reports that the test-retest comparisons made from comparable samples over a one- or two-year time span produced highly consistent results. Of 45 such comparisons of studies, 90 percent differed by three points or less.

Validity. Buros (1972) reports correlation between CUES II scale scores, college aptitude measured by mean Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores of entering freshmen, and first semester grade point average (GPA) as well as other factors. These various relationships are reasonably congruent with expectations. The difficulties of measuring expectations of the campus environment is mentioned as a possible disadvantage in Buros; however it is stated that this measure does possess a variety of construct validity evidence. Dressel (1972) explicates that with the inherent difficulty in attempting to measure perceptions of the overall campus environment, a somewhat ambiguous term, the CUES II scale offers a measurement that is all that can be reasonably expected.

Grade Point Average (GPA)

The sixth dependent variable, GPA, was a measurement reported on a four point scale ranging from A = 4.0 to F = 0. Students' individual course grades were averaged. GPA is an often reported measurement tool

for success in college. Astin (1972) uses high school GPA as one of the main predictors of college GPA citing a .42 correlation.

Retention

The seventh dependent variable, retention, was defined for the purposes of this study as whether a student returns to the university the semester following the first enrollment. Retention reflects the degree of success of academic and/or social integration of that particular situation.

Research Design

The research design for this study utilized the causal comparative design as discussed by Gay (1976). Table II gives a description of this design.

TABLE II

CAUSAL COMPARATIVE DESIGN[1]

Group	Level of Orientation			Dependent Variable
I	(X_1) ALPHA	R	0	CUES II
			0	GPA
			0	Retention
II	(X_2) A & S 1111	R	0	CUES II
			0	GPA
			0	Retention
III	(X_3) ALPHA and A & S 1111	R	0	CUES II
			0	GPA
			0	Retention

[1] Causal Comparative Design: R=random 0=measurement

Procedure

The participants in the sample were Arts and Sciences freshman students enrolled at one land grant university for the 1983-84 school year. Group I (n=21) experienced Alpha prior to Fall matriculation. Group II (n=21) experienced A & S 1111 only. Group III (n=21) experienced Alpha the four days prior to Fall 1983 classes and they also participated in a 15 week continuing orientation Freshmen Seminar class. This class met once a week with mandatory attendance. One hour of credit was granted upon completion. The class consisted of lectures and small group discussions with faculty concerning academic and campus service information as well as including activities designed to reflect social and cultural awareness of the total campus environment. A syllabus for the Freshman Seminar is included in Appendix A.

Near the end of the semester, the fourteenth week, all three groups were administered the CUES II scales. The timing of the administration of the test was designed to ensure that all three groups had the same length of time in the campus environment. The participants' perceptions of the campus environment were reported along five scales or dimensions. These scales, Practicality, Community, Awareness, Propriety and Scholarship included one hundred items which were answered true or false according to the student's perception of the environment at the land grant university. Appendix B gives the questions and scoring key for the items comprising the five scales of the CUES II.

Data for the five scales were reported and analyzed. Individual scores were computed and results compiled by group for each of the five scales comprising the instrument.

The effects of the sixth variable, GPA, were assessed for all three groups upon completion of the Fall 1983 semester. GPA was based upon a student's carrying a full course load, 12 hours or more. Students in the study who dropped classes, placing them below the status of a full-time student, were dropped from the study so that all participating students were relatively equal on number of hours used to figure the GPA. Three students were dropped from Group I, leaving an n of 18. For Group II, three students also were dropped, leaving an n of 18. One student was dropped from group III, leaving 20 participants in that group.

The seventh variable, retention, defined for the purposes of this study as a student who enrolled either full or part time in classes at the land grant university for the second semester, 1983-84, was assessed when enrollment information became available for the Spring 1984 semester.

Data Analysis

A one factor ANOVA (Gay, 1976) was used to determine whether there was a significant difference between the means of the three groups on the variables, CUES II and GPA, with the selected probability of alpha = .05. A one factor test of proportion was used to determine whether there was a statistically significant difference between the three groups on retention.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter presents data collected from selected Arts and Sciences students during their freshman year at one land grant university. The students were divided into three groups according to their participation in different types of orientation programming. This data includes the grade point averages (GPA) for their initial semester at the university, retention statistics, or whether these students returned for the second consecutive semester at the university, and the results of the administration of the College and University Environment Scales, Second Edition. A discussion of the results is included at the end of the chapter.

Results

Hypothesis I: There is no different in Grade Point Average (GPA) for the initial semester among selected students who experienced Alpha or A & S 1111 or both types of freshman orientation.

The mean grade point averages for the initial semester are reported for the three groups (see Table III). Group I, the Alpha only group which consisted of 18 students, had a mean grade point average of 2.46 on a four point scale with A = 4.0. The standard deviation was .95. Group II, the group that experienced A & S 1111 had 18 subjects with the mean grade point being 2.48 with a standard deviation of .83. The 20 students who experienced both Alpha and A & S 1111, Group III, had a mean grade point of 2.70 with a standard deviation of 1.09.

TABLE III

SUMMARY OF GRADE POINT AVERAGES[2] FOR THE INITIAL SEMESTER

All Subjects		Group I Alpha		Group II A & S 1111		Group III Alpha and A & S 1111	
N=56		n=18		n=18		n=20	
M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
2.46	.95	2.17	.86	2.48	.83	2.70	1.09

[2] Grade Point Average Scale: A=4.0 B=3.0 C=2.0 D=1.0 F=0

Analysis of variance was used to explore whether a significant difference existed between the mean GPA's of first semester grades among Groups I, II and III. This data is summarized in Table IV. There was no statistically significant difference between mean first semester GPA's of groups participating in Alpha orientation, A & S 1111 or both types of programming ($F=1.49057$; $df=2.53$ $p < .05$). The type of orientation did not make a statistically significant difference in first semester grade point averages (GPA).

Hypothesis II: There is no difference in retention between the three groups participating in this study.

A chi square test of proportion was utilized to explore whether a significant difference existed between the three groups on retention. This data is summarized in Table V. Out of a total of 21 subjects in Group I, five did not return for the second semester at the university. For the second group, 18 subjects returned out of a total of 21 for the

second consecutive semester. Of the 21 subjects in Group III, two students did not return for the second semester at the university. No statistically significant difference (x^2=2.1993; df=2 $p < .05$) existed between the three groups on retention, therefore, Hypothesis II was not rejected. The type of orientation experienced by the three groups did not make a difference in retention or whether students returned to the university for the semester immediately following their initial semester at college.

TABLE IV

ANOVA RESULTS COMPARING MEAN GRADE POINT AVERAGES

Dependent Variable	df	ms	ms error	F
GPA	2.53	1.32	.88	1.49

Hypothesis III: There is no difference between the three groups in their perceptions of the intellectual-social-cultural environment of the campus as measured by the College and University Environment Scales (CUES II). The means and standard deviations for the scores on the five scales of the CUES II are reported in Table VI. The five scales of the CUES II each contained 20 questions. On the Practicality scale, the 18 students in the first group, the Alpha only group, had a mean score of 11.16 with a standard deviation of 2.40. Group II, the A & S 1111

group, had a mean score of 11.66 with a standard deviation of 2.42, and the third group, the one that experienced both Alpha and A & S 1111, had a mean score of 11.70 with a standard deviation of 2.07. The means and standard deviations for the Scholarship scale were 12.11 and 4.26 for Group I, 11.33 and 4.53 for Group II and 12.15 and 3.15 for the third group. On the Community scale, Group I had a mean score of 10.72 with a standard deviation of 2.63. Group II had a mean score of 12.00 with a standard deviation of 4.57, and the third group had a mean score of 12.00 with a standard deviation of 3.07. The means and standard deviations for the Awareness scale were 11.11 and 3.78 for Group I, 11.00 and 5.28 for Group II, and 10.10 and 4.05 for Group III. The means and standard deviations for the Propriety scale were 8.33 and 3.91 for the Alpha group, 7.50 and 2.91 for the A & S 1111 group, and 7.10 and 2.59 for the subjects receiving both Alpha and A & S 1111.

TABLE V

CHI SQUARE TABLE ON RETURN TO CAMPUS AND TYPE OF ORIENTATION

	Did not return	Returned	
Group I Alpha	5	16	21
Group II A & S 1111	3	18	21
Group III Alpha & A & S 1111	2	19	21
Column Total	10	53	63
Percent	15.8	84.2	100.0

TABLE VI

SUMMARY OF MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR SCORES ON THE FIVE SCALES COMPRISING THE COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT SCALES, SECOND EDITION

	SCALES									
	Practicality		Scholarship		Community		Awareness		Propriety	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Group I Alpha n=18	11.16	2.40	12.11	4.26	10.72	2.63	11.11	3.78	8.33	3.91
Group II A & S 1111 n=18	11.66	2.42	11.33	4.53	12.00	4.57	11.00	5.28	7.50	2.91
Group III Alpha & A & S 1111 n=20	11.70	2.07	12.15	3.15	12.00	3.07	10.10	4.05	7.10	2.59

Five univariate analyses of variance were used to explore whether significant differences existed between the means of the groups on the five scales of the CUES II. This data is presented in Table VII. Statistical significance was not reached at the .05 level, thus Hypothesis III was not rejected. No significant difference was noted among the three groups in their responses to the five scales measuring students' perceived integration to the environment at the university.

Discussion

The findings of this study in which there was no difference in the mean GPA by group according to type of orientation is contrary to the results of a study conducted by Kopecek (1971). In the study by Kopecek (1971), three types of orientation programming were compared and the outcomes measured by GPA, a questionnaire that measured campus knowledge and retention. Kopecek (1971) reported a significant difference in the mean GPA of those students who experienced an orientation program for three days prior to the beginning of fall classes as compared with students who either received only mailed materials or those who underwent a day of lectures after school began. The results of this study are similar to that of Rothman and Leonard (1967) who found no significant difference in mean grade point averages between freshman students who experienced a semester-long orientation program and those who had no orientation.

It was this researcher's position that students participating in one of the three different orientation methods would not differ in the rate of return to the university the second semester. The findings of this study in which there were no significant differences in retention

is similar to that of the Rothman and Leonard (1971) study in which no significant differences in the retention rate for selected students were found for either the second semester or for the entire year. The Kopecek (1971) study also found no significant differences between groups exposed to differing orientation methods on retention. However, the rate of retention in this study is somewhat higher than that reported by other researchers. Sixteen percent failed to return to the university for the second semester. Tinto (1975) reported that 28% of freshmen students fail to return for their sophomore year. Demitroff (1974) in a study on retention conducted at the University of Iowa reports that 26% of the freshman class did not return for their sophomore year.

TABLE VII

ANOVA RESULTS COMPARING THREE GROUPS

Dependent Variable	df	ms	ms error	F
Practicality	2.53	1.64	5.29	.30
Scholarship	2.53	3.89	16.00	.24
Community	2.53	9.97	12.33	.80
Awareness	2.53	5.92	19.42	.30
Propriety	2.53	7.41	10.04	.73

The researcher also hypothesized that there would be no differences in regard to perceptions of the campus environment as measured by the five scales of the CUES II according to the type of orientation received the first semester of the freshman year. The findings of this study in

which no significant differences were found is in agreement with those of the Kopeck (1971) study in which no significant differences in knowledge of the campus were found as measured by a knowledge of campus questionnaire. However, the findings of this study are contrary to the results of a study conducted by Nelson (1961) in which students exposed to a semester-long orientation program did show significantly higher test scores on an instrument designed to measure level of knowledge of the campus.

Summary

This chapter has presented the results of this study which includes the statistical analysis an interpretations of the data collected. Six univariate analyses of variance and a chi square test of proportion were used for statistical analysis of the data. The analyses of variance and chi square analysis resulted in failure to reject the null hypotheses. This suggests that the treatments failed to make a difference in the students' level of integration to campus their freshman year.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine whether the type of orientation experienced by freshman students would influence their perception of the college environment. This study focused on three varying types of orientation programming. Group I, experienced a four-day pre-class Alpha program, a series of activities designed to ease the transition to a new environment. Once classes commenced there was no further continuation of the program. Another group, Group II, experienced a semester-long type of orientation programming, while Group III experienced both types of freshman orientation.

The subjects for this study were 63 freshman Arts and Sciences students who attended a large southwestern university. The students experienced one of the three orientation methods and then were randomly selected from all students to form each of the three comparison groups. The three hypotheses generated for this study were as follows:

Hypothesis 1: There is no difference in Grade Point Average (GPA) for the initial semester at a large southwestern university among the three groups of selected students experiencing Alpha or A & S 1111 or both types of orientation.

Hypothesis 2: There is no difference in retention between the three groups participating in this study.

Hypothesis 3: There is no difference between the three groups in their perceptions of the intellectual-social-cultural environment of the campus as measured by the College and University Environment Scales (CUES II).

Subjects were administered the College and Environment Scales, Second Edition (CUES II) during the fourteenth week of the initial semester at the university. Six univariate analyses of variance and a chi square test of proportion were used for the statistical analyses of the data. No statistically significant differences were found in first semester grade point averages (GPA) among those students who participated either in Alpha, the pre-class orientation program, or A & S 1111, the semester-long type of orientation, or those who received both methods of orientation. No statistically significant differences were found in retention among the groups participating in the study. No statistically significant differences were found in perceptions of the campus environment as measured by CUES II.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions are made.

1. Although no statistically significant difference in the mean GPA's was determined among the three groups, mean scores tentatively indicate a trend toward higher grade point averages for those who experienced both the pre class and the semester-long types of orientation (Group III). Perhaps a study with a larger sample and one that also includes a comparison group of students who experienced no orientation would lend support to the positive value of combining a pre class and semester-long type of orientation.

2. Although differences in retention among the three groups was not appreciably different, the fact that 84% of the total participants returned for their second semester at least minimally supports the contention that orientation programming provides the opportunity for students to meet their peers, ask questions, learn their way around the campus and visit with faculty and staff in a more informal manner than is provided in a formal classroom setting. Orientation programming possibly does help students feel more comfortable in their environment and less likley to leave.

3. Responses to the five scales of the CUES II did not show any major group differences. However, this could be due to the instrumentation used or the short time period, only 14 weeks, that students were on campus when they responded to the instrument. Since the idea of an orientation program is a concerted attempt to create meaningful relationships between each student and the various components which comprise the university such as other students, faculty, administrators, advisors, and extra curricular experiences, the timing of a 14 week evaluation may be too premature.

Recommendations

Based on the results of this study the following recommendations for future research are made:

1. A similar study should be conducted using a larger number of subjects in each group.

2. Another study relative to orientation may be conducted including an additional group of students who do not receive any orientation.

3. Future research should be conducted with groups being assessed after a full academic year instead of one semester on campus.

4. Additional research could be conducted using other instruments measuring perceptions of the campus environment.

5. To ensure that orientation programs are designed to meet the needs of freshmen students, needs assessments should be conducted and the results used in planning both pre-class and semester-long orientation programs.

6. Qualitative research could be conducted in understanding the reasons for students dropping below the 12-credit hour for those in orientations groups.

References

Apps, J. (1981). The Adult Learner on Campus. Chicago: Fallett.

Astin, A. W. (1972). College Dropouts: A National Profile. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education.

Astin, A. W. (1975). Preventing Students from Dropping Out. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bakas, J. (1974) in M. Barr (Ed.) National Orientation Directors Association Handbook. Austin: University of Texas.

Baker, R. W. & Siryk, B. (1980). Alienation and freshman transition into college. Journal of College Student Personnel, 9, 437-442.

Barr, M. (1974) in M. Barr (Ed.) National Orientation Directors Association Handbook. Austin: University of Texas.

Baumbart, N. L. & Johnstone, J. N. (1977). Attrition at an Australian university: A case study. Journal of Higher Education, 48, 553-570.

Blaine, G. & MacArthur, C. (1971). The Emotional Problems of Students. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Bloom, B. L. (1971). A university freshman preventive intervention program: Report of a pilot project: Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 37, 235-242.

Buckely, P. J. (1982). Prolongation of late adolescence and the contemporay student. National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal, 19 (4), 9-12.

Burck, H. D. & Peterson, G. W. (1975). Need: More evaluation, not research. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 53, 563-569

Buros, O. (1972). Personality Tests and Reviews. Seventh Mental Measurement Yearbook. Highland Park, N.J.: Gryphon.

Capole, R. B. (1964). A rationale for the orientation course. Journal of College Student Personnel, 6, 42-46.

Celio, M. B. & Sedlacek, W. E. (1976-77). A profile of University of Maryland, College Park, freshmen. (Report No. 11-76). College Park: University of Maryland.

Chickering, A. W. (1969). Education and Identitiy. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cope, R. G. & Hannah, W. (1975). Revolving College Doors. New York: John Wiley.

Cross, K. P. (1976). Accent on Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Daher, D. M. & Weisinger, R. (1979). College Survival Test. A structured intervention for orientation or Parents day programming - Journal of College Student Personnel, 80, (5), 9.

Dean, D. (1961). Alienation: Its meaning and measurement. American Sociological Review, 26, 753-758.

Demitroff, F. (1974). Student persistence. College and University, 2, 553-564.

Drake, R. W. (1966). Review of the Literature for Freshman Orientation Practices in the U. S. Fort Collins, Co.: Colorado State University.

Dressel, D. (1972) in O. Buros (Ed.) Personality Tests & Reviews. Seventh Mental Measurement Yearbook. Highland Park, N.J.: Gryphon.

Drum, D. J. & Figler, H. E. (1973). Outreach in Counseling. New York: Intext Press.

Drum, D. J. & Knott, J. E. (1977). Sturctured Groups for Facilitating Development. New York: Human Sciences Press.

Erikson, E. Identity and the Life Crisis. (1959). New York: International Universities Press.

Foxley, C. H. Orientation or disorientation. (1969). Personnel and Guidance Journal, 48, 218-221.

Frew, L. E. (1980). A group model with a loneliness theme for the first-year college student. Journal of College Student Personnel, 21, 449-451.

Gay, L. R. (1976). Educational Research: Competencies for Ananylsis and Application. Columbus: Merrill.

Gill, S. J. and Fruehling, J. A. (1979). Needs assessment and the design of Services Delinery systems. Journal of College Student Personnel, 204, 322-328.

Goldston, S. E. (1977). An overview of primary prevention programming. In D. C. Klein and S. E. Goldston (Eds). Primary Prevention: An idea whose time has come. Rockville, MD: National Institute of Mental Health.

Grant, H. (1974). in M. Barr (Ed.), National Orientation Directors Association Handbook. Austin: University of Texas.

Havinghurst, R. (1953). Human Development and Education. New York: Longman, Green.

Heath, D. (1968). Growing Up in College. San Fancisco: Jossey-Bass.

Heath, R. (1964). The Reasonable Adventurer. Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press.

Hendin, H. (1975). The Age of Sensation. New York: W. W. Norton and Co.

Herron, D. G. (1974). Orientation effects on student alienation. Journal of National Association of Women's Deans and Counselors, 2, 107-111.

Higginson, L. C., Moore, L. V., & White, E. R. (1981). A new role for orientation: Getting down to academics. NASPA Journal, 19, 21-27.

Houston, B. K. (1971). Sources, effects, and individual vulnerability of psychological problems for college students. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 18, 157-165.

Huckman, J. & Dysinger, W. (1970). Commitment to college as a factor in student attrition. Sociology of Education, 43, 311-324.

Humes, C. U. (1972). Accountability: A boom to guidance. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 50, 21-26.

Hurst, J. C. & Smith, T. T. (1974). Immediate follow-up in Orientation program evaluation. Journal of College Student Personnel, 15, 46-48.

Hutchison, J. E. & Johnson, A. E., Jr. (1980). Identifying persisters, voluntary with drawers and academic dropouts at a liberal arts college. NASPA Journal, 18, (2), 41-45.

Inhelder, B. & Piaget, J. (1958). The Growth of Logical Thinking. New York: Basic Books.

Katz, J. (1968). No Time for Youth. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Katz, J. (1975). Psychodynamics of development during the college years. In B. L. Bloom and D. Adelson (Eds.). Psychological Stress in the Campus Community. New York: Behavioral Publications.

Kegan, D. L. (1976). The augmented end-of-year cycles survey. (Rep. No. W31). Amherst, Mass.: Hampshire College, Office of Institutional Research and Evaluation.

Kerr, C. (1964). The Uses of the University. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Knott, J. E. & Daher, D. M. (1978). A structured group program for new students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 19, 5, 456-461.

Kohlberg, L. (1958). Stages of moral development. In C. M. Beck, B. Crittender, & E. Sullivan (Eds.). Moral Education. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Kopecek, R. J. (1971). Freshmen orientation programs: A comparison Journal of College Student Personnel, 12 (1), 54-57.

Kramer, C. (1980). Monitoring freshman perceptions of college. Journal of College Student Personnel, 81, (8), 3.

Krause, M. S. & Howard, K. I. (1976). Program evaluation in the public interest: A new research methodology. Community Mental Health Journal, 12, 291-300.

Kris, E. & Leites, N. (1950). Trends in twentieth century propaganda, in B. Berelson (Ed.). Reader in Public Opinion and Communication. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.

Kronvet, E. (Summer, 1969). Current practices in freshman orientation. Improving College and University Teaching. 7, 204-5.

Krumbaltz, J. D. (1974). An accountability model for counselors. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 52, 639-646.

Lance, L. M., Lourie, J., & Mayo, C. (1979). Needs of re-entry university students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 20, 479-485.

Lasch, C. (1979). The Culture of Narcissism. New York: W. W. Norton.

Lea, H. D., Sedlacek, W. E., & Stewart, S. S. (1979). Problems in retention research in Higher Education. National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 7, 1.

Levine, A. (1980). When Dreams and Heroes Died. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Lidz, T. (1968). The Person. New York: Basic Books.

Mann, J. (1973). Time-limited Psychotherapy. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Mathews, A. (1974). in M. Barr (Ed.), National Orientation Directors Association Handbook. Austin: University of Texas.

McDavis, R. J. & Mingo, G. W. (1980). A summer orientation program for students in special service programs: A coordinated approach. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1, 88-89.

McGee, R. (1974). in M. Barr (Ed.), National Orientation Directors Handbook. Austin: University of Texas.

Menning, A. (1974). in M. Barr (Ed.), National Orientation Directors Association Handbook. Austin: University of Texas.

Moore, P. L., Pappas, E. K., & Vinton, J. C. (1979). An organizational model for orientation programs. NASPA Journal, 17, 1, 40-45.

Morgan, M. K. (1974). Male univeristy attrition: a discriminant analysis. Research in Higher Education, 2, 281-289.

Morstain, B. (1972). The importance of student interaction in the freshman year: Some bases of an experimental living-learning program. NASPA Journal, 9, 283-287.

Muskat, H. (1979). Educational expectations and college attrition. National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Jouranl, 17, 1.

Nelson, E. Measuring the freshman orientation course. School and Society, 1941, 54, 598-600.

Nelson, J. & Murphy, H. (1980). The projected effects of enrollment and budget reductions on student servies. National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal, 17, 4, 8-10.

Netter, G. A. (1957). A measure of alienation. American Sociological Review, 22, 670-677.

O'Banion, T. (1969). Experiment in orientation of junior college students. The Journal of College Student Personnel, 10, 12-15.

Ottoson, J. W. (1968). A longitudinal study of the expressed problems of students attending a mid-western church-related liberal arts college (Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1968). Dissertation Abstracts International, 28, 4007A-4008A.

Pace, C. & Stern, G. G. (1958). An approach to the measurement of psychological characteristics of college environments. Journal of Educational Psychology, 49, 269-277.

Pace, R. (1963). The College and University Environment Scales. Princeton: Educational Testing Service.

Palladino, J. & Tryon, G. (1978). Have the problems of entering freshmen changed? Journal of College Student Personnel, 313-316.

Panos, R. J. & Astin, A. W. (1967). Attribution among college students. American Council on Education Research Report, 2, (4).

Pantages, T. J. & Creedon, C. F. (1978). Studies of College attrition. Review of Educational Research, 48, 49-101.

Pervin, L. & Rubi, D. (1967). Student dissatisfaction with college and the college dropout: a transitional approach. Journal of Social Psychology, 72, 285-295.

Rayman, J., Bryson, D., & Day, J. (1978). Toward a systematic computerized career development program for college students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 19, 202-207.

Rokeach, M. (1969). The Open and Closed Mind. New York: Basic Books.

Rootman, I. (1972). Voluntary withdrawal from a total adult socialization organization: a model. Sociology of Education, 45, 258-270.

Rose, H. & Elton, C. (1971). Attribution and the vocationally undecided student. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1, 99-103.

Rothman, L. K. & Leonard, D. G. (1967). Effectiveness of Freshman orientation, Journal of College Personnel, 8, 300-304.

Sagaria, M.D., Higginson, L. C., & White, E. R. (1980). Perceived needs of entering freshmen: The primacy of academic issues. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 21, (3), 243-247.

Sanford, N. (1976). Where Colleges Fail. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Seeman, M. (1959). On the meaning of alienation. American Sociological Review 24, 783-791.

Shulman, C. H. (1978). Recent trends in student retention. Journal of College Student Personnel, 19, 195-199.

Smallwood, K. B. (1980). What do adult women college students really need? Journal of College Student Personnel, 21, 65-73.

Smith, D. G. (1976). Personality differences between persisters and withdrawers in a small women's college. Research in Higher Education, 5, 15-25.

Srole, L. (1956). Social integration and certain corollaries: An exploratory study. American Sociological Review, 21, 709-716.

Stodt, M. M. (1982). Psychological characteristics of 1980's ocllege students: continuity, changes, and challenges. National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal, 19, 3-8.

Strang, R. (1951). Orientation of new students. In C. G. Wrenn (Ed.). Student Personnel Work in College. New York: Ronald Press.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (1971). Educational Evaluation and Decision-making. Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock.

Summerskill, J. (1962). Dropouts from college. In N. Sanford (Ed). The American College. New York: Wiley.

Tautfest, P. B. (1961). An evaluation technique for orientation programs. Journal of College Student Personnel, 3, 25-28.

Terenzini, P. T. & Pascarella, E. T. (1977). Voluntary freshman attrition and patterns of social and academic integration in a university: a test of a conceptual model. Research in Higher Education, 6, 25-43.

Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from high education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. Review of Educational Research, 45, 89-125.

VanEaton, E. (1974). in M. Barr (Ed.), National Orientation Directors Association Handbook. Austin: University of Texas.

Wallace, D. A. (1979). A comparative analysis of the needs of undergraduate adults. NASPA Journal, 16, 3, 15-23.

Wallis, W. A. (1966). Centripetal and centrifugal forces in university organizations. In R. S. Morrison (Ed.), The Contemporary University: Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co.

Warner, R. (1975). Planning for research and evaluation: Necessary conditions. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 54, 10-11.

Warner, R. W. & Hanson, J. C. (1970). Alienated youth: The counselor's task. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 48, 443-448.

White, R. W. (1974). Strategies of adaptation: An attempt all systematic description. In G. V. Coelho, D. A. Hamburg, and J. E. Adams (Eds.). Coping and Adaptation. New York: Basic Books.

Wigent, P. A. (1971). A student-directed orientation program. Journal of College Student Personnel, 12, 370.

Wright, E. O. (1973). A study of student learnes of absence. Journal of Higher Education, 44, 235-247.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

COURSE OUTLINE AND INFORMATION

FOR A & S 1111

Course Calendar

Week	Topic
1	Introduction, Course Syllabus General welcome, discussion of course goals, explanation of assignments, grading procedures and attendance policy and distribution of the "Student Profile" which is a questionnaire designed to facilitate student awareness of self and the instructors' knowledge of each individual student.
2	Roles of Teachers and Students in the University Discussion of different types of teachers, students' perceptions and misconceptions concerning the role of the teacher in college. Discussion based on articles: I remember Max by Steven M. Weiss and How Do We Find the Student in a World of Academic Gymnasts and Worker Ants? by James T. Baker.
3	Time Management and Other Skills for Academic Success The importance of building a schedule that is based on each student's priorities, a consideration of fixed and flexible activities, a plan for study and the importance of developing good study habits, the necessity of including time for relaxation and other activities as a break from the study routine.

4 What Constitutes Academic Dishonesty?

A discussion on the various forms plagiarism can take, the rationale behind the heavy penalties assessed for it, discussion on the motives behind some of the academic dishonesty which occurs in college based on the article entitled Why College Students Cheat by David Barnett and John Dalton.

5 College Student Development and Student Services at OSU

A discussion on the various services available to the student at OSU, particularly those individual and group sessions offered through the University Counseling Services, emphasis placed on the different types of counseling services available to meet the student in a developmentaly appropriate way.

6 Sharing Arts Assignment

Students share their reactions to campus events they have chosen to attend such as a dramatic production, lecture or a musical performance, reactions and critiques can be submitted in a paper and shared with others in class discussion or kept in the form of a log.

7 & 8 General Education

Delineation of the General Education Requirements in the College of Arts and Sciences, the

philosophy behind the emphasis and belief in the importance General Education holds for the expression and enhancement of a full life no matter what occupation is chosen.

9 Majors and Career Choices

Individual planning worksheet is completed and brought to class for classification and further understanding of courses related to majors and career choice.

10 Visits to Arts and Sciences Departments

Students do not come to class, rather they use this time to visit departments they are interested in learning more about, or they plan to visit with professionals in certain areas to further clarify major or career concerns.

11 Academic Advising

The role and function of the academic advisor in the student's college life, emphasis on the advisor's role as a facilitator, information-giver, and valuable aid in career and life planning.

12 Sharing Arts Assignment II

Second discussion of opinions and reactions to attendance of various campus lectures, poetry readings, plays or art showings.

13	Managing Stress and Preparing for Finals Discussion on learning to manage one's own stress, emphasis on learning to recognize individual sources of stress and ways of coping, importance of exercise, sharing any anxieties or questions about upcoming final exams.
14	Final Exercise General course wrap-up and evaluation, return of journals, papers, autobiographical essays, logs or papers on arts experiences.

Fall 1983

ARTS & SCIENCES 1111

Educational and Vocational Orientation

Faculty Mentor _____

Office _____

Telephone #_____

Office Hours _____

Catalog Description: An orientation course for freshmen. Study techniques, evaluation of one's abilities, and the making of proper educational and vocational choices.

Course Goals:

1. To introduce students to the purposes of higher education and to their responsibilities as students in the College of Arts and Sciences;
2. To enhance student awareness of the linkages among the Arts and Sciences;
3. To identify for students the resources for intellectual, personal and social growth available to them as members of the University community;
4. To provide an introduction to the skills necessary for academic success;
5. To provide opportunities for increased student self-awareness.

Exams and Major Assignments

Requirements for the course include completion of a student profile, an autobiographical essay, six arts assignments, and a final exam or paper.

Arts Assignments

Each student in the course will be required to attend six campus events during the spring semester. The six events are to be chosen from among the following: (1) an art opening, (2) a dramatic production, (3) a reading of poetry or fiction works, (4) a lecture in the sciences, (5) a lecture in the humanities or social sciences, (6) a musical performance. For each event attended, the student should either keep a log or submit a paper describing the event and his or her personal reactions to the event. Faculty mentors will make specific assignments and establish due dates.

Grading Procedures

A & S 1111 is graded on a Pass-Fail basis. To receive a grade of "Pass" the student must:

1. Participate satisfactorily in his or her discussion section and attend the lectures.
2. Satisfactorily complete the written assignments for the course.
3. Complete the final exam with an acceptable score.

Attendance Policy

Students are expected to attend both lecture and discussion sessions. A combined total of four absences for lecture and discussion sessions will result in a grade of "Fail" for the course.

Text Materials

The A & S Orientation Discussion Guide is available in the Student Union Bookstore for $2.00. The Catalog is distributed in the discussion sections at no chage to A & S 1111 students.

Fall 1983

A&S 1111

Student Profile

NAME_____ STUDENT I.D. #_____

LOCAL ADDRESS _____ LOCAL TELEPHONE _____

SEMESTER AT OSU (circle one): 1st 2nd

1. What were your 3 most important reasons for choosing to attend OSU?

   (a) _____

   (b) _____

   (c) _____

2. Have you chosen a concentration or major?_____ If yes, what?

   _____ What are two reasons for your choice?

   (a) _____

   (b) _____

3. List your courses for the Spring semester.

   (a)_____ (d)_____

   (b)_____ (e)_____

   (c)_____ (f)_____

4. Which two of the above courses do you expect to be most difficult for you and why?

   (a) _____

   (b) _____

5. Which best describes your study habits and skills?

_____ adequate for success at OSU

_____ not sure about the adequacy of my skills for college work

_____ currently inadequate for success at OSU

6. Which, if any, of the following academic skills do you feel you need to improve? (check as many as apply)

_____ time management

_____ organization

_____ reading

_____ writing

_____ note taking

_____ exam skills

_____ library skills

_____ math or computational skills

7. Are there personal concerns which may affect your academic performance this semester?

_____ financial problems

_____ relationships

_____ health

_____ choice of major

_____ loneliness

_____ physical appearance

_____ learning disability

_____ other _____

8. How many hours per week did you study last semester? _____

9. How many hours per week do you feel you need to study this semester?

_____

10. Will you be working this semster? _____ If yes, how many hours per week? _____ Where? _____

11. What are some of your interests?

_____

_____

_____

12. What magazines do you read regularly?

_____

13. What are the three best books you have read and what made each special to you?

(a)_____

(b)_____

(c)_____

14. What campus activities are you planning to be involved in at OSU?

_____

_____

15. What out of class opportunities do you hope to find at OSU?

_____

_____

16. How many people at OSU do you consider your good friend? _____

17. If you are a second semester student, how many OSU faculty and staff members have taken a personal interest in you? _____

18. What rewards and satisfaction are you receiving (or do you expect to receive) at OSU?

_____

_____

19. What do you dislike about OSU?

_____

_____

_____

20. What are two things you would like to discuss in this class?

(a) _____

(b) _____

21. Is there anything else you would like for the instructor or others to know about you? _____

SUGGESTIONS FOR EFFECTIVE TIME MANAGEMENT

Time management is accomplished through sound decision-making and planning. Consider the following as ideas that might be utilized in planning success in higher education, both academically and in general. The process is to build a schedule that will work for you while replacing that which doesn't.

1. PLAN YOUR SCHEDULE BY FIRST DECIDING YOUR PRIORITIES. What grades are O.K. for you? How much work do you want to do in student government? How much free or fun time is enough to meet your needs? What about dating, watching T.V., study, going to movies, etc.? These decisions are important and time allocation can only be made after your priorities are chosen.
2. CONSIDER FIXED AND FLEXIBLE THINGS THAT YOU DO. Some activities will take a certain amount of time and must be done. You may want to include these on a master schedule for the semester. Other activities are flexible and may or may not be scheduled. Again, decisions that make sense to you must be made. Plan your schedule according to your decisions. Some examples are:

Fixed Time Allocations	Flexible Time Allocations
Sleeping	Television Viewing
Classes	Recreation
Eating	Study
Meetings	Personal Business
Work	Dating
Church	Relaxation

3. PLAN TIME FOR STUDY. The old rule of three hours of study for each hour of in-class lecture is still a good one. However, consider such things as how rapidly you read, how well you recall facts and information, and then modify the rule. By multiplying your in-class hours by three you can determine a rule of thumb to be scheduled.
4. ESTABLISH STUDY HABITS. Research shows that people study best and learn most by studying in the same place at a regular time, routinely. Decide once and plan it in your schedule. This will save you daily battles with yourself about when and where and what to study. Also, don't schedule "study", but be specific - "study chemistry", "study math", etc. need to be written into your plan. Another good idea is to study a soon as possible after a lecture class and prior to a discussion class.
5. SCHEDULE ALL OF YOUR HOURS BETWEEN CLASSES. Don't waste that one or two hours between one class and another. Additionally, most people are more productive during the daylight hours than they are in the evenings.
6. REWARD YOURSELF FOR GOOD WORK. Contract with yourself to reward you if you succeed. Don't reward you when you choose to not do what is planned. Specifically, watch T.V. after you study. Drink beer after you study. Get some recreation after you've accomplished an unpleasant but necessary task.
7. TRADE TIME. If you are forced to choose to leave your schedule (those two hours for studying history on Tuesday night) don't just forget it. Plan to make up the two hours at another time.
8. KNOW YOURSELF AS A LEARNER. Research indicates that after 1½ to 2 hours of study most people get a reduced return for their spent

energy. After this time, schedule at least a short break (a reward for you 'cause you're doing "good") and return to take up another subject or course. This method should help you to keep your interst and efficiency.

9. PEOPLE NEED TO PLAY. All of us need to have time to relax and enjoy - whatever that means to us. Be sure to schedule this in. Typically weekends are a good time - but not all weekend.

WEEKLY STUDY SCHEDULE

	MON	TUES	WED	THURS	FRI	SAT	SUN
7:30 8:30							
8:30 9:30							
9:30 10:30							
10:30 11:30							
11:30 12:30							
12:30 1:30							
1:30 2:30							
2:30 3:30							
3:30 4:30							
4:30 5:30							
5:30 6:30							
6:30 7:30							
7:30 8:30							
8:30 9:30							
9:30 10:30							
10:30 11:30							

INFORMATION FROM DEGREE PLANS

1. General Studies Requirements--All OSU students will need general studies requirements which are similar, but not identical, in the colleges. This plan demonstrates one difference between the B.A. & B.S., the foreign language requirement. If you are considering several different degree plans, it will be helpful to you to compare their general studies requirements when choosing courses for your freshman year.
2. Departmental Requirements--Departmental requirements also include lower division courses (numbered 1000 or 2000) and should be completed during the freshman or sophomore years. Check with your adviser to see if departmental requirements will also meet general studies requirements in your curriculum.
3. Field of Concentration--These courses are almost always 3000 and 4000 courses that are taken during the junior and senior years. Using the catalog course description along with the degree plan will allow you to better understand nature of study in a given area.
4. Electives--The number of electives varies greatly in different degree plans. Some degree plans include controlled electives (i.e., acceptable electives will be specified by the department). When free electives are available, they allow you to meet personal objectives and should be chosen carefully.

Each college has available the degree plans for its majors. Books including all degree plans are usually available at Student Academic Services offices, advisers offices, the Career Information Center, and the Library (4th floor).

Name _____

Discussion # _____

A&S 1111

Education Planning Worksheet

DEGREE: BA BS BFA (circle one)

MAJOR OR CONCENTRATION: _____

(If undecided, choose a possibility for this practice exercise.)

STEP I - List specific courses you have taken or may take to meet General Studies requirements.

GENERAL STUDIES:

Required of all students:

Orientation (1 hr.)

English Composition (6 hrs.)

U.S. History & Government (6 hrs.)

Natural Science (8-16 hrs.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

Abstract & Quantitative Thgt. (3 hrs.)

_____

Foreign Language (0-10 hrs.)

_____

_____

Humanities (8-12 hrs.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

Social Sciences (3-6 hrs.)

_____

_____

Lower Division Departmental Requirements (which can't be met through gen. studies)

Electives during your first two years. _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____

_____

_____

STEP II - Sequence the courses you will be taking over your first four semesters at OSU. Note that it is neither necessary nor preferred that you complete all of your general studies requirements within your first two years.

1st Semester	2nd Semester	3rd Semester	4th Semester

Summer Session 19 ___

_____

_____

STEP III - Answer the following questions regarding the above planning.

1. What general studies requirements, if any, will you not have met at the end of two years?

_____

2. What departmental requirements, if any, will you not have met at the end of two years?

_____

3. Which of your courses, if any, will meet the scientific investigation requirement?

_____

4. Which of your courses, if any, will meet the international dimension requirement?

_____

5. Choose a general studies area not related to your major; give your rationale for choosing courses in that area.

_____

6. Give your rationale for the electives you have chosen for your first two years. _____

A&S 1111 - FINAL ASSIGNMENT

Personal, Educational & Career Development

Fall, 1983

This assignment is due in your last discussion section meeting. The assignment should result in a highly introspective essay in which you ask yourself "Who am I?" and "Where am I going?" These questions can usually be addressed in four or five pages. The length of the paper, however, will necessarily vary because of the uniqueness of your own development. The following outline should give you some ideas about how you might organize your paper.

1. Discuss your home environment. What people and events affected the kind of person you are today and the kind of person you want to become?
2. What do you remember most about your secondary school experiences? What and who challenged you to grow personally and intellectually? What elements in the school environment stifled such growth?
3. Are there other significant people or experiences (eg., teachers, friends, work, etc.) which you really liked or disliked? Did these also help shape you as a person?
4. What do you hope to gain from your university experience? What steps are you taking to help assure that you get those desired outcomes?
5. Considering that all of us are continuously in a "process of becoming," what kind of person would you like to become? What lifestyle do you hope for? What balance among career, family, and other pursuits seems compatible to you?

APPENDIX B

KEY FOR PRACTICALITY SCALE, COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT SCALES, SECOND EDITION

APPENDIX B

KEY FOR PRACTICALITY SCALE, COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT SCALES, SECOND EDITION

Item	Statement	Key
1.	Students almost always wait to be called on before speaking in class.	T
2.	Big college events draw a lot of student enthusiasm and support.	T
3.	There is a recognized group of student learners on this campus.	T
4.	Frequent tests are given in most courses.	T
5.	Students take a great deal of pride in their appearance.	T
6.	Education here tends to make students more practical and realistic.	T
7.	The professors regularly check up on the students to make sure that assignments are being carried out properly and on time.	T
8.	It is important socially here to be in the right club or group.	T
9.	Student pep rallies, parades, dances, carnivals, or demonstrations occur very rarely.	F

APPENDIX B (Continued)

Item	Statement	Key
10.	Anyone who knows the right people in faculty or administration can get a better break here.	T
51.	The important people at this school expect others to show proper respect for them.	T
52.	Student elections generate a lot of intense campaigning and strong feeling.	T
53.	Everyone has a lot of fun at this school.	T
54.	In many classes students have an assigned seat.	T
55.	Student organizations are closely supervised to guard against mistakes.	T
56.	Many students try to pattern themselves after people they admire.	T
57.	New fads and phrases are continually springing up among students.	T
58.	Students must have a written excuse for absence from class.	T
59.	The college offers many really practical courses such as typing, report writing, etc.	T
60.	Student rooms are more likely to be decorated with pennants and pin-ups than with paintings, carvings, mobiles, fabrics, etc.	T

APPENDIX C

KEY FOR COMMUNITY SCALE, COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT SCALES, SECOND EDITION

APPENDIX C

KEY FOR COMMUNITY SCALE, COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT SCALES, SECOND EDITION

Item	Statement	Key
21.	It is easy to take clear notes in most courses.	T
22.	The school helps everyone get acquainted.	T
23.	Students often run errands or do other personal services for the faculty.	T
24.	The history and traditions of the college are strongly emphasized.	T
25.	The professors go out of their way to help you.	T
26.	There is a great deal of borrowing and sharing among students.	T
27.	When students run a project or put on a show everyone knows about it.	T
28.	Many upperclassmen play an active role in helping new students adjust to campus life.	T
29.	Students exert considerable pressure on one another to live up to the expected codes of conduct.	T
30.	Graduation is a pretty matter-of-fact, unemotional event.	F
71.	This school has a reputation for being very friendly.	T

APPENDIX C (Continued)

Item	Statement	Key
72.	All undergraduates must live in university approved housing.	T
73.	Instructors clearly explain the goals and purposes of their courses.	T
74.	Students have many opportunities to develop skill in organizing and directing the work of others.	T
75.	Most of the faculty are not interested in students' personal problems.	F
76.	Students quickly learn what is done and not done on this campus.	T
77.	It's easy to get a group together for card games, singing, going to the movies, etc.	T
78.	Students commonly share their problems.	T
79.	Faculty members rarely or never call students by their first names.	F
80.	There is a lot of group spirit.	T

APPENDIX D

KEY FOR AWARENESS SCALE, COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT SCALES, SECOND EDITION

APPENDIX D

KEY FOR AWARENESS SCALE, COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT SCALES, SECOND EDITION

Item	Statement	Key
31.	Channels for expressing students' complaints are readily accessible.	T
32.	Students are encouraged to take an active part in social reforms or political programs.	T
33.	Students are actively concerned about national and international affairs.	T
34.	There are a good many colorful and controversial figures on the faculty.	T
35.	There is a considerable interest in the analysis of value systems, in the relativity of societies and ethics.	T
36.	Public debates are held frequently.	T
37.	A controversial speaker always stirs up a lot of student discussion.	T
38.	There are many facilities and opportunities for individual creative activity.	T
39.	There is a lot of interest here in poetry, music, painting, sculpture, architecture, etc.	T

APPENDIX D (Continued)

Item	Statement	Key
40.	Concerts and art exhibits always draw big crowds of students.	T
81.	Students are encouraged to criticize administrative policies and teaching practices.	T
82.	The expression of strong personal belief or conviction is pretty rare around here.	F
83.	Many students here develop a strong sense of responsibility about their role in comtemporary social and political life.	T
84.	There are a number of prominent faculty members who play a significant role in national or local politics.	T
85.	There would be a capacity audience for a lecture by an outstanding philosopher or theologian.	T
86.	Course offerings and faculty in the social sciences are outstanding.	T
87.	Many famous people are brought to the campus for lectures, concerts, student discussions, etc.	T
88.	The school offers many opportunities for students to understand and criticize important works of art, music, and drama.	T
89.	Special museums or collections are important possessions of the college.	T
90.	Modern art and music get little attention here.	F

APPENDIX E

KEY FOR PROPRIETY SCALE, COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT SCALES, SECOND EDITION

APPENDIX E

KEY FOR PROPRIETY SCALE, COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT SCALES, SECOND EDITION

Item	Statement	Key
41.	Students ask permission before deviating from common policies or practices.	T
42.	Most student rooms are pretty messy.	F
43.	People here are always trying to win an argument.	F
44.	Drinking and late parties are generally tolerated, despite regulation.	F
45.	Students occasionally plot some sort of escapade or rebellion.	F
46.	Many students drive sports cars.	F
47.	Students frequently do things on the spur of the moment.	F
48.	Student publications never lampoon dignified people or institutions.	T
49.	The person who is always trying to "help out" is likely to be regarded as a nuisance.	F
50.	Students are conscientious about taking good care of school property.	T

APPENDIX E (Continued)

Item	Statement	Key
91.	Students are expected to report any violation or rules and regulations.	T
92.	Student parties are colorful and lively.	F
93.	There always seems to be a lot of little quarrels going on.	F
94.	Students rarely get drunk and disorderly.	T
95.	Most students show a great deal of caution and self-control in their behavior.	T
96.	Bermuda shorts, pin-up pictures, etc., are common on this campus.	F
97.	Students pay little attention to rules and regulations.	F
98.	Dormitory raids, water fights, and other student pranks would be unthinkable.	T
99.	Many students seem to expect other people to adapt to them rather than trying to adapt themselves to others.	F
100.	Rough games and contact sports are an important part of intramural athletics.	F

APPENDIX F

KEY FOR SCHOLARSHIP SCALE, COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT SCALES, SECOND EDITION

APPENDIX F

KEY FOR SCHOLARSHIP SCALE, COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT SCALES, SECOND EDITION

Item	Statement	Key
11.	The professors really push the students' capacities to the limit.	T
12.	Most of the professors are dedicated scholars in their fields.	T
13.	Most courses require intensive study and preparation out of class.	T
14.	Students set high standards of achievement for themselves.	T
15.	Class discussions are typically vigorous and intense.	T
16.	A lecture by an outstanding scientist would be poorly attended.	F
17.	Careful reasoning and clear logic are valued most highly in grading student papers, reports, or discussions.	T
18.	It is fairly easy to pass most courses without working very hard.	F
19.	The school is outstanding for the emphasis and support it gives to pure scholarship and basic research.	T

APPENDIX F (Continued)

Item	Statement	Key
20.	Standards set by the professors are not particularly hard to achieve.	F
61.	Most of the professors are very thorough teachers and really probe into the fundamentals of their subjects.	T
62.	Most courses are a real intellectual challenge.	T
63.	Students put a lot of energy into everything they do in class and out.	T
64.	Course offerings and faculty in the natural sciences are outstanding.	T
65.	Courses, examinations, and readings are frequently revised.	T
66.	Personality, pull, and bluff gets students through many courses.	F
67.	There is very little studying here over the weekend.	F
68.	There is a lot of interest in philosophy and methods of science.	T
69.	People around here seem to thrive on difficulty--the tougher things get, the harder they work.	T
70.	Students are very serious and purposeful about their work.	T

VITA

Nancy Ruzicka Childress

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: COMPARING FRESHMAN ORIENTATION PROGRAMS ON INITIAL CAMPUS INTEGRATION

Major Field: Student Personnel and Guidance

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in St. Louis, Missouri, November 3, 1946, the daughter of Edward John and Celeste Breen Ruzicka. Married to Donald Booker Childress, 1972. Two children, Allyson Breen and John Booker.

Education: Graduated from Shawnee Mission East High School, Prairie Village, Kansas, in May, 1964; received Bachelor of Science degree in Education from University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona, in 1968; received Master of Science in Counseling and Student Personnel from Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, in 1979; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in December, 1984.

Professional Experience: Librarian, 1968-69, at Wakefield Junior High in Tucson, Arizona; Media Coordinator, William Pistor Junior High, Tucson, Arizona, 1969-71; Librarian, Center North Junior High, Kansas City, Missouri, 1971-72. Academic Advisor, College of Arts and Sciences, Oklahoma State University, 1980; Graduate Assistant, Office of the Vice President for Student Services, Oklahoma State University, 1982-84.