

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Lawrence Floyd Griggs for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in College Student Services Administration presented on May 3, 1978

Title: THE EFFECT OF A SPECIAL LIVING-LEARNING
RESIDENCE HALL EXPERIENCE ON THE SELF CONCEPT
OF ENTERING EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM
STUDENTS AT OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

Abstract approved: Signature redacted for privacy.
Dr. Jo Anne J. Trow

The overall purpose of this research was to determine the factors involved in Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) freshmen making a successful adjustment to the Oregon State University campus environment and to determine whether this adjustment can be accomplished early in the students' college career. Specifically, this investigation was designed to examine the effects of a living-learning residence hall experience on the self concept and college adjustment of entering freshman EOP students.

The sample of the study consisted of 54 freshman students. Twenty-three of the students were admitted to the university through the Educational Opportunity Program and comprised Group I (Experimental Group) and Group II (Control Group I). The remaining 31 students were admitted to the university through the regular

admission process and comprised Group III (Control Group II).

The primary source of the data was students' responses to the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) and the Adjective Check List (ACL). Students were administered the instruments within two weeks after the start of fall term, 1977. The instruments were again administered one week before the end of fall term, 1977. The TSCS served as a measure of self concept and the ACL was used to measure adjustment to the college environment. The total scores on both instruments were used for testing the statistical hypotheses.

The data were analyzed by an analysis of variance, an analysis of covariance, and a test for correlation. Statistical comparisons were made to ascertain if differences existed between: (1) Group I and Group II on pre and post test mean scores on self concept and college adjustment after one quarter of college. (2) Group I, Group II, and Group III on pre and post test mean scores on self concept and college adjustment after one quarter of college. (3) Group I, Group II, and Group III on pre-test mean scores on self concept and college adjustment at the beginning of fall term.

The following conclusions were drawn from the results of this study:

1. EOP students who participate in a special living situation show no significant difference in change in self concept and adjustment to college in the majority of tested areas as compared to EOP students

residing in regular campus residence halls.

2. Non-EOP students appear to have more positive change in some areas of self concept and college adjustment during the first quarter of college compared to EOP students.

3. EOP and non-EOP students appear to enter college with similar expectations concerning the college environment.

4. Both EOP and non-EOP students appear to adjust to the college environment basically at the same rate during the first quarter of college.

5. Non-EOP students appear to enter OSU with a more positive self concept in many areas than EOP students.

6. Both EOP and non-EOP students scored lower on the post test than they scored on the pre-test. The majority of the mean change scores were in the negative direction.

The Effect of a Special Living-Learning Residence
Hall Experience on the Self Concept of Entering
Educational Opportunity Program Students
at Oregon State University

by

Lawrence Floyd Griggs

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Completed May 3, 1978

Commencement June 1978

APPROVED:

Signature redacted for privacy.

Professor of Education
in charge of major

Signature redacted for privacy.

Dean of the School of Education

Signature redacted for privacy.

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented May 3, 1978

Typed by Opal Grossnicklaus for Lawrence Floyd Griggs

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This writer would like to extend sincere appreciation to Dr. Jo Anne J. Trow for her continued guidance and support as my major professor. Appreciation for assistance and support is also extended to other committee members: Dr. Robert Chick, Dr. Dale Simmons, Dr. Glenn Clark and Dr. Robert Newburgh.

Gratitude is extended to the EOP students who participated in this study, to the EOP staff members who assisted in the completion of this study, and to Dr. Gwendolyn Henderson for her assistance and support. Sincere appreciation is extended to Dr. Stuart Knapp for his assistance and encouragement, to Dr. Norbert Hartmann for his statistical assistance, and to Sabina Wolski for her time and effort in typing the final draft of this thesis.

Finally, special gratitude is expressed to my mother, Mildred M. Griggs, who has always given support and encouragement throughout my life in all my endeavors. Appreciation is extended to my daughter, Linda, for her patience and understanding. Sincere appreciation is also extended to my wife, Diane, for without her support, encouragement, and assistance, this dissertation would not have been completed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	7
Purpose of the Study	12
Significance of the Study	13
Limitations of the Study	15
Definition of Terms	16
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	20
Self Concept Theory and Adjustment	20
Culture and Economic Status on Self Concept	26
Effects of Educational Opportunity Programs	34
Effectiveness of College Residence Hall	
Experience in Enhancing the Developmental	
Process of Students	45
III. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES	81
Design and Subjects	81
Procedure of Collecting Data	83
Instruments	83
Treatment of Data	97
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA	98
Hypothesis I	100
Hypothesis II	102
Hypothesis III	102
Hypothesis IV	104
Hypothesis V	109
Hypothesis VI	111
Hypothesis VII	111
Summary	115
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	117
Summary	117
Conclusion	122
Recommendations	126

	<u>Page</u>
BIBLIOGRAPHY	128
APPENDICES	139
Appendix A	139
Appendix B	140
Appendix C	144
Appendix D	147
Appendix E	148
Appendix F	149

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. An Analysis of Variance Between Group I, Group II, and Group III Pre-Test Mean Scores on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale to Examine for Significant Differences.	101
2. An Analysis of Covariance Between Group I, Group II, and Group III Examining Differences in Change in Self Concept as Measured by Comparing Post Test Mean Scores Adjusted for the Pre-Test Scores on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale.	103
3. An Analysis of Variance Between Group I, Group II, and Group III Pre-Test Mean Scores on the Adjective Check List to Examine for Significant Differences.	105
4. An Analysis of Covariance Between Group I, Group II, and Group III Examining Differences in Change in College Adjustment as Measured by Comparing Post Test Mean Scores Adjusted for the Pre-Test Scores on the Adjective Check List.	107
5. An Analysis of Covariance Between Group I and Group II to Examine Differences in Change Mean Scores on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale When Post Test Mean Scores Have Been Adjusted.	110
6. An Analysis of Covariance Between Group I and Group II to Examine Differences in Change Mean Scores on the Adjective Check List When Post Test Mean Scores Have Been Adjusted.	112
7. A Correlation Between Change Scores on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (total P score) and the Adjective Check List.	114

THE EFFECT OF A SPECIAL LIVING-LEARNING RESIDENCE
HALL EXPERIENCE ON THE SELF CONCEPT OF
ENTERING EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY
PROGRAM STUDENTS AT OREGON
STATE UNIVERSITY

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, the opportunity to seek a higher education in the United States has been largely limited to individuals with personal economic resources (Egerton, 1968). This, of course, inevitably excluded most minority and some poor white individuals from ever attaining a higher education. With a few exceptions, this trend of only educating the elite in the American society continued until the middle and late 1960's.

In the middle 1960's the trend of educating only those who could afford it began to change. In 1964 Congress began appropriating funds to develop programs in higher education for the purpose of assisting financially disadvantaged students. This marked the beginning of whittling away at the barriers most minority and poor white students encountered in attaining a higher education.

The late 1960's witnessed Educational Opportunity Programs coming into existence in American higher education institutions. With the aid of grants from the Office of Education, many colleges

and universities for the first time opened their doors to large numbers of these non-traditional students.

The Oregon State System colleges and universities were actively involved in experimenting with programs for the disadvantaged in the late sixties. The State Board of Higher Education adopted a policy, which became effective during the 1968 school year, to admit a small number of freshmen to its institutions who had not met the basic admission requirement. This policy was known as the Three Percent Program. The policy permitted the institutions to admit a number of freshmen totaling no more than three percent of the institution's previous year's freshman class. With the approval of the Oregon State University Faculty Senate, a small program was initiated in the Fall of 1968 at Oregon State University. The initiation of the Three Percent Program in the Fall of 1968 has now, after nine years, evolved into the current Educational Opportunity Program.

The current Educational Opportunity Program provides many supportive services to its students; financial assistance, transitional courses, counseling, tutorial services, and a personal adjustment group counseling course. Students in the EOP are admitted to the University through the program or apply to be admitted into the program after being admitted through normal channels. Most students request to be admitted into the EOP to take advantage of one or more of the supportive services mentioned above. Many of those students

who are admitted into the University through the EOP usually do not have the grade point average (2.50) from high school to be admitted as a regular student, need financial assistance, and/or need transitional courses. Those students who come into the EOP after being admitted through normal channels usually need financial assistance, tutorial assistance, and/or transitional courses. Occasionally, a small number of students seek admission into EOP for the purpose of having a place or program on campus to identify with, a place to use as a point of reference on campus. These students are generally ethnic minorities and do not need financial assistance.

Even though today most of the barriers such as a lack of financial assistance and supportive services that prohibited non-traditional students from attaining a higher education in the past are being removed, there is still another significant barrier plaguing non-traditional students--the transitional barrier. The transitional barrier is the difficulty non-traditional students have in making the necessary transition from the home and neighborhood environment to the college environment. In other words, the amount of time it takes to decrease, eliminate or successfully cope with the feeling of alienation and to enhance self concept and achievement in college among non-traditional students.

Adjustment to the college environment by entering freshmen has always been a concern by most colleges and universities. This

is quite evident from the different types of orientation programs developed to assist freshmen in becoming familiar with the campus. In a study by Summerskill (1962) on college attrition rates, it was found that socioeconomic background does affect the adjustment to the college environment and consequently is a factor in affecting attrition rates.

Adjustment to the college environment by non-traditional students within a limited amount of time has recently become very important. The national economic situation is causing a tightening of university budgets which has brought about a cut-back of resources and monies. This situation is expected to worsen in the future. Special programs, such as Educational Opportunity, Upward Bound, and Special Services are viewed by many in higher education as being "extras" and have a tendency to be affected first during economic difficulty. These programs were developed and implemented during an era when the economy was healthy and social concerns for equal educational opportunities were on the increase. Today, college administrators are forced to find ways to stretch shrinking budgets and are trimming the extras and/or special programs.

For example, according to the Chronicle of Higher Education, April 12, 1976, the governing board of the City University of New York approved an end to open admissions and the merger of four colleges into two. The board's action was recommended by the Chancellor to

cope with severe budget reductions. CUNY's budget in 1976 was recommended by the Chancellor to cope with severe budget reductions. CUNY's budget in 1976 was nearly seven percent less than the amount it spent the previous year. Some of the changes approved by the board included: Limiting admission to senior colleges to students in the top one-third of their high school graduating class or a "B" high school grade average; limiting admission to community colleges to students in the top three-fourths of their high school graduating class or a "C" high school grade average; and dropping students who fail to maintain required grade averages. Although students from deprived areas receiving financial support under the university's special programs will be exempt from the new admission requirements, they must however, maintain a minimum grade average.

The Chronicle also reported that the State University of New York is experiencing financial problems. The New York legislature decreased appropriations for the University by \$27 million and ordered it to increase income by \$25 million. The University had to increase tuition, lay off faculty members and cut programs. One of the first programs to be eliminated was Puerto Rican Studies at the Albany campus. Several other campuses experienced demonstrations by students demanding that programs and services affecting women and members of minority groups not be eliminated or reduced.

The April 7, 1976 issue of the Oregon Daily Emerald reported that William Boyd, President of the University of Oregon was continuing his reorganization and elimination of certain aspects of the Academic Opportunities Program (AOP), which was previously the EOP. The admission, financial aid, and academic advising facets of the AOP were eliminated as a part of a vast reorganization of student services. The two directors of admissions and financial aid for AOP were cut from the program and assigned new responsibilities. All AOP students are now processed and receive academic advising through the regular channels. The only aspect of the program that was retained was the AOP central office, which directs the academic affairs of minority and disadvantaged students.

During the 1974-75 academic year a new policy regarding eligibility for continuation of the State Need Grant became effective. This new policy required students to make satisfactory progress (36 or more hours at a 2.00 GPA or better) toward a degree each year or the grant would be discontinued. Although all residents are affected by this new policy, many freshmen EOP students have found it difficult to meet the State Scholarship Commission's criterion for satisfactory progress. Currently, EOP students go through a long transitional period and often don't make satisfactory progress until the end of the first year or the beginning of the second year. Consequently, these students will lose their State Need Grants.

This researcher believes that the preceding examples are indicative of a trend that has been developing in higher education recently to reduce funding or completely eliminate special programs for non-traditional students. Presently, and in the future, special programs will no longer be able to carry students through long transitional periods because of a lack of resources and monies.

Therefore, if Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) students are to succeed in the academic community, experiences must be provided to assist them in making the transition into the college environment easier and much faster. In this study the researcher has attempted to determine the types of outcomes produced in the transition experience.

Statement of the Problem

The problem was one of determining the effects of a Special Living-and-Learning Residence Hall experience for freshmen EOP students on their self concept and college adjustment compared to freshmen EOP students not participating in the special residence hall experience.

If the current Educational Opportunity Program is necessary to provide an alternate avenue through which students previously hindered from obtaining a higher education may enter the university, then it is safe and logical to assume that these students may have had

experiences with education which have tended to give them a less than positive self concept. They have been hindered by financial, geographic, motivational and academic barriers, as the studies cited below will indicate.

Recent research related to self concept is exploring the relationship between self concept and academic success or failure, self concept and race, and self concept and the economically disadvantaged. According to Dyson in his "Study of Ability Grouping and the Self Concept," it was found that high achievers reported significantly more positive academic self concepts than low achievers (Dyson, 1965). He concludes that negative academic experiences are the means through which a person learns to develop a poor self concept and positive self concepts result from positive experiences. Combs reported from findings of a study,

that underachievers saw themselves as less adequate to others, saw peers and adults as less acceptable, showed a less effective approach to problem solving, and showed less freedom and adequacy of emotional expression (Aspy, 1971, p. 369).

One of the adolescent's most basic developmental tasks is the establishment of self-identity. Prejudice and discrimination from the dominant culture have been shown to affect the responses of minority group members to themselves and their groups. It would be expected that the self concept of Black youths has been adversely influenced in a predominantly white society (Dales and Keller, 1972, p. 35)

The literature researched in the area of race and its relationship to self concept is too confounded with other variables such as age, socioeconomic status, and education level to show a significant relationship between race and self concept. However one researcher has done extensive work in this area.

According to Thompson (1972) results from studies on the self concepts of Blacks indicate that black samples show a characteristic Tennessee Self Concept Scale. The following features are typical of the self descriptions of Black samples:

Self-Esteem: Thompson found the level of Positive (P) scores varied considerably. Most samples, particularly junior high and high school students, had low P scores which indicates below-average level of self-esteem. A characteristic pattern of column P scores was an elevated Physical Self and Personal Self Score and a lowered Moral-Ethical Self Score. The total Positive (P) Score reflects the overall self-esteem of the respondent and is the most important single score.

Defensiveness: Data indicates that Blacks show greater than average defensiveness, reflected by a low Self Criticism and a high Defensive Positive (DP) Score. A high DP Score indicates a positive self description stemming from defensive distortion. The Self Criticism Score is composed of ten items. These are mildly derogatory statements that most people admit as being true for them.

Conflict: Thompson's results indicate that conflict Scores for Blacks are usually high, indicating contradiction, confusion, and general conflict in self-perception.

Variability: The Variability Scores, which measure the amount of variability or inconsistency from one area of self perception to another, are generally high for Black samples.

Response Set: Black samples usually score high on True-False Ratio (T/F), indicating an acquiescent response set, i. e., a tendency to neither reject nor deny items.

Empirical Scale Scores: In this area Black samples usually show deviant features across the set of scores; specifically; Black samples have high GM and Psy Scores and low PI Scores.

The Empirical Scale consists of six scales. The General Maladjustment Scale (GM) is composed of 24 items which differentiate psychiatric patients from non-patients. The Psychosis Scale (Psy) is based on 23 items which differentiate psychotic patients from other groups. Another empirical scale is the Personality Integration Scale (PI). Individuals who score low on this scale are judged as below average in terms of level of adjustment or degree of personality integration.

Culturally disadvantaged children seem to mirror the negative attitudes of others and reflect the discrimination in their own negative self images according to Witty in a 1967 study.

Handicapped by poverty and grossly unstimulating conditions, they are characterized by a denigration of one's potential as a person and as a learner, by a low aspirational level in academic area, by a need for immediate self-gratification rather than for future goals, and by a spirit of resignation (Havighurst and Moorefield, 1967; Tannenbaum, 1967, p. 32).

According to Havighurst and Moorefield, the segregation imposed upon disadvantaged children insulates them, at least for the early years, from acquiring the negative attitudes from those who are not disadvantaged. Younger children have not yet had to encounter the search for the social possibilities which will determine their disadvantage unless they have achieved the symbols of competence such as educational achievement, economic efficiency, or adult marital role.

The disadvantaged child's self concept becomes affected when the child reaches the more heterogeneous high school. He or she may find it a different world; a foreign environment perhaps, from what he or she had experienced, and so does not continue to derive satisfaction and some measure of success from the school. The gains of the elementary years may give way to the greater pressures of the secondary school years when the children are emerging as individuals and searching for an identity (Erikson, 1950).

In a study by Frerichs in 1971, it was found that Black disadvantaged children from a homeogeneous inner-city neighborhood can achieve a high degree of self-esteem if they know they are

academically successful in school. The study also indicated that academically successful disadvantaged Black children perceive themselves in a positive manner, just as do their white suburban middle-class counterparts.

The implication from research related to self concept is that race and disadvantaged status have some influence on self-concept, but one of the most dominant influences on self concept is success or failure in past experiences. Not only is the self concept affected by the experiences one has had, but also the self concept influences the manner in which one approaches and utilizes new experiences.

In summary, the problem was one of trying to provide entering EOP freshmen with a successful experience their first quarter on campus to determine what effect this experience had on their self concept and adjustment to the college environment.

Purpose of the Study

The overall purpose of this study was one of determining the factors involved in EOP freshmen making a successful adjustment to the OSU campus environment and whether this adjustment can be accomplished early in the students' college career. More specifically, the purposes of this study were: 1) To determine whether after one quarter of college there is a significant difference in self concept of EOP freshmen participating in a Special Living-Learning Residence

Hall experience compared to EOP students not participating in the Special Residence Hall; 2) To determine whether after one quarter of college there is a significant difference in adjustment to college by EOP freshmen participating in a Special Living-Learning Residence Hall experience compared to EOP students not participating in the Special Residence Hall; 3) To determine if EOP freshmen students enter Oregon State University with a lower self concept compared to regular Oregon State University freshmen; 4) To determine if EOP freshmen students' self concept changes after one quarter of college compared to regular Oregon State University freshmen students; 5) To measure the adjustment to college by EOP freshmen after one quarter of school compared to regular freshmen students.

Significance of the Study

If special programs such as the EOP and the Upward Bound Program, which are designed to assist non-traditional students in their educational pursuits, are to succeed, ways must be developed to assist these students in making a faster and more successful transition to the college environment during the freshman year of college.

According to Robert D. Brown, in the Student Personnel Series No. 16, American College Personnel Association monograph, 1972, the major focus of many recent and important reports on higher

education has been on numbers, years, degrees, access, options, organizations, and finances. With the exception of one report, little direct attention has been given to the impact that the suggested changes in higher education will have on the student and the student development.

It is further stated by Brown that even though student characteristics when students enter college have a significant impact on how students are affected by their college experience, the freshman year represents a critical stage in the students' developmental process and this is where significant developmental changes occur.

Studies in the area of student development tend to support the idea that the environment and factors within the environment have the most affect on student development and the academic life has little, if any, affect on development. Adams (1970) developed a diagram to show what he believes to be the final characteristics of students. He stated that the final characteristics of the students at any given university or college are a combination of initial student characteristics and college characteristics interacting with the total experience of students.

The environmental factors that hold the most promise for affecting student developmental patterns include the peer group, the living unit, the faculty, and the classroom experience (Brown, 1972, p. 34).

Even though this present study is small in terms of the amount and types of research that ought to be conducted in the area of special programs and students and their development, nevertheless, the results from this study will give directors of special programs for disadvantaged students some insight into ways of developing better models for enhancing the developmental patterns of their students.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to male and female entering freshmen students at Oregon State University fall quarter, 1977. These students were residing in a residence hall, had never attended college before, and had graduated from high school within the previous year. Participation in this study was on a voluntary basis. All students, EOP and non-EOP were given a choice to participate and chose to do so. Subjects' voluntary participation may have an influence on the results.

The extent to which the instruments used accurately measured what they were supposed to measure may have had a limiting influence on this study, i. e., self concept and college adjustment. The Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) was used to determine the kind of self image and perception that the individuals involved in the study had of themselves. The Adjective Check List (ACL) was used as an indication of how the subjects viewed themselves in relation to the

college environment.

Finally, the possibility always existed that some variables not controlled could have affected the results of this study.

Definition of Terms

Living-Learning Residence Hall refers to a coeducational residence hall with a small instructional program for students living in that residence hall. Also, this residence hall program included a peer counseling and tutorial program.

College Adjustment refers to the ability to develop coping behaviors in order to function adequately in the academic community.

Control Group (CI) is defined as EOP freshmen students who were not participants in the Living-Learning Residence Hall.

Control Group (CII) refers to other regular university freshmen, i. e., students that enter the university through the regular admission process.

Disadvantaged is a term used in current literature and refers to individuals who are educationally and/or economically deprived.

EOP Students are students who enter the university through the EOP and/or students who are admitted to the EOP after being admitted to the university through normal channels. The following groups further define EOP students:

- a) Black Americans, Native Americans, Mexican Americans,

financially disadvantaged White Americans, or culturally different students.

- b) Students recommended or referred by the OSU Upward Bound or Special Services programs, BOOST or other Talent Search programs, or any other community service agency.
- c) Students with special academic or personal circumstances, for example: those whose education has been interrupted for several years, single parents, older persons, physically handicapped, etc.
- d) A student who, upon the recommendation of the EOP, receives funds through the Financial Aid Office of OSU; is admitted to OSU without having met the admission requirements of OSU; or receives an Out-of-State fee waiver; or uses any of the support services of the EOP. These services may include the following: tutorial services, academic advising, counseling and guidance or enrollment in any EOP class.

Experimental Group (E): This term applies to those EOP students who participated in the Living-Learning Residence Hall experience.

Self Concept implies an area of essentially private experience and self evaluation. It is private even though it is in part translated into action by most of the things one says and does, by the attitudes one holds, and the beliefs one expresses. The self concept may be defined as those perceptions, beliefs, feelings, attitudes, and values

which the individual views as describing himself. The terms self-image, self-perception, self-esteem, and self-report are used in this study as being synonymous with self concept. Although it is recognized that no instrument can actually measure self concept, the instruments in this study were used to measure what individuals reported to be their self concepts. In other words, the instruments measured self report.

Transitional Barrier refers to the amount of time it takes for decreasing, eliminating or coping with the feeling of alienation and for enhancing the self concept and achievement in college among disadvantaged students.

Non-Traditional Students refers to those individuals who have been excluded from obtaining a higher education in the past because they were academically and/or financially disadvantaged.

Research Hypotheses

The following are research hypotheses formulated:

1. There will be no significant difference in self concept at the beginning of the fall term between groups E, CI, and CII as measured by comparing mean scores on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS).
2. There will be no significant difference in change in self concept after one quarter of college between groups E, CI, and CII as

measured by comparing pre and post test mean scores on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale.

3. There will be no significant difference in college adjustment at the beginning of the fall term for groups E, CI, and CII as measured by comparing mean scores on the Adjective Check List (ACL).
4. There will be no significant change in college adjustment for groups E, CI, and CII after one quarter of college as measured by comparing pre and post test mean scores for the Adjective Check List.
5. There will be no significant difference in change in self concept after one quarter of college between group E and group CI as measured by comparing pre and post test mean scores on the Tennessee Self Concept.
6. There will be no significant change in college adjustment between group E and group CI after one quarter of college as measured by comparing pre and post test mean scores for the Adjective Check List.
7. There will be no significant correlation between change scores on the TSCS and the ACL.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter is divided into four sections. Section One deals with the general theory of self concept and its relationship to behavior and adjustment. Section Two examines the effects of culture and economic status on self concept. Section Three views information concerning the success or lack of success associated with programs which perform functions similar to those functions performed by the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) and Upward Bound. Section Four concerns itself with the effectiveness of college residence hall experiences in enhancing the developmental process of students.

Self Concept Theories and Behavior

That which we call the self comes into being as the child, with all that is inherent in his make-up, comes to grips with the experiences of life. The self, as it finally evolves, is made up of all that goes into a person's experiences of his individual existence. It is a person's inner world. It is a composite of a person's thoughts and feelings, strivings and hopes, fears and fantasies, his view of what he is, what he has been, what he might become, and his attitudes pertaining to his worth (Jersild, 1960, p. 196).

Although theories of self concept development vary considerably, there is some general agreement among theorists on two points: (1) That the self concept does not exist before birth; and (2) that the self

concept is formed by the interactions of an individual with other significant human beings.

George Mead (1934) states that the self is an entity which has a development. It is not initially there at birth, but arises in the awareness of social experience and activity. Mead's self is an object of awareness. It is developed in the following manner: First, there is no self because a person cannot enter his or her own experience directly. The individual can and does experience other people as objects, but he or she does not initially regard himself or herself as an object. However, other people react to the individual as an object, and these reactions are experienced by the person against whom they are directed. As a consequence of these experiences, the child learns to think of himself or herself as an object and to have attitudes and feelings about himself or herself. One responds to himself or herself as others respond to him or her. Mead sees his self as a socially formed self. But his self can only arise in a social setting where there is social communication. "He becomes a self insofar as he can take the attitude of another and act toward himself as others act" (1934, p. 171).

According to Symonds, P. M. (1951), the self as a percept is not present at birth but begins to develop gradually as perceptive powers develop.... The self develops as we feel ourselves separate and distinct from others, but the first differentiations are dim and hazy. It is probably true that one learns to recognize and distinguish the self.... As the recognition of the familiar face takes shape, vague

notions of the self simultaneously develop. As the mother begins to take shape as a separate person the baby forms vague notions of himself as a separate individual (p. 62).

Symonds believes the concept of the self comes only after the child is able to recognize and conceptualize others. Our concept of ourselves is developed basically from the reactions and attitudes expressed toward us by others. As a child is labeled, either positively or negatively by others, he or she tends to live up to this concept that others help him or her to form of himself or herself.

Combs and Snygg feel the major development of the phenomenal self or the subjective self begins with the birth of the child into the world of which he or she is going to become a part. As the child grows and explores himself or herself, he or she discovers what he or she is. Some of the child's perceptions are gained through the explorations of self. Other concepts, especially those which have to do with values, are acquired from interactions with people about the child. The child discovers not only what he or she is, but also what he or she is not and attaches values to these discriminations. The child learns about himself or herself not just from his or her own explorations, but through the mirror of himself or herself represented by the actions of those about him or her.

Combs and Snygg further state that essentially the self is a social product arising out of experience with people. Even though some of the individual's experience of self may be achieved in

isolation from other people, by far the greater portion of the individual's self arises out of his or her relationships with others. Human personality is primarily a product of social interaction. And individuals learn the most important and fundamental facts about themselves from inferences about them made as a consequence of the way they perceive others behaving toward them. The individual learns who he or she is and what he or she is from the way he or she is treated by those who surround him or her; in the child's earliest years by his or her family, and later by those people with whom he or she comes in contact.

Sullivan's theory of self concept is based on his concept "reflected appraisals." The "self-system" originates in interpersonal relationships and is influenced by "reflected appraisals." If a child is accepted, approved, respected, and liked for what he or she is by significant others the child will develop an attitude of self acceptance and respect for himself or herself. If the significant people in his or her life reject him or her, the child's attitudes toward himself or herself will become unfavorable. As the child is judged by significant others, he or she will tend to judge himself or herself. Further, according to Jersild (1960), the attitudes which the child has of himself or herself, in turn will influence the attitudes he or she has toward other individuals. "He judges himself as he has been judged and then, in turn, judges others as he judges himself" (Jersild,

1960, p. 122).

Cooley's theory of self concept is based on the idea that the individual imagines a perception of himself or herself in the mind of another and is affected by it. Cooley's self idea has three principal elements: (1) the imagination of our appearance to the other person, (2) the imagination of his or her judgment of that appearance, and (3) some sort of self feeling, such as pride or mortification (Cooley, 1902, p. 152).

John Kinch (1963) attempts to summarize the basic principles of theories relating to self-concept and to develop his formalized theory of the self-concept. Kinch states:

The general theory--In very general terms, the basic notions of the theory can be stated in one sentence: The individual's conception of himself emerges from social interaction and, in turn, guides or influences the behavior of that individual (p. 481).

Kinch believes the following postulates have been used in most theories of self concept and he will use them as his basic postulates in his formalized theory.

1. The individual's self concept is based on his or her perception of the way others are responding to him or her.
2. The individual's self concept functions to direct his or her behavior.
3. The individual's perception of the responses of others toward him or her reflects the actual responses of others toward him

or her. The implication is that individuals can perceive how others are reacting to them.

His theory can be summarized in the following statement:

The actual responses of others to the individual will be important in determining how the individual will perceive himself; this perception will influence his self-conception which, in turn, will guide his behavior (p. 482).

Kinch seems to be one of many theorists to emphasize the idea that the self concept will have direct influence on behavior. Another theorist that relates the importance of self concept to determining behavior is Carl Rogers. Rogers believes that psychological adjustment is based on the individual perceiving and accepting into one consistent and integrated system all his or her sensory and visceral experiences. Rogers (1951) states:

Psychological adjustment exists when the concept of self is such that all the sensory and visceral experiences of the organism are or may be simulated on a symbolic level into consistent relationship with the concept of self (p. 513).

At this point in Section One of this chapter, it is felt that the relationship between self concept and behavior and adjustment should be emphasized.

Combs and Snygg (1959) see the goal of all behavior as the achievement of personal adequacy, which is to be highly successful in the achievement of effective maintenance and enhancement of self. The adequate personalities see themselves in positive ways, and,

therefore, are free and open to their experiences, able to accept both themselves and others, and to identify strongly with their fellow human beings.

In summary, the implication from research related to self concept theories and their relationship to behavior and adjustment is that the self concept is an entity that is not inherited, but is developed after birth through interaction with significant others which in turn influences one's behavior and adjustment.

Culture and Economic Status on Self Concept

Many researchers have explored culture and economic status as they relate to self concept and at this point there seems to be little consensus on what effect culture and economic status have on self concept. Some researchers such as Deutsch (1967), Witty (1967), Havighurst and Moorefield (1967), Ziller (1969), and Long and Henderson (1968) suggest that culture and economic status have significant influence on self concept. A number of other researchers such as Frerich (1971), Soares and Soares (1969), Coopersmith (1967), Rosenberg (1965), and Dales and Keller (1972) suggest that culture and economic status have little, if any, influence on self concept.

The individual is continually countered with two kinds of problems--maintaining inner harmony and harmony with his environment. Inner harmony is closely attuned to man's single purpose of self-consistency. Any value entering the

system which is inconsistent with the individual's valuation of himself cannot be assimilated on the other hand, if an individual is constantly devalued by others, he will come to think of himself in similar terms. This is true because he cannot hold onto a view of himself which is inconsistent with the attitudes surrounding him. Eventually, he comes to realize that the other's view is the "correct" one. Thereafter, he also views himself as unfavorable, yet, this attitude has not become consistent, and he holds onto it tenaciously. This changed self-attitude is apt to be manifested through his self-images. Therefore, once you surround an individual with certain expectations, he begins to live up to those same expectations (Lecky, 1945, p. 31).

According to Witty, culturally disadvantaged children seem to mirror the negative attitudes of others and reflect the discrimination in their own negative self images, while according to Havighurst and Moorefield, the segregation imposed upon disadvantaged children insulates them, at least for the early years, from acquiring the negative attitudes from those who are not disadvantaged. Younger children have not yet had to encounter the social possibilities which will determine their disadvantage. They are insulated until they begin their search for the symbols of competence, such as educational achievement, economic efficiency and adult marital role.

Handicapped by poverty and grossly unstimulating conditions, they are characterized by a denigration of one's potential as a person and as a learner, by a low aspirational level in academic area, by a need for immediate self-gratification rather than for future goals, and by a spirit of resignation (Havighurst and Moorefield, 1967; Tannenbaum, 1967, p. 32).

Erikson (1950) believes that the disadvantaged child's self concept becomes affected when the child reaches the more heterogeneous

high school. He may find it a different world; a foreign environment perhaps, from what he had experienced, and so he does not continue to derive satisfaction and some measure of success from the school. The gains of the elementary years may give way to the greater pressures of the secondary school years when the children are emerging as individuals and searching for an identity.

Aaron Lipton (1963) believes cultural heritage is important in developing self-esteem. He sees cultural heritage enabling the child to look at himself and acquire a feeling of strength and worth in terms of the people from which he came. To identify with a people's hero, with a history, with a movement, gives strength and courage to children of many backgrounds. From Lipton's point of view, almost all American Blacks are to some extent culturally deprived. Further, Lipton states that the historian, educator, and psychologist must look to his own American history so that he may reestablish the Black in his own culture, thereby aiding in the development of a self-esteem so necessary to the Black student.

In a study by Long and Henderson (1968) using a nonverbal method to investigate self and social concepts of disadvantaged Black school beginners in a rural Southern community, it was hypothesized that the social experiences of these children would be different from those of more advantaged children in the community, and that these differences would be reflected in their self-perceptions in relation

to others. It was also proposed that the self-social concepts of disadvantaged children would be related to their classroom behavior and family background. This study's experimental group consisted of 36 Black boys and 36 Black girls who were about to begin first grade in a rural southern community. All were enrolled in a Head Start Program and met the low income requirements. The control group consisted of 36 white boys and 36 white girls beginning school in the same community.

For this study, a preschool form of the Children's Self-Social Constructs Tests was developed to measure various aspects of the child's conception of himself or herself in relation to others. Classroom behavior was measured by a teacher's rating scale.

Long and Henderson found significant differences on the CSSCT between the two groups. The disadvantaged children were found to have a lower self-esteem, a less realistic self concept for color, less identification with father, and greater identification with mother and with teacher than the control group.

Although the preceding studies by various researchers are quite convincing that culture and economic status have a significant influence on self concept, other researchers have concluded that culture and economic status are not significant influences on self concept. They believe that the relationship between culture and socioeconomic status to self concept is too confounded with other

variables to show a significant relationship. These variables are the community one lives in, age, education, and significant others.

In a study by A. Frerichs (1971), it was found that Black disadvantaged children from a homeogeneous inner-city neighborhood can achieve a high degree of self-esteem if they know they are academically successful in school. The study also indicated that the academically successful disadvantaged Black children perceive themselves in a positive manner, just as do their white suburban middle-class counterparts.

Anthony T. Soares and Louise M. Soares (1969) studied the self-perceptions of culturally disadvantaged children. Their subjects were 514 students in an urban school system--229 students from a public elementary school in a disadvantaged area and 285 students from a public elementary school in an advantaged area of the same city; 244 girls and 270 boys; grades four through eight, with a minimum of 40 students from each grade. The disadvantaged children lived in low-rent tenements or subsidized housing. The ethnic composition was about two-thirds Black and Puerto Rican and one-third white. The family income was less than \$4,000 and many families received state aid or welfare funds.

In contrast, the children who were not disadvantaged were generally from a middle class neighborhood in the city and the family income was over \$7,000. The family lived in homes which they own.

The ethnic make-up was 90 percent white and ten percent minority groups.

The Soares' study was designed to answer the following questions: (1) Do disadvantaged and advantaged children have positive or negative self-perceptions? (2) Are disadvantaged children significantly different from advantaged children in their self-perceptions? (3) Are there significant differences between the self-perception scores of disadvantaged and advantaged children when they are grouped according to grade? (4) Are there significant differences between the self perception scores of disadvantaged and advantaged children when they are grouped according to sex? (5) Are there significant differences between the self perception scores of disadvantaged and advantaged children when they are grouped according to any combination of sex and grade?

Soares and Soares found in their study that, not only did the disadvantaged group indicate positive self-perceptions, but the group also had higher self-perceptions than the advantaged group. They also found there were no significant differences between the sexes. However, there were some differences within both sexes between the disadvantaged and advantaged groups. Advantaged girls tended to be higher in self perception than advantaged boys and disadvantaged boys were higher than disadvantaged girls.

It appears that both the preceding studies support Erikson's

belief that the disadvantaged child's self concept becomes affected when the child reaches the more heterogeneous high school. The gain of the elementary years may give way to the greater pressure of the secondary school years when the children are emerging as individuals and searching for an identity. Although Erikson's implication that disadvantaged children's self concept becomes affected when contact is made with advantaged children in high school is supported by some research, there also appears to be some research contradicting Erikson's belief.

In a study by Dales and Keller (1972) designed to show the developmental growth of self concept over a three year period among Black and white culturally deprived adolescent males, they defined the students as being culturally deprived by being from a lower social class family as measured by the McGuire-White Index of Social Status. The subjects met the following criteria: Enrolled in one of the 29 schools located in culturally deprived areas of north Florida; Black and white; between the ages of 13 and 17.

Dales and Keller found after a three year period the self concept scores for each year showed no clear trend for whites, but indicated higher scores in the later years of high school for Black youth. From grade nine through twelve the mean scores of Blacks were higher than whites and in the ninth and twelfth grades the scores were significantly higher than whites. The trend of Blacks

was toward higher self concept scores in the later high school grades.

Both Coopersmith (1967) and Rosenberg (1965) conducted studies to explore the relationship between social class and self-esteem. They concluded that there was no clear and definite pattern of relationships between social class and positive and negative attitudes toward the self. They further indicated that though persons from the upper and middle classes are more likely to express favorable self attitudes than persons in the lower group, the differences between groups are neither as large nor as regular as might have been expected. In addition, both studies showed that though persons in the lower class are most likely to report lower self-esteem, there are almost as many persons in this class who report high self esteem as low self esteem.

Ronald L. Nuttall (1972) examined variables expected to be associated with academic achievement. His sample consisted of 2,500 students from eight secondary schools in Bayamon Norte, Puerto Rico. Nuttall's study explored whether variables associated with academic achievement differed by sex or by socioeconomic status. He found that self concepts were higher for achievers from the low socioeconomic status students in junior high schools, and self concepts were higher for all achievers, both low and high socioeconomic status students in high school.

The research literature related to the effects of culture and economic status on self concept appears to be contradicting. The implication from the available research is that culture and economic status have some influence on self concept, but it is not the dominant influence on self concept. It appears that the most dominant influence on self concept is success or failure in past experiences.

The Effects of Educational Opportunity Programs

The purpose of this section is to review information concerning the success or lack of success associated with programs which perform functions similar to those functions performed by the Educational Opportunity Program at Oregon State University.

According to Klingelhofer and Longacre, Educational Opportunity and similar programs are relatively new to higher education. Although some individuals within colleges have always concerned themselves with the educational problems of the academically and economically disadvantaged, and few colleges had programs in operation before the upsurge, no concerted or general interest in the plight of the disadvantaged existed until the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Dr. King's assassination gave emphasis to the growing recognition of the racial problems in American society and the need to take corrective action. One positive step was the establishment of Educational Opportunity Programs at many colleges and

universities in the country.

Educational Opportunity Programs burst onto the American higher education scene in 1968, arousing controversy both in and out of higher education. Politicians deplored what they labeled the unfair or discriminatory nature of such programs, and professors predicted a catastrophic fall in academic standards with the advent of the economically disadvantaged low-achieving student (Klingelhofer and Longacre, 1972, p. 5).

Although Educational Opportunity Programs have been in existence since 1968, little research has been done to this date and this researcher couldn't find any research done after 1973 relating to the effectiveness of such programs.

The following researchers concluded after their studies that special programs were successful in terms of assisting disadvantaged students:

Paschal and Williams (1970) conducted a study to determine the effects of participation in a summer upward bound program on the self-concept and attitudes of disadvantaged adolescents. The subjects for this investigation consisted of 31 adolescents who had just completed the eleventh grade in Dade County, Miami, Florida. The 15 girls and 16 boys comprising this sample ranged in age from 16 to 18. Their mean grade point average was a "C." The gross annual incomes of the families of the subjects ranged from \$1, 100 to \$5, 500, with a mean annual income of approximately \$3, 000. Twenty-one of the subjects were Blacks (nine boys and twelve girls),

six were Caucasians (five boys and one girl), three were Cubans (one boy and two girls) and one was Bahamian (boy). These students participated in the University of Miami's Upward Bound Program which existed for six weeks during the summer of 1968 on the campus. The students took classes in communication, mathematics and science, social studies, the enrichment areas, and physical education. No tests or grades were utilized, class attendance was optional, and supplementary tutors were available. Paschal and Williams found that the program increased the motivation of the students when measured by the Maryland Self Concept Test as a Learner Scale. A significant difference was found in problem solving task orientation.

Herson (1968) studied an assessment of changes in achievement motivation among Upward Bound participants at the University of Maryland. The experimental subjects were thirty male students from low-income families, and had completed the tenth grade at two inner-city comprehensive high schools. None of the experimental subjects, prior to the project, had been in an academic or college preparatory curricula. The control group consisted of thirty non-participants drawn from the same school as the experimental group. Herson found that the experimental subjects, after the completion of the program, were motivated toward going to college.

Olsen (1972) conducted a study designed to identify the level of self-concept-of-academic ability of black and white pre-college

compensatory education students upon enrollment in, and completion of, a compensatory education program. He found that the changes in academic roles, from compensatory education students, did have a positive effect on the self-concept-of-academic ability of all black subjects. The changes in academic roles had a positive effect on the self-concept-of academic ability of white male subjects but not white female subjects. All subjects after the completion of the compensatory program had a self-concept-of-academic ability score that indicated average to above average ability.

Hunt and Hardt (1969) investigated an upward bound program designed to meet the needs of high school juniors and seniors. They found that the program significantly increased the self-esteem and internal control of all students participating in the program over a two year period.

Although the preceding studies seem to be quite impressive in terms of their effectiveness in assisting disadvantaged students, some writers and researchers would argue that these studies are not what they seem to be.

Robert Williams, in a paper to the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges stated:

Recent data indicates that probably more than 50 percent of the institutions of higher learning in this country now have special programs for such students, who are frequently described as disadvantaged or high risk. Most of these programs, however, are currently little more than token efforts (Williams, 1969, p. 274).

Fred Crossland is another researcher who would agree with Williams' assessment. His concern is whether these special programs are achieving their objectives. Crossland commented:

At this juncture, it is impossible to determine whether or not these efforts are achieving their objectives. Virtually every college and university has its own well-publicized success story, but apparently few thought it prudent to list those students who fell by the wayside. Many evaluative reports were issued, but ordinarily they were produced by the same college administrators responsible for the special minority programs. The reports may have been self-serving and more optimistic than warranted by the facts (Crossland, 1971, p. 94).

Angelo Dispenzieri and others (1971) support Crossland's belief in a study conducted on five and one half years' operation of a special college program for disadvantaged students in community colleges in New York City. The program offered supportive services of remedial courses, counseling, tutoring, and financial aid. The program has grown from 231 students in 1964 to 4,650 by September, 1970. By February 1970, 530 College Discovery Programs students had graduated from community college. Of these 530 students, 468 had entered senior college and 99 had graduated. Enough time had elapsed between 1964 and February 1974 for nearly every student in the first three entering classes to have graduated. Only one-third (35%) had graduated. The other two-thirds withdrew. Dispenzieri implied that students in programs such as College Discovery and open admission do not perform as well as students who meet traditional

college entrance requirements, but these programs are effective.

Not all studies of special programs for disadvantaged students, however, showed significant changes in the participants. Wilson (1970) investigated the effects of special tutoring and counseling on the academic success of Black freshmen enrolled at Southern State College for the fall semester, 1969-1970. He concluded that the program of special tutoring and counseling made no significant difference on the academic success of these students.

Pearson (1969) developed a study to determine the effect of an upward bound project on selected factors of students' growth in the areas of academic achievement related to communication skills, self concepts, critical thinking, study skills, school attendance, and drop outs. A battery of tests were administered on a pretest/post-test basis: The Stanford Achievement Test, the Tennessee Self-Thinking Appraisal, and the Spitzer Study Skills Test. The results of this study indicated that the Upward Bound Program at Carson-Newman College did not contribute significantly to students' growth in relationship to the purpose of the program.

Herskovity (1969) conducted a study to determine whether a group of disadvantaged Black youth, who had been identified as potential high school dropouts, would develop more positive self-perception after participation in an educational-vocational rehabilitation program. Herskovity found that the program was not long enough or powerful

enough to effect positive changes in the self-concepts of the participating students.

From the above studies it is evident that some special programs for disadvantaged students are successful in assisting these students and other programs are not so successful. The questions at this point are, what makes a program successful, is it the program that assisted the students in becoming successful, or is it the type of students in the program that makes the program successful?

Some writers and researchers, such as Klingelhofer and Longacre believe that it is a certain type of student which is successful in college. Klingelhofer and Longacre concluded after their study:

The students who mastered the environment readily seemed to have strong middle class affiliations; those who were dropped for academic reasons rejected middle class values... The persisters who finished on or ahead of schedule seemed to have a pervasive middle class orientation, and in most cases a parent, brother, sister, or other close relative who had had college experience (Klingelhofer and Longacre, 1972, p. 5 and 7).

If Klingelhofer and Longacre's belief is correct, that students with middle class orientations are the ones that are successful in college, then one must question whether educational opportunity programs are recruiting disadvantaged students.

Contrary to Klingelhofer and Longacre's belief, Bowlin (1971), Jensema and Lunneborg (1972), and Shaffer (1973) found in their

studies that a pre-enrollment program enhanced the students' chances of success.

Bowlin found that a summer orientation and counseling program for entering high risk freshmen students contributed to their overall future success at the University of Oregon. All students involved in the study came from high school with a GPA of less than 2.00.

Jensema and Lunneborg found in their preliminary examination of a special education program at the University of Washington that the special education program helped many of those in it to overcome their poor high school background. They also found that the first quarter is critical and that the initial experience decides whether a student digs in or drops out. They suggested that special programs should concentrate on pre-enrollment preparation and special help during the first quarter.

Shaffer found that satisfactory completion of a summer preparatory program by disadvantaged minority high school graduates contributed to the students' academic success the first two years of college. Of the 80 students who enrolled in college after a summer program, 35 were eligible to continue their education after four consecutive semesters. Of this 35, only 5 did not pass the courses during the summer program.

There is another group of researchers who believe that the

environment is the most significant aspect in enhancing the chances of success of disadvantaged students.

Williams (1969) believes there are several factors that are needed in order to effect change in achievement patterns of high risk students. They are:

1. Scholastic motivation
2. Adequate study skills
3. A supportive social environment

The primary objective of the universities' programs should be to create the kind of environment that would enhance the chances of success of these students.

Brown (1972) is another researcher who feels that the environment is very important in enhancing student development. He states:

Developmental changes in students are the result of the interaction of initial characteristics and the press of the environment. Changes in students do not occur in a vacuum, nor do they necessarily occur automatically or in a positive direction. The concept of readiness has some relevance for those looking at student development... Most students are very receptive at the beginning of their freshman year. Normal maturation may lead to developmental changes irrespective of the environment but not independent of it. It is important to be cognizant that not only can growth be inhibited but that some changes can be regressive. For example, the self-concept of an 18-year old can be drastically altered and his self-confidence dramatically diminished by academic failure (Brown, 1972, p. 35).

May's (1974) research findings support Brown. May's study was designed to ascertain which type of housing in the university

setting is considered a variable in the achievement of disadvantaged university students. Four types of housing were used in this study: apartments; fraternities or sororities; parents homes; and university residence halls. May concluded from his findings that high-risk students earn higher grades when not living with family or maintaining their own apartment. He also indicated that those students who lived in fraternity or sorority houses received the highest grade point average. Students living in university residence halls received a mean GPA slightly less than the Greeks.

Peterson's (1973) findings suggest that a positive self concept is a dominant factor on success in college by disadvantaged students. His study was designed to evaluate the usefulness of a variety of standardized tests for prediction of college success among students admitted to an equal opportunity program. At the beginning of the fall semester the American College Test, Vocational Preference Inventory, and Bills' Index of Adjustment and Values were administered to 54 EOP freshmen. A post-test was administered at the end of the spring semester. Peterson's findings indicated that the EOP students who were considered successful (i. e., those having a GPA of 2.0 or above and having completed a minimum of 24 units) had a higher and more positive initial self concept score than the unsuccessful EOP students. Peterson felt the most significant change in performance of the successful EOP students was that they demonstrated an increasing

positive self concept, whereas the unsuccessful students demonstrated a diminishing self concept during the year. Peterson also believed that the disadvantaged student's self concept appeared to be congruent with success or lack of success in college.

Educational Opportunity Programs and similar programs came into existence in the mid sixties. The programs were established to provide higher educational opportunities to those students who had been excluded from obtaining a higher education in the past. Administrators across this country, unfamiliar with non-traditional students' needs, hurriedly initiated small educational opportunity programs in their colleges and universities.

During the early developmental years educational opportunity programs went through various changes to better meet the needs of their clientele. Some of these students were successful in obtaining a college degree, and some were not so successful. Those students who were successful were able to successfully function in the college environment. The ones not successful were not able to function in the environment and withdrew or were dropped for academic reasons. But the old argument that not all students should be in college was used to accept these students' failure without question.

Some research findings indicate that educational opportunities program students or disadvantaged students can be successful in college if pre-college programs are utilized, if these students are

provided a supportive environment, and/or if these students have a positive self concept or the self concept is enhanced during the first year of college.

The Effectiveness of College Residence Hall Experience in Enhancing the Developmental Process of Students

The purpose of this section is to review literature relating to higher education and student development and to explore studies relating to the residence hall and its relationship to student development.

Higher Education and Student Development

In recent years, more educators and/or researchers have explored higher education and its impact on student development. Some researchers have taken a close look at theories of personality development during adolescence to see if some of their concepts could be utilized in higher education. One theory of personality development, the Organismic Theory, can be closely related to some of the changes that have taken place in higher education since the latter half of the nineteenth century. Individuals such as Freedman (1965), Sanford (1967), and Brown (1972) have utilized some of the concepts from the Organismic Theory in their research.

Freedman believes in the concept that individuals operate as

wholes. Changes in one part of the total system influence all other parts. He feels that educators cannot treat intellectual or cognitive processes as if they were fixed entities, independent of other aspects of human functioning.

After conducting research at Vassar College in 1955, Freedman concludes:

...systematic personality change occurs during the college years. Development in this period may not be thought of as simply a matter of progression along lines laid down in early adolescence or in infancy. Late adolescence, if we may bestow this label on the college years, is a period deserving of attention in its own right. It is not simply a screen through which prior and more potent forces are filtered. Late adolescence may be thought of as a developmental phase with certain regularities of problems or conflicts and certain systematic ways of meeting them (p. 29).

Sanford supports the idea that growth during adolescence usually has a progressive character. The individual remains in a stage or phase for a time; then passes on to another stage or phase. Sanford believes two basic concepts are necessary to explain the sequential changes in personality. He states:

One is the idea of readiness, the notion that certain kinds of responses can be made only after certain states or conditions have been built up in the person... The other is that change in the personality is induced largely by stimuli arising either from the person's bodily functioning or from his social and cultural environment, and that the order of events in the personality is largely determined by the order in which these stimuli are brought to bear (p. 53).

Although Sanford emphasized the concept of readiness in personality growth, he does not believe personality develops automatically according to a predetermined plan. Readiness simply means the individual is now open to growth, but until some type of stimuli arrive to upset the existing equilibrium and require new adaption, growth does not occur.

After extensive work in the area of student development in higher education, Brown summarized some of his findings by introducing five key student development concepts.

1. Student characteristics when they enter college have a significant impact on how students are affected by their college experience.
2. The collegiate years are the period for many individual students when significant developmental changes occur.
3. There are opportunities within the collegiate program for it to have a significant impact on student development.
4. The environmental factors that hold the most promise for affecting student developmental patterns include the peer group, the living unit, the faculty, and the classroom experience (pp. 33-35).

Brown further explains his key concepts by indicating that the students' psychological structure, background, and successes and failures in past experiences add up to make a pattern of predispositions that affect how much he or she will be influenced by the college environment. The first year in college represents critical stages in the developmental process. This year also represents a time of

becoming more independent, autonomous, and finding a new identity. Colleges and universities should take an active and positive role in assisting the developmental processes of students. This means colleges should assist by seeing that developmental processes occur when and how they should. Student developmental research indicates that living arrangements, roommate patterns, and peer groups are potent forces for change among students. Research also suggests that students still need and want adult influence. The interaction between the teacher style and student characteristics will have an impact on cognitive development. Some students do well in a highly structured classroom setting while others do not. The type of environment and individual readiness are important concepts in student development. Changes in students do not occur automatically or always in a positive direction. Individual growth can be inhibited and some changes can be regressive.

Other researchers, such as Chickering and Astin have conducted extensive research relating to the impact of college on student development. Chickering's (1974) research examined the impact of higher education on resident and commuting students. He found that student characteristics are different for commuters and residents, i. e., socioeconomic background, parental background, and high school achievements and experiences. Although the college environment is an important factor influencing student change, students' initial

characteristics will determine how they are impacted by the college experience. Chickering's findings suggest that there are substantial differences in the college experiences and activities of commuters and residents. He states that:

in every area commuters are less involved than their resident peers. These differences begin in the freshman year and pervade the general college experience during the entire college period. The residents, who as entering freshmen bring wider ranging experiences and achievements and records of more effective academic performance, continue to exceed commuters in their level of participation. The freshmen who commute bring less competence, less experience, and a narrower range of achievements, and continue to operate in a more limited framework than the residents, missing the diverse possibilities that fuller and wider ranging participation offers (p. 63).

According to Chickering, commuters at entrance are less prepared compared to residents to enter various beneficial educational and developmental activities and experiences. Chickering found that students who live in college dormitories learn more and exceeded commuters in personal development. Students who live at home participate less in academic activities, in extracurricular activities, and in social activities with other students compared to students who live in college dormitories. Chickering also concluded "that commuters and residents begin their college careers with an unequal start which strongly favors the residents." "The gap between them grows." "Residents have access to, find, and are forced to encounter diverse experiences and persons who spur them on their

way" (p. 85).

Astin's (1977) findings support Chickering. He indicated that students change in many ways after entering college and these changes are affected by student's characteristics when entering college, the type of college attended, and the extent of the student's involvement in the college environment. Astin's findings appear to indicate that student change during the college years is inevitable, but whether the change is positive or negative, and the amount of change depend on many factors. However, one factor that had more impact on student change than any other was living in the dormitory. Astin found that positive changes facilitated by the college experience are enhanced by the residential experience. Living in a dormitory had positive effect on aspiration and substantial impact on persistence. He also found that students are much more likely to be satisfied with all aspects of their undergraduate experience if they live in a dormitory.

It appears that Freedman, Sanford, and Brown reached some similar conclusions: many individuals are in a late adolescent period of development during the first year of college; this period is very critical in relationship to continued positive growth and it is the time when significant developmental changes occur; the environmental factors or stimuli interact with students' characteristics to induce change; and college should organize their resources in an effort to

assist individuals in developing when and how they should.

Contrary to Freedman, Sanford and Brown's conclusions, Astin and Chickering's findings suggest that students' initial characteristics when entering college will influence the impact of the college experience. Other factors such as type of college attended and the extent of involvement in the college environment will influence student change. Also student characteristics are different for commuters and residents. The difference in characteristics gives the advantage to the resident student which continues throughout the college career.

Residence Halls Experiences and Student Development

The impact of residence halls experiences on student development is an area in higher education that has experienced increased attention in recent years. Many research findings suggest that the residence halls experiences are significant factors influencing student change during the college career. This section will review studies conducted in four areas: special assignment programs; roommate relationships; coeducational living; and living-learning programs.

DeCoster (1966) conducted a study to determine the affects of assigning high-ability male and female students to residence halls in a homogeneous fashion as opposed to a random procedure. The

students were divided into two groups: one group was assigned to specific living units, while the other group was randomly assigned to other living units on campus. Those high-ability students living in close proximity with other high-ability students seem to have better academic success.

DeCoster (1968) completed a follow-up study to the one in 1966. He concluded, high-ability students both male and female performed better academically when assigned homogeneously, but females seem to do better than males. Also, these students felt their living units were conducive to study, more often felt that informal discussions were educational, and felt their living accommodations were more desirable. DeCoster's findings seem to indicate that enlightened assignment procedures can have an impact on the learning process.

Taylor and Hanson's (1971) research findings appear to support DeCoster's studies. They conducted a study using freshman engineering students to examine the effects of homogeneous housing and tutoring in a residence hall. They found that cumulative achievement was significantly better for engineering students living in a homogeneous residence hall situation when compared with randomly assigned and nonresidence hall engineering freshmen. Taylor and Hanson also felt that their results suggested that the influence of peers with common interest and common courses had a strong and positive effect on achievement.

Brown's (1968) study also tends to support DeCoster's studies. He designed a study to ascertain the effects of having college residence hall floors numerically dominated by students with similar academic majors and the effects of a program of intellectual discussions held on the residence hall floors. The students were freshmen and they were assigned rooms so that the ratio of science students to humanities students was four to one on two floors and the ratio of humanities students to science students was also four to one on two floors. On two floors a series of intellectual discussions were held. Measures used included Thinking Introversion and Theoretical Orientation, of the Omnibus Personality Inventory, and questionnaire data on activities, academic-vocational goals and satisfaction. Brown found that the dominance of one vocational group had a significant effect on feelings about college major, satisfaction with college, and social interaction. The intellectual discussion programs had a significant impact on the intellectual attitudes and activities of both dominant groups.

Although Siegel and Siegel's study did not relate to homogeneous assignment situations, it does appear to support the idea of peer influence on attitude. Siegel and Siegel (1957) conducted a study to examine the attitude changes which occur over time when reference groups and membership groups are identical and when they are different. The subjects lived in the same residence hall the first year. At the end of the first year they all moved to different halls. They were

divided into three groups: (1) those who wanted to move to a sorority house and were able to; (2) those who wanted to move to a sorority house, but were unable to; and (3) those who did not want to move to a sorority house and did not. Siegel and Siegel found that attitudes of all three groups changed, but the greatest attitude change occurred in those who experienced an imposed group residence hall assignment.

Other studies relating to living unit assignments have explored academic classification. Beal and Williams (1968), Chesin (1969), and Schoemer and McConnell (1970) conducted studies to ascertain the effects of assigning freshmen to residence halls which contained freshmen only and to halls containing upper class students.

Beal and Williams' (1968) study housed one group of freshmen, both male and female with other freshmen. Another group of freshmen males and females were housed with upper class students. They found no difference between the two groups in terms of grades. However, the group of freshmen housed with upper class students were more satisfied with the college experience.

Chesin's (1969) study supports Beal and Williams' findings. His study assigned one group of freshmen, the experimental group, to units that were occupied predominantly by upper classmen. One control group of freshmen were assigned to units which were mixed with freshmen and upper classmen. The students were given pre and post tests to determine their change in attitudes and beliefs.

Chesin found that those freshmen who had contact with upper class students were mature and less stereotypic in attitudes and beliefs after their first year of college.

The findings in Schoemer and McConnell's (1970) study tend to support the belief that freshmen contact with upper classmen will influence academic achievement. However, their findings appear to disagree with the idea that freshmen contact with upper class students would influence attitudes relating to the college environment. Schoemer and McConnell assigned freshman women to an all-freshman women's hall, to coed halls, and to all-undergraduate halls. They measured academic achievement, conduct, and perception of the college environment. The results were that the women in the all-undergraduate residence halls achieved more academically than the freshmen in the other two residence halls. There were no significant differences among the three groups in the conduct variable. All three living arrangements did not indicate to have a differential effect on the students' perceptions of the college environment.

Research findings relating to special assignment programs appear to indicate that homogeneous grouping of all students, freshmen and upper class students has a positive effect on academic success. However, when homogeneous grouping is not done, freshmen students who are grouped with or have contact with upper class students do better academically. Research findings also suggest

that the dominant group in a living situation has an influence on the attitude and perceptions of the college environment of the dominated group.

Roommate relationships is an area where extensive research has been conducted. Broxton (1962) conducted a study to explore the interpersonal attraction factors involved in roommate satisfaction. The sample was female freshmen at the University of Kentucky. They were taken from three residence halls and were divided into an experimental and a control group. Students were randomly assigned roommates. The experimental group was students who voluntarily changed roommates at the middle of the academic year, and the control group consisted of those students who remained with their roommate throughout the year. All students were administered a test specifically designed for this study, the Personal Schedule Inventory. To analyze the inventory, a comparison was made of responses from a group of satisfied roommates to a group of dissatisfied roommates. Broxton found that satisfied roommates were significantly more similar than dissatisfied roommates on certain moral factors, i. e., attitudes on drinking, smoking, and church attendance; on studying and sleeping habits, i. e., number of study hours per day, studying with radio or record player, and sleeping with windows open; on father's education and salary; and on the size of high school graduating class.

A study by Gehring (1970) did not support Broxton's findings. Gehring tested the results from Broxton's (1962) study. He used Broxton's findings, five variables to test the difference in compatibility between students assigned as roommates at random and students assigned experimentally, on the basis of five variables. After a six week period students were permitted to change rooms and all students who requested changes were interviewed individually. The criteria for compatibility were: (1) not changing roommates, (2) not requesting new roommates, and (3) indicating during the interview that he or she was compatible with his or her roommate. The findings of this study indicate that a significant difference did not exist between pairs matched on the five variables and those assigned at random.

Elton and Bate (1966) conducted a study to ascertain if freshman roommates enrolled in similar academic programs achieved better academically compared to freshman roommates enrolled in different academic programs. Also, if students' grade point average is an effective predictor of their roommates' grade point average. The dependent variables were seven personality factors, an aptitude score, high school grade point average, and the first semester college grade point averages of roommates. The results indicated that similar educational majors do not influence first semester achievement among roommates. It also appears that first semester college grade

point average of a student is a poor predictor of the first semester college grade point average of his or her roommate.

In a study by Crew and Giblette (1965) roommates influenced academic performance among roommates. Crew and Giblette's study compared the academic performance of freshman male roommates in required courses compared to the general freshman population. American College Test (ACT) scores for English and math, predicted grades, and earned grades were used as variables. The population consisted of two groups: (1) one group of male freshmen who entered the University of Maryland in September 1962 and, (2) pairs of freshmen randomly assigned as roommates by the Housing Office in the residence halls. Crew and Giblette concluded that roommates earned higher grades in the required courses than grades predicted by the ACT scores for the general freshman population for the same courses. They also concluded that proximity, not size of peer-group influenced academic performance among roommates.

Pace (1970) attempted to measure residence hall roommate dissatisfaction and relate it to scholastic achievement, psychological perception of the college environment, freshman-nonfreshman, and male-female differences. Residents of Harrison Hall at Colorado State College, Greeley were subjects for this study. Instruments and measurements used in this study were the Roommate Checklist, grade point average, the College and University Environment Scales,

number of completed academic units, and the sex of the student. The results of the study gave evidence that highly dissatisfied roommate pairs had significantly lower academic achievement than the roommate pairs with little roommate dissatisfaction. The freshman roommates with little dissatisfaction had a higher mean grade point average than freshman roommates with a high degree of dissatisfaction. Perception of the college environment differed significantly from those roommates with a low degree of dissatisfaction. Also, female roommate pairs tended to be more dissatisfied than male roommate pairs.

Volkwein (1966) studied roommate compatibility between pairing students and randomly assigning roommates. New freshmen were divided into two groups. One group consisted of roommates matched on the basis of age, size of high school, and proposed major. The second group of roommates were matched randomly. The two groups of roommates were evenly distributed on each floor and in each residence hall. Incompatibility was measured by requested changes during the first semester. Volkwein concluded that there were no significant differences in requested roommate change between pairs matched randomly and pairs matched on the three variables.

A study by Lozier appears to support Volkwein's findings. Lozier (1970) attempted to find if more satisfying roommate pairings could be made and fewer roommate changes if roommates were

were paired according to educational goals and extracurricular plans. A sample of freshman students were paired as roommates according to educational-vocational goals and extracurricular plans as listed on the American College Test Profile Reports. A third samples, half the size of the first sample, was paired randomly according to alphabetical listing. Six months after this began a questionnaire was administered to the sample to determine whether or not roommates in the three groups were compatible, and to study how their reasons for compatibility compared to the variables by which the first two groups were matched. The results indicate that matching roommates according to educational-vocational goals and extracurricular plans compared to randomly matching did not create significantly fewer roommate changes or significantly more compatible roommates.

The results from the preceding studies appear to indicate that it is very difficult to identify and control those variables that make roommates compatible. However, compatible roommates have an influence on each others academic achievement and perception of the college environment.

Although many colleges and universities have explored coeducational living in residence halls in recent years, relatively little research has been conducted to ascertain the impact of coeducational living compared to other living situations. The following papers and research findings appear to be in agreement regarding the impact

of coeducational living situations on student development.

Allen, Collins, Gee, and Nudd (1964) developed a paper relating to three aspects of coeducational living: (1) students; (2) staffing and special factors; and (3) food service. They used the concept, communities of men and women residents, as their definition of coeducational residence halls. They believed:

Residence halls as coeducational communities are men and women students living in a specific physical environment within a university or college campus, working and learning together in the changing process of human relationships and interrelationships (pp. 82-83).

They felt that the coeducational living situation was a healthy and a natural living situation for students. Students of both sexes needed to work together outside of the classroom. Although organizations and campus clubs provided students with the opportunity to work together, they did not always require the types of decisions and problem solving the residence halls required. In the coeducational residence hall the planning of cultural, educational, and social programs to meet the needs of a variety of students and the needs of both sexes provided the opportunity for students to be imaginative and creative. Allen, Collins, Gee and Nudd expressed the belief that a coeducational living situation could provide a more natural climate of association and contact similar to that through which the resident progresses before college age and continues after leaving the campus.

Thorsen (1970) presented findings on a survey of students, faculty, parents, and administrators' reactions toward coeducational living at Oberlin College. She concluded that coeducational living appeared to encourage a more easy give-and-take in casual meetings, an increase in community activities, and a sharing of studies that had not caused grades to drop from their usual level. She also felt that many of the students chose to live in coeducational dorms because of less social pressures. Before coeducational dorms, pressures used to build up toward the weekend date, under which males and females tended to regard each other as rare sexual objects. In coeducational dorms students felt they developed more platonic relationships. They were more like brothers and sisters. Therefore, there is not as much explicit sexual activity in coeducational dorms as in more protective systems. Problems in the coeducational dorms are of a different type: not enough privacy; not enough freedom for males to be sloppy or females to be in pin-curlers outside of their rooms; and too much pressure to develop platonic relationships.

According to Thorsen, many parents of students attending Oberlin did not think their children could handle so much instant freedom. However, one staff psychologist at Oberlin felt that many students needed coeducational living. She believed:

Oberlin students tend to be brighter than normal-but also lonelier. They're an introspective lot, always questioning their own values and those of people around them...

Because their parents usually have money, they've always had leisure time, and they spend it within themselves. Life at home for most of the students has been an intellectual experience, without much loving or open emotions. Their parents have pressured them constantly to achieve, to be something, to do something... These young people come here wanting desperately to generate warm human feelings, but no one has ever shown them how (p. 38).

Corbett and Sommer's (1972) findings support Thorsen's conclusion that coeducational dorms meet the needs of many students. However, their findings do not appear to share the opinion that brighter, lonelier, and/or students who have not experienced much love or open emotions at home choose to live in coeducational dorms. Corbett and Sommer conducted a study at the University of California, Davis campus to ascertain how the introduction of coeducational living affected social relationships within the dormitory. They administered a questionnaire to all occupants of Ryerson Hall. Prior to their study the same questionnaire was administered to males and females living in separate dormitories. Ryerson Hall consisted of one coeducational floor, two all female floors, and one all male floor. Corbett and Sommer found that the coeducational floor students seemed generally pleased with their living arrangement. Students living on the coeducational floor, compared to floors of all one sex, rated their floor higher in terms of friendly atmosphere. It appeared that the coeducational floor seemed to function as one large, friendly community with less small group formation and more interaction as

a whole than did the other floors. Corbett and Sommer believed that students' needs varied, and the coeducational floor did not meet the needs of all students. They also felt that their findings were in accord with the findings of Greenleaf (1962) that the coeducational floor students appeared to be a more mature group. The fact was that living together on a day-to-day basis would tend to eliminate fantasy and intrigue, promoting a realistic relationship between the sexes.

Brown, Winkworth and Braskamp's (1973) findings support the idea that students living in coeducational situations tend to be more mature. They conducted a study to examine the impact of a coeducational residence hall at the University of Nebraska on student life. The coeducational hall consisted of nine floors with every other floor assigned to either males or females. In order to collect data, students were administered questionnaires, interviewed individually and in groups, and observed. Seventy-five percent of all students were contacted. The same data collecting procedure was used to assess the nature of student life in non-coeducational residence halls. Brown, Winkworth, and Braskamp concluded that males living in coeducational halls had less of a need to prove their masculinity and had less of a need to participate in predominantly male activities. Females tended to explore new activities on campus compared to non-coeducation hall females. One of the major differences

between the coeducational and non-coeducational hall students was the casual relationships among males and females in coeducational halls. Formal dating was less frequent and students felt comfortable in mixed-sex groups during recreational activities. In coeducational halls males became more aware of their language and manners, while females thought more about marriage and their sex roles. Coeducational halls produced more mixed-sex studying and students were more likely to study within the hall. Coeducational halls also increased the morale of students. Students in coeducational halls appeared to be excited about being involved in something new and that developed a sense of community.

White and White (1973) conducted a study to determine if male and female residents of the coeducational living arrangement developed heterosexual platonic relationships with a greater degree of frequency than residents of unisexual halls. The subjects of this study were fifty residents, half males and half females, randomly selected from the residence halls on the East Texas State University campus. The students were administered a sociogram with instructions to list, in order of closeness to them, five close friends of either sex. They were also instructed to omit relatives or persons with whom they were having a sexual relationship. White and White concluded that the results from their study indicated that residents of a coeducational living arrangement are more likely to develop a

greater number of heterosexual platonic relationships than residents of a unisexual hall. They also believe that the development of platonic relationships could be used as an indicator of initial progress in a coeducational system.

Lynch (1971) and Donohue's (1973) findings support the idea that coeducational residence halls have an impact on students attitudes, perception, and behavior. Lynch surveyed 272 students at the University of Maryland to ascertain how they felt about their living arrangement. The students were randomly selected from ten coeducational and non-coeducational resident halls. Lynch concluded that students in coeducational halls felt their halls encouraged good study habits, cultural programming, creativity, and intellectual discussions and achievement. It appears that coeducational hall residents have greater affinity for, and more interaction within, their living units.

Donohue's (1973) study investigated and described the perceptions students have of their environments before and after the transition from a uni-sexual to coeducational living situation. The College and University Environment Scale was administered to 100 randomly selected males and to 100 randomly selected females living in unisexual residence halls. These same uni-sexual halls were converted to coeducational halls the following year. After a year of coeducational living the population was given a post-test. Subjects were

randomly selected and only those students living in the uni-sexual halls prior to conversion to coeducational halls were selected.

Donohue concluded that his findings indicate that students developed more positive perceptions toward university life after moving to a coeducational environment (alternate floors). Donohue also indicated that the grade point average of the coeducational hall was higher than it was for uni-sexual halls.

Many studies relating to the impact of coeducational halls on development appear to indicate that students' further development is enhanced by these halls. However, Schroeder and LeMay's (1973) research findings indicate that students who chose coeducational halls show a difference on selected scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) compared to students who chose single-sex halls. Their study was designed to ascertain if there were differences on selected scales of the POI between students who chose coeducational halls and those who chose the traditional single-sex residence halls. The study also attempted to determine if living in coeducational units had an impact on further development of self-actualization. Subjects for this study consisted of entering freshmen born in the United States and nineteen years old or younger. All subjects were administered the POI during New Student Week and again during spring term. Schroeder and LeMay concluded that the results indicated that students who chose coeducational residence halls are more mature,

exhibit greater flexibility in their application of values, and possess a greater ability to develop meaningful, interpersonal relationships.

Another study that examined the kinds of students who choose coeducational housing and students who choose unisex housing was conducted by Toupin and Luria (1975). They found at Tufts University that Black freshmen females chose unisex dormitories compared to coeducational dormitories more than 2 to 1 (71% to 29%), while white males, Black males and white females chose coeducational dormitories over unisex dormitories. The respective percentages were: white males 69% to 31%; Black males 69% to 31%, and white females 63% to 37%. Toupin and Luria's study explored the reasons for the difference in choice of dormitory. Their findings led them to conclude that many white students choose coeducational dormitories because they are perceived as being more natural for interaction between the sexes. They advocate a spiritual commune and inhabitants are looked upon as extended family members. There is an emphasis on group relationships and students are expected to be part of a group of asexual comrades. However, Blacks, both male and female, who chose unisex dormitories do so because unisex dormitories present a more conventional, formal relationship between the sexes. There is also a preference by students in unisex dormitories for individual rather than group action when dating is concerned. There is a general uncomfortable feeling about close living arrangements with

members of the opposite sex and the pressures that might arise. Distance between the sexes is perceived as lessening the likelihood of sexual encounters. Black parents support unisex dormitories because they feel the dormitory provides a feminine environment where they can work out shared and special identity problems with support from other Black women.

Related research findings in the area of coeducational living appear to indicate that these living situations encouraged more platonic relationships between the sexes. They decreased the social pressures toward dating and created an atmosphere of living in a friendly community. Coeducational living situations appear to have an impact on the development of students and meet the needs of many students, but not all students. Those students who chose coeducational dormitories were seen as being more mature, exhibiting a greater flexibility in their application of values, and possessing a greater ability to develop meaningful, interpersonal relationships. However, those students who did not choose coeducational dormitories felt that these living situations did not afford them the privacy they needed. Black students, especially females, felt the coeducational dormitories did not provide the type of environment to work out identity problems with the support from other Blacks.

Living-learning residence halls provide students with an opportunity to take full advantage of the residence environment without divorcing themselves from the academic

programs and departments of the university... The combination of living and learning facilities within the same physical area undoubtedly helps to strengthen student-to-student relationships on an intellectual basis as well as in the areas traditionally credited to conventional residence halls. The injection of teachers and classrooms as major elements of daily living, together with the motivating force of student groups engaged in a common enterprise, generate a remarkable new enthusiasm for learning. Student interaction in academic concerns is greatly enhanced and learning becomes a continuous process (Adams, 1974, p. 89).

Many colleges and universities have been experimenting with the living-learning concept in recent years. Some schools have developed elaborate living-learning residence halls, such as the Justin Morrill College at Michigan State University, while other schools have offered classes taught in the residence halls. Some schools have even tried cluster grouping with courses. Although the living-learning concept may take on different forms or designs at various colleges and universities, there appears to be a common purpose for the existence of the situations.

Papers and studies relating to the living-learning experience such as: Olson; Blanton, Peck and Greer; Leyden; Wills; Ebbers and Stoner; and Brown have indicated that students benefit from and faculty members enjoy these types of experiences. Olson's (1964) study viewed the living-learning units from the faculty perspective. Twenty-five instructors were selected for the Case-Wilson program at Michigan State University. These instructors had office

space in the residence halls and served as academic advisers to students living in the halls. They also taught seventy-five sections of four courses. At the end of one term each of the instructors was interviewed to determine his or her reactions toward the living-learning situation. Olson found that a majority of the instructors believed that holding classes and locating offices in the coeducational residence halls had an educational value. Almost half of the instructors believed there was more discussion in residence-hall classes than in main-campus classes. More than one-fourth of the instructors felt that class discussion was of more value in residence-hall classes. Over one-third of the faculty indicated that students in the residence hall classes visited their instructors and advisers more frequently. The instructors found that there was more out-of-class discussion of courses among students and they appeared to be happier in the living-learning units. Most faculty members appeared to be enthusiastic about the coeducational living-learning units and 80 percent made favorable or highly favorable comments about the units.

Blanton, Peck, and Greer (1964) studied the affects of a living-learning residence hall experience on academic achievement. Kinsolving and Littlefield Residence Halls at the University of Texas were used for this study. An honors program was introduced into Kinsolving Hall. The program was designed to foster intellectual stimulation, encourage academic excellence and membership in

scholastic honoraries, and promote opportunities for faculty-student contact. At the end of two years a comparison was made of the academic performance of freshman women living in the two halls. Blanton, Peck and Greer found a significant difference in the academic performance of students in the two residence halls. Under the honors program 13 percent of the freshman women living in Kinsolving made the Dean's honor roll. Ten percent of the freshman women living in Littlefield were named to the Dean's list during this time period. Before the honor program Kinsolving had 7 percent of its students on the Dean's honor roll. The researchers of this study concluded that a university women's residence hall can be a living-learning residence hall and that an honors program within the residence hall can help students achieve academic excellence.

Ebbers and Stoner (1972) developed a living-learning residence hall situation within a larger dormitory to ascertain if the program fostered individual growth and development within the university community. Subjects were randomly selected by using freshman housing contract applications filed with the Department of Residence at Iowa State University. The subjects were administered a battery of tests, i. e., Strong Vocational Interest Blank, Adjective Check List, Allport-Vernon-Lindsay, and the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire. They were also encouraged to have two interviews to discuss their personal, social and intellectual involvement in the

University community. The subjects took a one hour academic credit seminar offered each quarter in the residence hall. The subjects also decided upon the type of governmental structure in the house, the type of experience they desired, and the direction of the program. Ebbers and Stoner found that students in their study maintained a combined grade point average of 2.88. This grade point average was well above the all men's and men's organized living units averages. The students also developed close interpersonal relationships with each other. The researchers concluded that this study, the Lorch House Project, provided insights into meeting the needs of students.

Brown's (1972) study explored the intellectual and personal growth of students at the University of Nebraska. Subjects for this study were freshmen and upperclassmen of both sexes. They were housed in an older remodeled residence unit which had classrooms, lounges, faculty offices, and recreation facilities. The students took most of their courses within the residence unit. They were also expected to take an active role in the decision-making process of the affairs of the unit. After one year students in the living-learning residence unit were compared with students in conventional units using personal interviews, observations, questionnaires, and self-reports. Brown concluded that the living-learning unit developed a strong sense of community, a good student-faculty relationship, and

an informal male-female relationship. The students in the living-learning unit were much more satisfied with their first year of college than were those students in the regular university.

Centra, Larsen and Montgomery, and Dugmore and Grant's findings appear to suggest that not all types of living-learning situations are successful. Centra's (1968) study examined students' perceptions of the residence halls and of the total university. The samples for this study were randomly selected freshmen and upper-classmen of both sexes. They were selected from living-learning and conventional residence halls at a large university. Subjects were administered the College and University Environment Scales (CUES) and a questionnaire of reworded items from the CUES to apply to residence halls. Centra concluded that the findings indicated that there wasn't any significant difference in the perception of the residence hall university environments between students in conventional and students in living-learning residence halls. However, the living-learning residence halls appeared to be successful in reducing the impersonal, hotel-like atmosphere which often characterized the conventional large residence halls.

Larsen and Montgomery's (1969) study examined the effects of cluster grouping. The subjects were freshmen enrolled in the College of Liberal Arts at the University of Tennessee. They shared a common residence hall and were enrolled in three common course

sections. The control group were freshmen liberal arts' students from two other residence halls. The students were administered a questionnaire designed especially for this study. Larsen and Montgomery concluded that cluster grouping as measured in their study proved ineffective.

Another study that explored cluster grouping and supports Larsen and Montgomery's findings is Dugmore and Grant's (1970) study. Their study focused on the face-to-face friendship groups that are expected to emerge from a clustering program. During fall registration 100 entering freshmen were grouped into seven clusters. Each of the seven clusters was placed into three courses. A three-item sociometric test was used to compare the subgroups of students not belonging to clusters. Dugmore and Grant's findings suggest that cluster members appear to form more social identity as a group than non-clusters in the same classes. However, when cluster groups are compared with a group formed through the natural registration process, they selected each other significantly less frequently on a reciprocated basis as friends.

Contrary to Centra's findings, Eberly and Cech's (1968) findings suggest that students in living-learning residence halls have a different perception of the university environment compared to students in conventional residence halls. Their study was designed to ascertain the effects of a special residence hall program on low-achieving students.

One group of subjects for this study resided in a residence hall designed with a special program. Another group resided in the traditional residence hall program. Students in the special residence hall had a counselor-in-residence, a program of cultural and educational activities, an orientation program, individual and group counseling, and study skills training. The students were administered the College Characteristics Index at the end of one semester. Eberly and Cech found that there was no significant difference in the grade point average earned by the students in the two groups. They did find however, that the students' in the special residence hall program perception of the university was more favorable.

Findings in the area of living-learning situations appear to indicate that many of these experiences enhance student development. Living-learning residence halls are perceived by many educators as natural environments which can provide the colleges and universities an opportunity to assist in the development of students. Some forms of the living-learning concept have not been too successful and these living-learning situations will not meet the needs of all students. Some findings also suggest that living-learning experiences enhance low-ability students' perceptions of the university environment.

Literature relating to student development and higher education indicate that some researchers believe that students are in a certain stage or phase of development when entering college. This stage or

phase is when many students are open for change. Findings in the area of residence halls experiences and student development indicate that a homogeneous grouping of all students, freshmen and upperclass students, has a positive effect on academic success. The variables that make roommates compatible are very difficult to identify and control. Those roommates who are compatible have an influence on each others academic achievement and perception of the college environment. Coeducational living situations appear to encourage more platonic relationships between the sexes. These living situations decreased the social pressures toward dating and created an atmosphere of living in a friendly community. They also appeared to have an impact on student change and met the needs of many students, but not all students. Findings in the area of living-learning situations indicate that many of these experiences enhance student development and these situations are perceived by many educators and students as natural environments. Living-learning experiences will not meet the needs of all students. However, findings suggest that these experiences enhance low-ability students' perceptions of the college environment.

Summary of Reviewed Literature

The review of the literature was concentrated in four general areas: the general theory of self concept and its relationship to

behavior and adjustment; the effects of culture and economic status on self concept; information concerning the success or lack of success associated with programs which perform functions similar to those functions performed by the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) and Upward Bound; and the effectiveness of college residence hall experiences in enhancing the developmental process of students.

Many self concept theorists emphasized the idea that the self concept is an entity that is not transmitted through genes, but is developed after birth through interaction with significant others. The concept of the self comes only after the individual is able to recognize and conceptualize others. Many theorists such as Kinch (1963) and Rogers (1951) believe the self concept has a direct influence on behavior, and adjustment is based on the individual perceiving and accepting into one consistent and integrated system all sensory and visceral experiences.

The literature related to the effects of culture and economic status on self concept appears to be contradictory. The implication from literature is that culture and economic status have some influence on self concept, but it is not the dominant influence on self concept. It appears that the most dominant influence on self concept is success or failure in past experiences.

Research relating to the success or lack of success of Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) and programs similar to EOP

indicate that some of these programs were successful in assisting students in obtaining a college degree, and some were not so successful. Those programs that were successful: provided pre-college programs for students; created a supportive environment; and/or admitted only those students who had positive self concepts. The literature also indicated that the success of non-traditional students in higher education is related to the students' self concept. These students must enter college with a positive self concept or experiences must be provided to enhance these students' self-concept during the first year of college.

Some researchers believe in the concept of readiness in relation to higher education and student development. It is further believed that the first year in college represents a critical stage in the student's developmental process because many students are now open to growth. Other researchers such as Astin and Chickering believe that students' initial characteristics when entering college will have an impact on change. Students' characteristics are different for residents and commuters. Also other factors such as the type of college and the students' involvement in the college environment will influence change. One factor which appears to be dominant in enhancing student development is living in the residence halls, because students enter college with different needs, no one type of residence hall can meet the needs of all students. It appears that some forms

of the living-learning concept can be successful on many campuses and they have the potential of meeting the needs of many students.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the design and subjects of the study, the procedure used to collect data, the two instruments used, and the treatment of data.

Design and Subjects

The overall purpose for this study as outlined in Chapter I was to identify the factors needed for successful adjustment of Educational Opportunities Program (EOP) freshmen to the Oregon State University (OSU) campus environment and to determine whether this adjustment could be accomplished early in the students' college career through a structured residence hall experience. Because it was the intent of this study to examine the effects of different residence halls experiences on students who had no previous college experience, the following factors were controlled: place of residence, high school graduation date, marital status, age, and college experience. All individuals involved in the study were administered pre and post-tests utilizing the instruments chosen for this study.

The subjects in this study were first year college freshmen who entered OSU fall term, 1977. They were nineteen years of age and younger, single, residing in one of the campus residence halls,

had graduated from high school within the previous academic year, and had no college experiences prior to entering OSU. The subjects were divided into two groups.

The first group consisted of students who had been admitted to OSU through the EOP. All students who were admitted by August 1, 1977, were considered in the group from which the random sample was selected. The sample of students randomly selected were sent a letter (Appendix A) explaining a new experimental living situation and indicating they could volunteer to participate. Those students volunteering were used as the experimental group (E). Students who indicated that they did not wish to participate and the students who were not randomly selected comprised control group one (CI).

The second group consisted of students admitted to OSU through the regular admission process. The students were enrolled in a freshmen psychology class and were used as a representative sample of regular admitted freshmen students. This sample of students from the class comprised the second control group (CII).

Approximately half (13) of the EOP students, experimental group (E), in the study were provided with a special residence hall experience. The students lived on two floors in a co-educational residence hall, one floor for males and one floor for females. They took two courses (Math 095A and Psychology 111A) as a group that were taught in their residence hall. Those students needing and

requesting tutorial assistance were also tutored in their residence hall. The assigned counselors to the students had some evening office hours in the residence hall.

Procedure of Collecting Data

Educational Opportunities Program students who were admitted to Oregon State University fall term, 1977 were required to take a series of placement tests the weekend prior to fall term registration. Two standardized instruments were included in the series of tests administered to the students: the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) and the Adjective Check List (ACL). One week prior to the end of fall term, EOP students were again re-tested with the placement test. The TSCS and ACL were also administered to these students.

The second control group (CII) was part of a group of freshmen enrolled in a psychology III class. All class members were administered the standardized tests, TSCS and ACL, during the second week of classes fall term 1977. The TSCS and the ACL were readministered to the students one week prior to the end of fall term.

Instruments

Two standardized instruments were utilized for this study. The Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) was utilized to ascertain

the kind of self image and perception the subjects participating in the study had of themselves. The Adjective Check List (ACL) was utilized to ascertain how the subjects perceived themselves in relation to the college environment.

Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS)

The developmental work on the TSCS began in 1955 by William H. Fitts. His original purpose for the development of the scale was to meet a need for an instrument that was multi-dimensional in its description of the self concept. There was also a need for the instrument to be widely applicable, well standardized, and reasonably easy to administer to subjects. Fitts saw a need to develop the TSCS because he believed:

The individual's concept of himself has been demonstrated to be highly influential in much of his behavior and also to be directly related to his general personality and state of mental health. Those people who see themselves as undesirable, worthless, or "bad" tend to act accordingly. Those who have a highly unrealistic concept of self tend to approach life and other people in unrealistic ways. Those who have very deviant self concepts tend to behave in deviant ways. Thus, a knowledge of how an individual perceives himself is useful in attempting to help that individual, or in making evaluations of him (p. 1).

Fitts completed the development of the instrument in its present form in 1965. The scale consists of 100 self descriptive items which are responded to by choosing one of five response options labeled from completely false to completely true. The 100 items are used

to provide the subject with a reflected image of him or her self. There are two forms of the TSCS, the Counseling Form and the Clinical and Research Form. The Counseling Form was chosen for this study.

The TSCS is divided into four major sections: the Self Criticism Score, the Positive Score, the Variability Score, and the Distribution Score. The following provides an explanation of the nature and meaning of each section.

The Self Criticism Score (SC). This scale is composed of ten items which are mildly derogatory statements that most people agree to being true for them.

The Positive Scores (P). Statements which make up this section seem to be indicating three basic messages:

- (1) This is what I am,
- (2) This is how I feel about myself, and
- (3) This is what I do.

Based on the three above statements, Fitts' formed three horizontal categories. They are listed on the answer sheet as Row 1, Row 2, and Row 3. The Row Scores are three sub-scores which are combined to constitute the Total Positive (P) Score. These scores reflect an internal frame of reference within which the individual is describing him or her self.

1. Total P Score. This sub-score represents the overall level

of self esteem of the individual. The P score is the most important single score on the form.

2. Row 1 P Score - Identity. This sub-score reflects the individual's basic identity - what the individual is as he or she sees him or her self.
3. Row 2 P Score - Self Satisfaction. This sub-score indicates the level of self satisfaction or self acceptance. The score is derived from those items where the subject indicates how he or she feels about the self he or she perceives.
4. Row 3 P Score - Behavior. This sub-score is derived from those statements that say "this is what I do, or this is the way I act." This score reflects the individual's perception of his or her own behavior or the way he or she functions.
5. Column A - Physical Self - This sub-score indicates how the individual views his or her body, state of health, physical appearance, skills, and sexuality.
6. Column B - Moral-Ethical Self. This sub-score indicates how the individual perceives the self from a moral-ethical frame of reference. His or her moral worth, relationship to God, feelings of being a "good" or "bad" person, and satisfaction with one's religion or lack of it.
7. Column C - Personal Self. Here the individual is indicating his or her sense of personal worth, his or her feeling of

adequacy as a person, and his or her evaluation of his or her personality apart from his or her body as his or her relationships to others.

8. Column D - Family Self. This sub-score indicates the individual's feelings of adequacy, worth, and value as a family member. How the individual sees his or her self in reference to his or her closest and most immediate circle of associates.
9. Column E - Social Self. Here the individual is indicating his or her sense of adequacy and worth in his or her social interaction with other people in general.

The Variability Scores (V). The V scores indicate the amount of variability or inconsistency from one area of self perception to another.

1. Total V. This score reflects the total amount of variability for the total scale.
2. Column Total V. This score ascertains and summarizes the variations within the columns.
3. Row Total V. This score is the total of the variations from the rows.

The Distribution Score (D). This score summarizes the way the individual distributes his or her answers across the five available choices in response to the items. High scores reflect that the individual is very definite and certain in what he or she indicates about

him or herself while low scores indicate the opposite (Fitts, 1965).

According to Fitts, a sample group of 626 people was to develop norms for the TSCS. The group consisted of equal numbers of both sexes, both Black and white subjects. The group also consisted of representatives of all social, economic, intellectual, and educational levels (6th grade through Ph.D. degree). Fitts indicates that data collected by Sundby (1962), Gwiden (1959), Hall (1964), and himself (1961) with high school students, army recruits, teachers, and Black nursing students reflected group means and variances which were comparable to those of the norm group.

Reliability

The test-retest reliability coefficients on major scores range from .60 to .92. Evidence of reliability is indicated in Congdon's (1958) study. A shortened version of the TSCS was used in a study with psychiatric patients and obtained a reliability coefficient of .88 for the total Positive Score (Fitts, 1965). Another study using 60 college students obtained a reliability coefficient of .92 over a two week test re-test period (Thompson 1972). Fitts (1965) also indicated that the remarkable similarity of profile patterns found through repeated measures of the same individuals over long periods of time supports the reliability of the instrument.

Validity

Fitts (1965) used four types of validation procedures: (1) content validity, (2) discrimination between groups, (3) correlation with other personality measure, and (4) personality changes under particular conditions.

The purpose for the content validity was to make sure that the classification system used for certain parts of the scale was dependable. To accomplish this, the judges were instructed to retain only those items where there was unanimous agreement that they were classified correctly.

Fitts believed that groups which differ on certain physiological dimensions should differ in self concept. He investigated the validity of the scale by determining how groups differentiated, i. e., psychiatric patients compared to non-patients and delinquents compared to non-delinquents.

Another way of supporting the validity of the instrument was to ascertain how the instrument correlated with other scales for which correlations should be predicted. Correlation with the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, the Edwards Preference Scale, and other similar scales show a positive correlation (Fitts, 1965).

Studies by Gividen (1959) and Ashcrafts and Fitts (1964) support the idea that individuals' concepts of self change as a result of

significant experience. Experiences that are positive are expected to enhance the self concept, while experiences of failure are expected to lower the self concept.

The TSCS was chosen for this study because findings from studies using the instrument with similar students appear to indicate the instrument was valid in measuring what it intended to measure. Also some groups used to standardize the instrument are similar to students in this study. Therefore, it appears that this instrument would be sufficient for this study.

Adjective Check List (ACL)

The developmental work on the ACL began in 1952 by Harrison G. Gough. In 1958 a series of experimental scales were developed for the ACL based on Murray's need-trait system by Alfred B. Heilbrun. The present version of the instrument was produced by these two individuals in 1965. Gough's purpose for developing the ACL was to devise an instrument that could offer words and ideas commonly used for description in everyday life in a format which was systematic and standardized. The ACL was originally designed to be used by observers in personality assessment of others. The ACL can be and is frequently used by an individual in self description. The ACL consists of 300 self descriptive adjectives. The respondent checks those adjectives he/she feels

describes him/her. The ACL has 24 experimental scales and indices. The following will describe each scale and the methods used in deriving each scale.

(1) Total number of adjectives checked. Checking more or fewer adjectives reflects certain personality dispositions. Checking many adjectives appears to reflect surgency and drive, and a relative absence of repressive tendencies. The individual who checks few adjectives appears to be quiet and reserved and more tentative and cautious in his or her approach to problems.

Individuals differ widely in the total number of adjectives checked. The range for a sample of 1,364 men was from 13 to 298, with a mean group of 99.05. For a sample of 642 women the range was from 21 to 225, with a mean of 91.18.

(2) Defensiveness. This scale was developed by Heilbrun to distinguish between individuals who were responding honestly to the adjectives and those who were altering their responses. He determined which adjectives discriminated between ACL's of maladjusted college students whose self-descriptions correlated with their level of adjustment and adjectives of similar college students whose self-descriptions were unduly favorable.

The higher-scoring individual appears to be self-controlled and resolute in attitude and behavior. The individual also appears to be insistent and ever stubborn in seeking his or her objectives. The

lower scoring individual appears to be anxious and apprehensive, critical of him or her self and others, and often complains about his or her circumstances.

(3) Number of favorable adjectives checked. In order to find the most favorable adjectives in the total of 300, ninety-seven students in psychology were asked to choose the 75 "most favorable" words. The percentage of choices for each word was tabulated, and the 75 with the highest percentages were used in the scale. The individual who checks many of the words in the list of 75 tends to be motivated by a strong desire to do well and to impress others. This individual also has a sincere concern with behaving appropriately and with doing one's duty. The low scoring individual often experiences anxiety, self-doubts, and perplexities.

(4) Number of unfavorable adjectives checked. This scale is the counterpart of the favorable scale. Ninety-eight undergraduate students in psychology were asked to choose the least favorable words in a list. The 75 most frequently chosen words were selected for this scale. The high scoring individual appears to be a disbeliever, a skeptic, and a threat to the complacent beliefs and attitudes of others. The low scorer appears to be more placid, more obliging, more mannerly, and more tactful.

In an effort to devise an adjective scale which would be similar

to the major factorial dimensions found in the California Psychological Inventory, Gough (1957) developed four scales: the self-confidence, the self control, the lability, and the personal adjustment scale.

(5) Self-Confidence. This scale corresponds to the "poise and self assurance" cluster of scales on the CPI. Norms for this scale were developed by contrasting the self-descriptions of men and women rated in assessment as higher and lower on traits such as poise, self confidence and self assurance. Items with consistent positive correlations were retained for the "indicative" cluster of adjectives, and items with consistent negative correlations were kept for the "contra-indicative" list. The high scorer on this scale is seen as assertive, affiliative, outgoing, persistent, and an actionist. The individual wants to get things done, and is impatient with people or things standing in his or her way. The individual's main objective appears to be creating a good impression, and he/she is not above cutting a few corners to achieve this objective. The low-scoring individual appears to be much less effective. This individual has difficulty in becoming mobilized and taking action.

(6) Self Control. This scale was intended to parallel the responsibility-socialization cluster of scales on the CPI. The high scores are seen as diligent, practical, and loyal workers. They also appear to be over-controlled, have too much emphasis on the proper means for attaining the ends of social living. The low-scorer appears to be

inadequately socialized, headstrong, irresponsible, complaining, disorderly, and impulsive.

(7) Lability. This scale was based on item analysis of experimental subjects rated higher on characteristics such as spontaneity, flexibility, need for change, rejection of convention, and assertive individuality. The major emphasis appears to be upon an inner restlessness and an inability to tolerate consistency and routine. The high scoring individual is seen favorably as spontaneous, and unfavorably as excitable, temperamental, restless, nervous, and high-strung. The low-scorer is seen as routinized, planful and conventional.

(8) Personal Adjustment. This scale was also derived from item analysis of experimental subjects rated higher and lower on personal adjustment and soundness. The high-scorerr is seen as dependable, peaceable, trusting, friendly, practical, loyal, and wholesome. The low scorer is seen as at odds with other people and as moody and dissatisfited.

The following 15 scales are need scales. They were selected from Murray's (1958) need-press system and each represented a disposition within his system. These need scales were developed by giving graduate students in psychology the Edwards' (1954) description of the variables and asking them which scale would indicate the presence of each need in them. Those scales that were chosen by a certain percentage of students were included.

- (9) Achievement. To strive to be outstanding in pursuits of socially recognized significance.
- (10) Dominance. To seek and sustain leadership roles in groups or to be influential and controlling in individual relationships.
- (11) Endurance. To persist in any task undertaken.
- (12) Order. To place special emphasis on neatness, organization, and planning in one's activities.
- (13) Intraception. To engage in attempts to understand one's own behavior or the behavior of others.
- (14) Nurturance. To engage in behaviors which extend material or emotional benefits to others.
- (15) Affiliation. To seek and sustain numerous personal friendships.
- (16) Heterosexuality. To seek the company of and derive emotional satisfaction from interactions with opposite sexed peers.
- (17) Exhibition. To behave in such a way as to elicit the immediate attention of others.
- (18) Autonomy. To act independently of others or of social values and expectations.
- (19) Aggression. To engage in behaviors which attack or hurt others.
- (20) Change. To seek novelty of experience and avoid routine.
- (21) Succorance. To solicit sympathy, affection, or emotional

support from others.

(22) Abasement. To express feelings of inferiority through self-criticism, guilt, or social importance.

(23) Deference. To seek and sustain subordinate roles in relationships with others.

(24) Counseling Readiness. This is the final scale on the instrument. Heilbrun and Sullivan (1963) developed the scale to help in identifying counseling clients who were ready for assistance and who appeared likely to profit from counseling (Gough and Heilbrun, 1965, pp. 7-11).

Reliability

The ACL has three areas of reliability: the test-retest reliability of the total list of words; the reliability of scales and scored variables; and the agreement among observers when the instrument is used for recording the observations of psychological assessors. This study is only concerned with the first two areas of reliability.

A test-retest reliability coefficient had a mean of $+.54$ when a sample of 100 subjects took the check list twice, approximately six months apart. In a test-retest reliability of scales, using college students tested ten weeks apart, adults tested six months apart, and medical students tested five and one-half years apart, the coefficients varied from a low of $+.25$ to a high of $+.90$.

Validity

Heilbrun's (1958, 1959, and 1963) studies appear to support validation of the instrument. Two of these studies support the validity of the instrument by showing positive correlation with other personality instruments. The third study found that six of the fifteen need scales were significantly related to dropping out of college, and that an index combining these six scales enhanced the prediction which could be made from a measure of scholastic ability.

Treatment of Data

The hypotheses under investigation were treated by utilizing three statistical analyses. The three were an analysis of variance, an analysis of covariance, and a coefficient of correlation test (pearson r). The .05 level of confidence was selected as the acceptable level of statistical significance.

An analysis of variance was used to ascertain the significant difference between Group I (Experimental Group), Group II (Control Group I), and Group III (Control Group II) before treatment, by comparing pre-test mean scores.

An analysis of covariance was used to ascertain the significant difference in changes for Group I (Experimental Group), Group II (Control Group I), and Group III (Control Group II) after treatment

was completed, by comparing the difference in pre and post test mean scores.

The third analysis, a coefficient of correlation test, was utilized to examine the relationship between changes on the TSCS and the ACL.

The hypotheses were stated in the Null for statistical purposes and were statistically analyzed as follows:

Hypotheses I and III were tested by a comparison of pre test mean scores utilizing a two-tailed F test (analysis of variance).

Hypotheses II, IV, V and VI were tested by a comparison of the difference in change between pre and post test mean score utilizing the pre-test score as a covariate. The analysis was subjected to a two-tailed F test (analysis of covariance).

Hypotheses VII was tested by a comparison of the total change for participants on the TSCS and the ACL, utilizing a Pearson product moment correlation.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

This study was conducted during the fall term of 1977, for the purpose of determining the factors involved in Educational Opportunities Program freshmen making a successful adjustment to the Oregon State University campus environment and whether this adjustment can be accomplished early in the students' college career. This chapter is devoted to presenting and analyzing data pertinent to this study. Tables with the analyses of the data are presented and indicate the procedure followed for testing each hypothesis.

For the purpose of statistical analyses, the seven hypotheses were stated in the null form. All scores (identity, self-satisfaction, behavior, physical self, moral-ethical self, personal self, family self, social self, total positive, self criticism, total variability, column total variability, row total variability, and distribution) on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale were used as a measure of the self concept and were utilized in testing the hypotheses. All scores on the Adjective Check List (total number of adjectives, defensiveness; number of favorable adjectives, number of unfavorable adjectives, self confidence, self control, lability, personal adjustment, achievement, dominance, endurance, order, intraception, nurturance, affiliation, heterosexuality, exhibition, autonomy, aggression,

change, succorance, abasement, deference, and counseling readiness) were used as a measure of college adjustment and were used in testing relative hypotheses.

Presentation of Results

The first null hypothesis was tested by an analysis of variance model with a two-tailed test of significance. The results were subjected to F tests. A .05 level of confidence was accepted as the significant level. This null hypothesis was stated as follows:

Hypothesis I: There will be no significant difference in self concept between Group I (N=13, Experimental Group), Group II (N=10, Control Group I), and Group III (N=31, Control Group II) at the beginning of fall term as measured by comparing mean scores on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS).

An analysis of the scores of the TSCS for testing Hypothesis I (Table 1) revealed that two (Behavior and Physical Self) of the fourteen scores had an F value of 3.19 or higher which indicated significant differences in means at the .05 level. Based on the analysis, the null hypothesis could not be rejected for significant difference in self concept between Group I, Group II, and Group III as measured by comparing mean scores on the TSCS.

The second null hypothesis was tested by an analysis of covariance model using the pre-test mean scores as the covariant with

Table 1. An Analysis of Variance Between Group I (N=13), Group II (N=10), and Group III (N=31)
Pre-test Mean Scores on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale to Examine for Significant
Differences (Testing Hypothesis I) \bar{x} = Means, S. D. = Standard Deviations

Scores	Groups	\bar{x}	S. D.	F Value
Identity	1	120.46	15.16	1.27
	2	120.00	7.94	
	3	124.74	8.20	
Self Satisfaction	1	100.53	13.04	.98
	2	96.90	7.93	
	3	102.77	11.97	
Behavior	1	102.53	13.02	3.54*
	2	104.30	7.42	
	3	110.51	9.18	
Physical Self	1	68.15	9.34	4.46*
	2	60.30	6.56	
	3	66.64	5.25	
Moral-Ethical Self	1	64.92	6.89	1.41
	2	65.60	5.01	
	3	68.16	6.60	
Personal Self	1	63.15	7.85	1.19
	2	66.80	6.82	
	3	66.32	6.20	
Family Self	1	63.61	8.45	3.01
	2	63.80	4.77	
	3	68.90	8.09	
Social Self	1	63.69	9.71	1.66
	2	64.70	5.90	
	3	68.00	7.46	
Total Positive	1	323.53	9.90	2.39
	2	321.20	6.45	
	3	338.03	4.03	
Self Criticism	1	34.46	6.57	1.58
	2	33.30	4.49	
	3	36.87	6.40	
Total Variability	1	48.23	14.60	.07
	2	50.20	8.24	
	3	49.54	13.07	
Column Variability	1	30.15	9.48	.03
	2	31.10	4.79	
	3	30.32	10.14	
Row Variability	1	18.07	5.89	.18
	2	19.10	5.80	
	3	19.22	5.67	
Distribution	1	110.07	30.84	1.53
	2	94.90	19.62	
	3	106.41	17.03	

F = 3.19 at .05 level

*Significant at the .05 level

a two-tailed test of significance. The results were subjected to F tests. A .05 level of confidence was accepted as the significant level. The null hypothesis was stated as follows:

Hypothesis II: There will be no significant difference in change in self concept after one quarter of college between Group I (N=13, Experimental Group), Group II (N=10, Control Group I), and Group III (N=31, Control Group II) as measured by comparing post test mean scores adjusted for pre test scores on the TSCS.

An analysis of the post test mean scores adjusted for the pre-test scores on the TSCS for testing Hypothesis II (Table 2) revealed that when the scores were adjusted four (total variability, column variability, row variability, and distribution) of the fourteen scores had F values that were significant, two at the .05 level and two at the .01 level. From the analysis the null hypothesis could not be rejected for significance in change in self concept after one quarter of college between Group I, Group II, and Group III as measured by comparing post test mean scores adjusted for the pre-test scores on the TSCS.

Null hypothesis three was tested by an analysis for variance model with a two-tailed test of significance. The results were subjected to F tests. A .05 level of confidence was accepted as the significant level. This null hypothesis was stated as follows:

Hypothesis III: There will be no significant difference in

Table 2. An Analysis of Covariance Between Group I (N=13), Group II (N=10), and Group III (N=31)
Examining Differences in Change in Self Concept as Measured by Comparing Post Test Mean
Scores Adjusted for the Pre-Test Scores on the TSCS. (Testing Hypothesis II)

Scores	Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Value
Identity	Covariance	1	351.87	4.91
	Treatment	2	223.49	3.12
	Residual	46	71.55	
Self Satisfaction	Covariance	1	98.28	1.305
	Treatment	2	11.16	.14
	Residual	46	75.33	
Behavior	Covariance	1	442.10	7.12
	Treatment	2	4.72	.07
	Residual	46	62.04	
Physical Self	Covariance	1	91.23	3.12
	Treatment	2	1.68	.05
	Residual	44	29.19	
Moral-Ethical Self	Covariance	1	77.49	2.74
	Treatment	2	26.24	.93
	Residual	45	28.21	
Personal Self	Covariance	1	616.70	16.08
	Treatment	2	4.08	.10
	Residual	46	38.34	
Family Self	Covariance	1	92.22	2.89
	Treatment	2	2.34	.07
	Residual	43	31.87	
Social Self	Covariance	1	196.76	6.42
	Treatment	2	56.23	1.83
	Residual	45	30.61	
Total Positive	Covariance	1	604.72	1.41
	Treatment	2	111.09	.26
	Residual	46	427.53	
Self Criticism	Covariance	1	148.89	7.36
	Treatment	2	11.34	.56
	Residual	42	20.22	
Total Variability	Covariance	1	965.26	9.26
	Treatment	2	666.95	6.40**
	Residual	49	104.21	
Column Variability	Covariance	1	481.44	8.30
	Treatment	2	316.32	5.45**
	Residual	48	371.36	
Row Variability	Covariance	1	310.62	11.82
	Treatment	2	100.28	3.81
	Residual	43	170.39	
Distribution	Covariance	1	59.66	.25
	Treatment	2	961.47	4.06*
	Residual	48	236.50	

F = 3.19 to 3.22 at .05 level

*Significant at the .05 level

F = 5.09 to 5.18 at .01 level

**Significant at the .01 level

college adjustment at the beginning of the fall term for the Group I (N=13, Experimental Group), Group II (N=10, Control Group I), and Group III (N=31, Control Group II) as measured by comparing mean scores on the Adjective Check List (ACL).

Comparison of the mean scores of the ACL for testing Hypothesis III (Table 3) revealed that five of the twenty-four scores had an F value of 3.19 or higher which indicated significant difference in mean scores at least at the .05 level. Because of the small number of significantly different mean scores, the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

Null Hypothesis IV was tested by an analysis of covariance model. The pre-test mean scores were used as a covariant. A two-tailed test of significance was utilized with the results subjected to F tests. A .05 level of confidence was accepted as the significant level. Null Hypothesis IV was stated as follows:

Hypothesis IV: There will be no significant difference in change in college adjustment between Group I (N=13, Experimental Group), Group II (N=10, Control Group I), and Group III (N=31, Control Group II) after one quarter of college as measured by comparing post test mean scores adjusted for pre-test scores for the Adjective Check List (ACL).

Comparison of the post test mean scores adjusted for pre-test scores on the ACL (Table 4) revealed that one of the twenty-four

Table 3. Analysis of Variance between Group I (N=13), Group II (N=10), and Group III (N=31)
 Pre-Test Mean Scores on the Adjective Check List to Examine for Significant Differences,
 (Testing Hypothesis III) \bar{x} = Means, S. D. = Standard Deviations.

Scores	Groups	\bar{x}	S. D.	F Value
No. Ckd	1	47.76	14.44	1.18
	2	42.20	12.59	
	3	41.48	11.80	
Df	1	50.46	10.85	.82
	2	49.90	8.54	
	3	46.96	8.76	
Fav	1	49.61	11.16	.22
	2	47.20	10.44	
	3	48.96	7.03	
Unfav	1	51.84	10.03	.10
	2	50.50	8.95	
	3	50.54	8.78	
S-Cfd	1	47.23	8.57	1.81
	2	42.90	6.15	
	3	49.41	10.56	
S-Cn	1	46.23	9.99	1.06
	2	51.10	6.70	
	3	47.61	7.71	
Lab	1	52.92	6.25	14.06**
	2	41.70	7.10	
	3	56.03	7.94	
Per Adj	1	46.61	7.74	.21
	2	46.80	10.14	
	3	48.12	7.15	
Ach	1	50.84	7.05	.49
	2	47.80	4.80	
	3	48.51	9.22	
Dom	1	50.00	9.68	1.42
	2	46.90	5.93	
	3	52.22	9.20	
End	1	50.38	7.51	1.62
	2	51.50	6.24	
	3	46.96	8.61	
Ord	1	48.00	9.48	1.73
	2	49.90	8.49	
	3	44.64	8.08	
Int	1	47.76	9.37	.40
	2	45.10	10.70	
	3	47.70	6.90	
Nur	1	49.15	7.55	.10
	2	48.60	6.75	
	3	49.77	7.40	
Aff	1	49.30	8.85	1.13
	2	44.00	11.86	
	3	48.45	8.12	

Table 3. (Continued)

Scores	Groups	\bar{x}	S. D.	F Value
Het	1	57.69	12.13	5.69**
	2	44.20	9.71	
	3	51.41	8.16	
Exh	1	49.07	3.66	5.83**
	2	46.30	8.87	
	3	55.22	9.02	
Aut	1	49.38	5.43	.34
	2	47.60	7.08	
	3	49.77	7.87	
Agg	1	48.61	6.27	4.21*
	2	46.30	8.90	
	3	55.06	10.69	
Cha	1	50.92	10.94	2.38
	2	46.40	10.53	
	3	53.80	8.41	
Suc	1	58.69	12.43	1.28
	2	52.80	4.44	
	3	56.61	7.99	
Aba	1	50.61	9.71	1.12
	2	52.70	6.37	
	3	48.67	7.03	
Def	1	51.84	6.42	3.58*
	2	52.40	6.65	
	3	46.74	7.74	
Crs	1	51.30	11.98	1.04
	2	53.50	8.87	
	3	48.80	8.33	

F = 3.19 at .05 level

*Significant at the .05 level

F = 5.07 at .01 level

**Significant at the .01 level

Table 4. Analysis of Covariance Between Group I (N=13), Group II (N=10), and Group III (N = 31) Examining Differences in Change in College Adjustment as Measured by Comparing Post Test Mean Scores Adjusted for the Pre-Test Scores on the ACL. (Testing Hypothesis IV)

Scores	Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Value
No Ckd	Covariance	1	2085.85	14.03
	Treatment	2	201.81	1.35
	Residual	46	148.58	
Df	Covariance	1	788.68	16.48
	Treatment	2	.78	.01
	Residual	48	47.85	
Fav	Covariance	1	327.17	5.70
	Treatment	2	51.45	.89
	Residual	44	57.30	
Unfav	Covariance	1	735.62	7.35
	Treatment	2	21.42	.21
	Residual	49	100.00	
S-Cfd	Covariance	1	788.25	18.22
	Treatment	2	6.41	.14
	Residual	49	43.26	
S-Cn	Covariance	1	418.51	9.88
	Treatment	2	2.82	.05
	Residual	49	42.32	
Lab	Covariance	1	685.74	10.03
	Treatment	2	137.40	2.01
	Residual	49	68.30	
Per Adj	Covariance	1	414.91	9.24
	Treatment	2	31.03	.69
	Residual	49	44.89	
Ach	Covariance	1	245.14	5.13
	Treatment	2	91.61	1.92
	Residual	48	47.71	
Dom	Covariance	1	151.80	3.21
	Treatment	2	6.81	.14
	Residual	46	47.29	
End	Covariance	1	236.56	7.12
	Treatment	2	.55	.01
	Residual	46	33.18	
Ord	Covariance	1	384.00	11.95
	Treatment	2	37.59	1.17
	Residual	49		
Int	Covariance	1	1334.65	27.54
	Treatment	2	51.31	1.05
	Residual	49	48.46	
Nur	Covariance	1	565.48	11.62
	Treatment	2	7.36	.15
	Residual	49	48.62	
Aff	Covariance	1	1727.80	15.56
	Treatment	2	60.66	.54
	Residual	49	111.01	

Table 4. (Continued)

Scores	Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Value
Het	Covariance	1	608.64	7.21
	Treatment	2	93.13	1.10
	Residual	48	84.33	
Exh	Covariance	1	416.88	10.34
	Treatment	2	1.50	.03
	Residual	47	40.31	
Aut	Covariance	1	523.56	9.79
	Treatment	2	44.63	.83
	Residual	47	53.44	
Agg	Covariance	1	489.52	6.13
	Treatment	2	23.49	.29
	Residual	48	79.76	
Cha	Covariance	1	701.03	15.48
	Treatment	2	162.70	3.59*
	Residual	48	45.26	
Suc	Covariance	1	1473.01	19.67
	Treatment	2	11.96	.16
	Residual	48	74.87	
Aba	Covariance	1	191.75	4.55
	Treatment	2	28.54	.67
	Residual	49	42.07	
Def	Covariance	1	477.67	15.39
	Treatment	2	25.18	.81
	Residual	49	31.03	
Crs	Covariance	1	2143.08	26.05
	Treatment	2	8.69	.10
	Residual	47	82.24	

F = 3.19 at .05 level

*Significant at the .05 level

scores (change) had an F Value of 3.19 or higher which indicates significant differences in means at the .05 level. Based on the analysis the null hypothesis could not be rejected for significant differences in change in college adjustment after one quarter of college between Group I, Group II, and Group III.

The fifth null hypothesis was tested by an analysis of covariance model using the pre-test mean scores as the covariant with a two-tailed test of significance. The results were subjected to F tests. A .05 level of confidence was accepted as the significant level. The hypothesis was stated as follows:

Hypothesis V: There will be no significant difference in change in self concept after one quarter of college between Group I (N=13, Experimental Group) and Group II (N=10, Control Group I) as measured by comparing post test mean scores adjusted for pre-test scores for the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS).

Comparison of the post test mean scores adjusted for pre-test scores for the TSCS (Table 5) revealed that the adjusted scores had one score with F values of 4.35 or higher which indicates the majority of the scores were not significant at .05 level of confidence. Based on the analysis the null hypothesis could not be rejected for significance in change in self concept after one quarter of college between Group I and Group II as measured by mean scores on the TSCS.

Table 5. Analysis of Covariance Between Group I (N=13) and Group II (N=10) to Examine Differences in Change Mean Scores on the SCS When Post Test Mean Scores Have Been Adjusted (Testing Hypothesis V)

Scores	Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Value
Identity	Covariance	1	357.60	3.48
	Treatment	1	7.75	.07
	Residual	19	102.62	
Self Satisfaction	Covariance	1	113.57	1.08
	Treatment	1	15.90	.15
	Residual	19	104.60	
Behavior	Covariance	1	206.45	2.80
	Treatment	1	5.51	.07
	Residual	19	73.51	
Physical Self	Covariance	1	58.65	1.77
	Treatment	1	1.75	.05
	Residual	20	32.97	
Moral-Ethical Self	Covariance	1	1.21	.03
	Treatment	1	3.21	.10
	Residual	17	30.94	
Personal Self	Covariance	1	459.01	8.70
	Treatment	1	.33	.00
	Residual	19	52.72	
Family Self	Covariance	1	15.63	.42
	Treatment	1	4.06	.11
	Residual	18	36.64	
Social Self	Covariance	1	248.47	9.00
	Treatment	1	1.26	.04
	Residual	18	27.58	
Total Positive	Covariance	1	539.99	.88
	Treatment	1	1.21	.00
	Residual	19	613.29	
Self Criticism	Covariance	1	45.99	.22
	Treatment	1	12.54	.51
	Residual	16	28.63	
Total Variability	Covariance	1	798.97	7.14
	Treatment	1	456.24	4.08
	Residual	20	111.83	
Column Variability	Covariance	1	279.17	4.18
	Treatment	1	80.90	1.21
	Residual	19	66.64	
Row Variability	Covariance	1	173.50	10.51
	Treatment	1	148.63	9.00
	Residual	18	16.50	
Distribution	Covariance	1	61.94	.29
	Treatment	1	597.06	2.81
	Residual	19	212.19	

F = 4.35 to 4.49 at .05 level

*Significant at the .05 level

The sixth null hypothesis was tested by an analysis of covariance model using the pre-test scores as a covariant with a two-tailed test of significance. The results were subjected to F tests. A .05 level of confidence was accepted as the significant level. The hypothesis was stated as follows:

Hypothesis VI: There will be no significant change in college adjustment between Group I (N=13, Experimental Group) and Group II (N=10, Control Group I) after one quarter of college as measured by comparing post test mean scores adjusted for pre-test scores on the Adjective Check List (ACL).

An analysis of the post test mean scores adjusted for pre-test scores on the ACL for testing hypothesis VI (Table 6) revealed that the mean change difference scores were not significant. From this analysis the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

The seventh hypothesis was tested by using the Product moment correlational method. A .05 level of confidence was accepted as the significant level. The hypothesis was stated as follows:

Hypothesis VII: There will be no significant correlation between change scores on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (total P score) and the Adjective Check List.

Analysis of the correlation between change scores on the TSCS (total P score) and the ACL for testing hypothesis VII (Table 7) revealed that seven scores had positive correlations. Based on

Table 6. Analysis of Covariance Between Group I (N=13) and Group II (N=10) to Examine Differences in Change Mean Scores on the ACL When Post Test Mean Scores Have Been Adjusted, (Testing Hypothesis VI).

Scores	Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Value
No. Ckd	Covariance	1	45.99	1.60
	Treatment	1	12.54	.43
	Residual	16	28.63	
Df	Covariance	1	9.64	1.37
	Treatment	1	.17	.02
	Residual	17	7.02	
Fav	Covariance	1	4606.76	6.88
	Treatment	1	469.71	.70
	Residual	20	668.87	
Unfav	Covariance	1	.85	.00
	Treatment	1	525.74	1.10
	Residual	19	474.52	
S-Cfd	Covariance	1	4.96	3.50
	Treatment	1	.05	.04
	Residual	13	1.41	
S-Cn	Covariance	1	45.05	1.18
	Treatment	1	11.30	.29
	Residual	20	37.96	
Lab	Covariance	1	78.50	1.19
	Treatment	1	474.65	7.20*
	Residual	20	65.86	
Per Adj	Covariance	1	20.64	.29
	Treatment	1	9.73	.14
	Residual	20	69.30	
Ach	Covariance	1	20.05	.55
	Treatment	1	131.66	3.64
	Residual	20	36.16	
Dom	Covariance	1	26.67	.46
	Treatment	1	.65	.01
	Residual	19	57.65	
End	Covariance	1	74.07	2.81
	Treatment	1	.96	.03
	Residual	18	26.30	
Ord	Covariance	1	189.06	7.58
	Treatment	1	56.38	2.26
	Residual	20	24.91	
Int	Covariance	1	1286.56	21.12
	Treatment	1	33.61	.55
	Residual	20	60.91	
Nur	Covariance	1	210.40	6.78
	Treatment	1	1.96	.06
	Residual	20	31.02	
Aff	Covariance	1	1664.76	23.98
	Treatment	1	36.51	.52
	Residual	19	69.39	

Table 6. (Continued)

Scores	Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Value
Het	Covariance	1	425.04	4.11
	Treatment	1	92.00	.89
	Residual	19	103.35	
Exh	Covariance	1	163.89	2.91
	Treatment	1	1.14	.02
	Residual	20	56.14	
Aut	Covariance	1	204.50	7.28
	Treatment	1	79.85	2.84
	Residual	18	28.09	
Agg	Covariance	1	92.22	1.70
	Treatment	1	40.55	.74
	Residual	20	54.14	
Cha	Covariance	1	766.19	14.02
	Treatment	1	2.17	.04
	Residual	20	54.63	
Suc	Covariance	1	1144.97	11.64
	Treatment	1	.00	.00
	Residual	19	98.31	
Aba	Covariance	1	225.43	4.92
	Treatment	1	4.87	.10
	Residual	20	45.75	
Def	Covariance	1	237.77	10.99
	Treatment	1	29.97	1.38
	Residual	20	21.63	
Crs	Covariance	1	1353.69	17.53
	Treatment	1	12.20	.15
	Residual	19	77.18	

F = 4.35 to 4.67 at .05 level

*Significant at the .05 level

Table 7. A Correlation Between Change Scores on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (total P score) and the Adjective Check List.

Scores	Coefficient	Cases	Level of Significance
No. Ckd	-.1379	54	.320
Df	.2551	54	.063
Fav	.4836*	54	.001
Unfav	-.2256	54	.101
S-Cfd	.3008*	54	.027
S-Cn	.2754*	54	.044
Lab	.2281	54	.097
Per Adj	.4023*	54	.003
Ach	.1602	54	.247
Dom	.2041	54	.139
End	.1587	54	.252
Ord	.1145	54	.410
Int	.1420	54	.306
Nur	.3841*	54	.004
Aff	.3961*	54	.003
Het	.3452*	54	.011
Exh	.0716	54	.607
Aut	-.1532	54	.269
Agg	-.0629	54	.651
Cha	.0641	54	.645
Suc	-.3231	54	.017
Aba	-.1072	54	.440
Def	.0275	54	.843
Crs	-.2180	54	.113

.2640 = Positive Correlation*

this analysis the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

In summary, the data for this study was collected fall term of 1977. The analysis procedures and results were reported in this chapter. The hypotheses were stated in the null and were treated by utilizing three statistical analyses. A .05 level of confidence was selected as the acceptable level of statistical significance.

An analysis of variance model with a two-tailed test of significance was utilized to analyze hypotheses I and III. An analysis of covariance model using the pre-test mean scores as a covariant with a two-tailed test of significance was utilized to analyze hypotheses II, IV, V, and VI. The third analysis was a test of correlation which was utilized to analyze hypothesis VII. All scores relating to the two instruments, Tennessee Self Concept Scale and the Adjective Check List, were used as a measure of self concept and college adjustment. In the testing of the correlation between the two instruments only the total P score on the TSCS was used.

The results relative to the testing of the seven hypotheses revealed the following:

There were no significant differences in self concept and college adjustment between Group I, Group II, and Group III at the beginning of fall term as measured by comparing mean scores on the TSCS and mean scores on the ACL.

There were no significant differences in change in self concept

and change in college adjustment after one quarter of college between Group I, Group II, and Group III as measured by comparing post test mean scores adjusted for pre-test scores on the TSCS and on the ACL.

There were no significant differences in change in self concept and change in college adjustment after one quarter of college between Group I and Group II as measured by comparing post test mean scores adjusted for pre test scores on the TSCS and on the ACL.

The correlation between change scores on the TSCS (P score) and the ACL did not show overall significance. However, seven scores had positive correlations at the .05 level of significance.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study was initiated out of concern for the development of non-traditional students attending Oregon State University (OSU) through the Educational Opportunities Program (EOP). The overall purpose of this study was one of determining the factors involved in EOP freshmen making a successful adjustment to the OSU campus environment and whether this adjustment could be accomplished early in the students' college career. More specifically, this study attempted to ascertain if EOP students entered OSU with a lower self concept compared to non-EOP students. Also, if EOP students residing in a special living situation which included academic classes, counseling service and tutorial assistance would achieve a more positive self concept and adjust faster to the OSU campus environment after one quarter of college compared to EOP students who were assigned to regular residence halls throughout campus.

During the middle 1960's the trend of educating only those students who could afford to attend college began to change. The United States Congress began to recognize and/or admit that there were unequal opportunities in the American society relative to

attaining a higher education among the financially disadvantaged. In 1964 Congress began appropriating funds to develop programs in higher education for the purpose of assisting financially disadvantaged students.

Educational Opportunities Programs came into existence in American higher educational institutions during the late 1960's. For the first time, many predominately white colleges and universities opened their doors to large numbers of financially disadvantaged and/or minority students. During the early developmental years many of these programs went through various changes to better meet the needs of their clientele. Some of these programs and students were successful and some were not so successful.

The Oregon State System colleges and universities experimented with programs for the disadvantaged in the late sixties. The current Educational Opportunities Program at Oregon State University was initiated in the Fall of 1968. The program provides many supportive services and is often used as a reference point on campus for many of its students. Several of the students in the program (especially those who earned less than a 2.50 grade point average in high school) go through a long transitional period and often do not do well academically until the end of the first year or the beginning of the second year. Many EOP students at OSU have difficulty making the necessary transition from the home and neighborhood environment to the college

environment.

Recently, the need to adjust to the college environment within a limited time by non-traditional students has become very important. The national economic situation is causing a tightening of universities' budgets which has brought about a reduction of resources and monies. Special programs are perceived by many in higher education as being "extras" and have a tendency to be affected first during economic difficulty. These programs were developed and implemented during an era when the economy was healthy and social concerns for equal educational opportunities were on the increase. Today, college administrators are forced to find ways to stretch shrinking budgets and are trimming the extras and/or special programs.

Reviewed literature relative to this study indicates that the most dominant influence on self concept was success or failure in past experiences. Because of failures in past educational experiences, many EOP students and/or disadvantaged students enter college with a poor self concept compared to their traditional counterparts. However, many special program and/or disadvantaged students can be successful in obtaining a college degree if experiences are provided to enhance their self concept early in the college career. Research appears to indicate that pre-college programs, supportive environments, and/or living in the college residence halls can provide those experiences necessary to enhance many students' self concepts.

Further research relating to student development in higher education indicates that many students are in a late adolescent period of development during the beginning of the college years and this period is very critical in relationship to continued positive growth. The early college years are when significant developmental changes most often occur.

The most recent research relating to student development suggests that students' initial characteristics when entering college will influence the impact of the college experience on student change. Also, other factors such as the type of college attended and the extent of involvement in the college environment will have an influence on student change. However, living in the residence halls appeared to be a dominant influence on student change.

Today, many colleges and universities have various types of living situations on their campuses. An extensive review of the literature revealed that no one type of residence hall or living situation could meet the needs of all students. Many findings indicate that some form of the living-learning concept was successful on many campuses and that these living-learning situations had the potential of meeting the needs of many students.

This study attempted to ascertain how living in a residence hall with a living-learning design effected EOP students. The subjects were classified as EOP and non-EOP students. They were male and

female freshman students who entered OSU fall term, 1977. They were nineteen years of age and younger, single, residing on campus, had graduated from high school within the previous academic year, and had no college experience prior to entering OSU. Group I, the experimental group, lived in a special living-learning residence hall which provided two courses taught in the hall, and tutorial and advising assistance.

The primary source of data was students' responses to the Tennessee Self Concept Scale and the Adjective Check List. The instruments were initially administered to the subjects during the first two weeks of fall term. The instruments were administered a second time during dead week of fall term, two weeks before the end of the term.

The data were analyzed using three statistical analyses. The .05 level of confidence was selected as the acceptable level of statistical significance. Hypotheses I and III were tested by a comparison of pre-test mean scores on the TSCS and on the ACL. The results were subjected to a two-tailed F test (analysis of variance). Hypotheses II, IV, V and VI were tested by examining differences in change on the TSCS and the ACL as measured by comparing post test mean scores adjusted for pre-test scores (analysis of covariance). Hypothesis VII was tested by a comparison of the total change on the TSCS and the ACL, utilizing a Pearson product moment correlation.

Conclusions

From the findings of this study the following conclusions and implications were drawn about the participants.

There were significant differences in two areas in self concept between Group I (Experimental), Group II (Control Group I), and Group III (Control Group II) at the beginning of fall term 1977. In addition to results from the F test which indicated two significant scores at the .05 level of significance (Table 1), the total Positive mean scores revealed observed differences among the three groups. This, though not significant, might indicate that non-EOP students enter OSU with a more positive self concept than EOP students.

It was concluded that while there were a few significant differences in change in self concept after one quarter of college among Group I, Group II, and Group III, there were not overall significant differences. The results from the F test (Table 2) revealed that four scores indicated significant differences at least at the .05 level of significance. Further analyses revealed that Group I (Experimental Group) had higher mean change scores including the total Positive score (the most important single score on the TSCS) compared to Group II (Control Group I) although they were not significant. An analysis of mean change scores also revealed that Group III (Control Group II) had higher mean change scores including the total Positive

score compared to Group I and Group II. These results (Appendix E) suggest that EOP students who participate in a special living situation when compared to EOP students who reside in regular residence halls might tend to have a more positive or less negative experience during the first quarter of college. These results also might indicate that when EOP students are compared to non-EOP students, non-EOP students appear to have a more positive or less negative experience during the first quarter of college because they have a more positive or less negative mean change score.

There were no overall significant differences in college adjustment between Group I, Group II, and Group III at the beginning of fall term. There were five scores (Lability, Heterosexuality, Exhibition, Aggression, and Deference) that were significantly different at the .05 level of significance (Table 3). The following are directions (high or low scores) and implications relative to the five significant scores:

- (1) Lability: Group II (EOP, Control Group I) scored the lowest mean score on this sub-score which indicates a need for more order and regularity compared to Group I and Group III. Group III (non-EOP, Control Group II) scored the highest mean score on this sub-score. A high score suggests an inability to tolerate consistency and routine.
- (2) Heterosexuality: Group II (EOP, Control Group I) scored the lowest mean score on this sub-score. A low scorer tends to be

disspirited, inhibited, and manipulative in interpersonal relationships. Group I (EOP Experimental Group) received the highest mean score on this sub-score. High scorers tend to be interested in experiencing most things around them in a healthy and outgoing manner.

(3) Exhibition: Group II (EOP, Control Group I) had the lowest mean score which indicates a lack of confidence and a tendency toward self-doubt in new situations.

(4) Aggression: Group II (EOP, Control Group I) received the lowest score on this sub-score which indicates a tendency to be a conformist, patiently diligent, and sincere in relationships with others. The highest mean score on this sub-score was received by Group III (non-EOP, Control Group II). A high score suggests a tendency to be competitive and aggressive.

(5) Deference: Group III (non-EOP, Control Group II) received the lowest score on this sub-score. A low score indicates a tendency to be more energetic, spontaneous, independent, and ambitious. Group I and Group II scored high on this sub-score. A high score suggests a tendency to be conscientious and dependable. The high score also suggests a tendency to be self-denying out of a preference for anonymity and freedom from stress and external demands.

Results revealed that there were five sub-scores which indicated significant differences in change in college adjustment after one quarter of college between Group I, Group II, and Group III. However,

there were no overall significant differences in college adjustment between the three groups after one quarter of college. The implications are that freshmen students, both EOP and non-EOP, adjust to the college environment basically at the same rate during the first quarter of college. Differences in campus living situations have little impact on how fast or to what degree students adjust to the college environment during the first term.

Over seventy-five percent of the students in this study scored lower on the post test than they scored on the pre-test. The majority of the mean change scores were in the negative direction for both the EOP and non-EOP students (Appendix E). This suggests that students' perceptions of the college experience upon entering are not consistent with what they experience during the first quarter. It is believed that when freshmen students score lower on the post test than on the pre test, they have had experiences that were negative or which lowered their self image.

In summary, it appears that EOP students have had experiences prior to entering college which have caused their self concept to be less positive in certain areas compared to non-EOP students. While experiences can be provided through a special living situation to enhance the self concept of EOP students the first quarter of college, with this particular group of students there were no significant overall changes. Non-EOP students when compared to EOP students

appear to enter college with more of the characteristics which will assist them in adjusting to the college environment. When non-EOP students' initial characteristics are taken into consideration, they adjust to the college environment basically at the same rate as EOP students during the first quarter. It appears that both EOP and non-EOP students' perceptions of the college experiences are not consistent with what they experience during the first quarter.

Recommendations

On the basis of the results obtained from this study the following recommendations are made:

1. Since some of the variables involved in this study were beyond the investigator's control, it is recommended that the study be repeated to determine the results from a larger sample over a longer period of time.
2. A follow-up study is recommended utilizing participants of this study for the purpose of examining changes in self concept and college adjustment at the end of the freshman year.
3. Research is recommended that would examine college bound seniors' perceptions of the college experience and ascertain what influence their perceptions would have on their adjustment to the college environment the first year.
4. Current research has indicated that residing in the campus

residence halls has a dominant influence on student change.

Additional research should be conducted involving EOP students to examine the types of residence halls that have the most impact on change.

5. It is recommended that this study be repeated by Educational Opportunities Programs at other colleges and universities in order to ascertain if the findings in this study would be consistent with their findings.
6. Current findings have indicated that EOP students' success in college is related to a positive self concept. It is highly recommended that additional research be conducted to determine if other types of experiences can enhance the students' self concept.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackley, Sheldon. "To Overcome Discrimination Now." Current. 129:35-8, May, 1971.

Adams, Donald V. Living and Learning Centers. In O. R. Herron (Ed) New Dimensions in Student Personnel Administration. Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Textbook Company, 1970.

_____ Residential Learning Opportunities. In David A. Decoster and Phyllis Mable (Eds.) Student Development and Education in College Residence Halls. Washington, D. C.: American College Personnel Association, 1974.

Alfert, Elizabeth and Suczek, Robert F., "Personality Development and Cultural Change," The Journal of Higher Education, January, 1971.

Allen, James G., Collins, Bessie B., Gee, Chuck Y., and Nudd, T. Roger, "Coeducational Residence Halls." Journal of College Student Personnel, December, 1964.

Ashcraft, Carolyn and Fitts, W. H. "Self-Concept Change in Psychotherapy." Psychotherapy. 1(3):115-118, 1964.

Aspy, David N., "Better Self Concepts Through Success," Journal of Negro Education. 40:369-72, 1971.

Astin, Alexander W. Four Critical Years. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977.

_____ "Open Admission and Programs for the Disadvantaged." Journal of Higher Education. 42:629-647, 1971.

_____ Preventing Students from Dropping Out. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1975.

Astin, Alexander W. and Panos, Robert J. The Educational and Vocational Development of College Students. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1969.

Beal, P. E. and Williams, D. A. "An Experiment with Mixed-Class Housing Assignments at the University of Oregon." Student Housing Research, Acuh Research and Information Committee, February, 1968.

Bischof, L. J. Interpreting Personality Theories. 2nd Ed. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1970.

Blanton, Wincie L., Peck, Robert F. and Greer, Jane. "Operation Knowledge": A New Approach to Academic Excellence," Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, Spring 1964.

Bowlin, Robert. "An Investigation of the Influence of a Summer Orientation and Counseling Program for Entering Freshmen Whose Predicted Grade Point Average at the University of Oregon is less than 2.00." Doctoral dissertation. Eugene, University of Oregon, 1971.

Brown, R. D. "Manipulation of the Environmental Press in a College Residence Hall." Personnel and Guidance Journal, 46:555-60, 1968.

✓ _____ "Student Development in an Experimental College, or I May Have Seen a Unicorn." Journal of College Student Personnel, 13:3, May, 1972.

✓ _____ "Student Development in Tomorrow's Higher Education: A Return to the Academy," Washington, D. C.: The American Personnel and Guidance Association. 1972.

Brown, R. D., Winkworth, J. and Braskamp, L. "Student Development in a Coed Residence Hall: Promiscuity, Prophylactic, or Panacea?" Journal of College Student Personnel. 14:98-104, 1973.

Broxton, J. A. "A Method of Predicting Roommate Compatibility for College Freshmen." Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors. 25:169-174, 1962.

Cairns, George. "Evaluation of Youth-Tutor Project." Atlanta, Atlanta Georgia Research and Development Report. 5:26, 1971.

Centra, John A., "Student Perceptions of Residence Hall Environments: Living-Learning vs. Conventional Units," The Journal of College Student Personnel, 9(4):266-272, July, 1968.

Chesin, S. E. "Effects of Differential Housing on Attitudes and Values." College Student Survey. 3:62-66, 1969.

Chickering, Arthur W. Commuting Versus Resident Students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1974.

_____. Education and Identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1972.

Combs, Arthur. "Intelligence From a Perceptual Point of View." Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1959.

Combs, Arthur and D. Snygg. Individual Behavior: A Perceptual Approach. (Rev. ed.) New York: Harpers, 1959.

Cooley, C. H. Human Nature and the Social Order. New York: Scribner's, 1902.

Coopersmith, S. The Antecedents of Self Esteem. San Francisco: Freeman, 1967.

Corbett, Judith and Sommer, Robert. "Anatomy of a Coed Residence Hall," Journal of College Student Personnel, May, 1972.

Crew, John L. and Giblette, John F., "Academic Performance of Freshman Males as a Function of Residence Hall Housing," The Journal of College Student Personnel, March, 1965.

Crossland, F. E. Minority Access to College. Review in Harvard Educational Review, 43 (Nov) 1971.

Dales, Ruth J. and Keller, James F. "Self Concept Scores Among Black and White Culturally Deprived Adolescent Males," Journal of Negro Education. 41:31-34, 1972.

Decoster, D. A. "Housing Assignments for High Ability Students." Journal of College Student Personnel, 7:19-22, 1966.

_____. "Effects of Homogeneous Housing Assignments for High Ability Students." Journal of College Student Personnel, 9:75-78, 1968.

Deutsch, Martin and Associates. The Disadvantaged Child. New York: Basic Books Inc., 1967.

- Dispenzieri, Angelo. "An Overview of Longitudinal Findings on a Special College Program for Disadvantaged Students." A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, N. Y., Feb., 1971.
- Donohue, William R. "Student Perceptions of Their Environment in Two Residence Hall Areas in Uni-Sexual to Co-Educational Transition," The Journal of College and University Student Housing, 3(1):7-10, January, 1973.
- Dugmore, Owen and Grant, Claude W. "Effects of Cluster Registration of College Freshmen," The Journal of College Student Personnel, May, 1970.
- Dyson, Ernest. "A Study of the Relationships Between Acceptance of Self, Academic Self-Concept, and Two Types of Grouping Procedures Used With Seventh Grade Pupils." Doctoral Dissertation. (Abstracted in Dissertation Abstracts, Education 1475) 1965.
- Ebbers, Larry H. and Stoner, Kenneth L. "Lorch House: Innovation in Residence Living." The Journal of College and University Student Housing. July, 1972.
- Eberly, C. G. and Cech, E. J. "Residence Hall Program and Perception of University Environment." College Student Survey. 2 Winter: 65-70, 1968.
- Edwards, A. L. Manual-Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. New York: The Psychological Corp., 1954.
- Egerton, John. "Higher Education for 'High-Risk' Students." Southern Education Foundation, Atlanta, Georgia, 1968.
- _____. "The White Sea of Higher Education. The Minority Student on the Campus: Expectations and Possibilities." Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1970.
- Elton, C. F. and Bate, W. S. "The Effects of Housing Policy on Grade-Point Average." Journal of College Student Personnel, 2:65-70, 1966.
- Erikson, Eric. Childhood and Society, New York: Norton, 1950.

- Farrell, Patty. "Student Services Cut for Minorities." Oregon Daily Emerald. 77(126):1, April 7, 1976.
- Feldman, K. A. "Research Strategies in Studying College Impact." Act Research Report No. 34, The American College Testing Program, 1970.
- Fitts, William H. Tennessee Self Concept Scale (Manual), Nashville, Tennessee: Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1965.
- Fitts, William, J. L. Radford, W. C. Richard, B. K. Thomas, M. M. Thomas, W. Thompson. The Self Concept and Self Actualization. Nashville, Tennessee: Dede Wallace Center Monograph, 3:14, 1971.
- Freedman, Mervin B. "Personality Growth in the College Years." College Board Review. 56:25-32, 1965.
- Frerichs, Allen H. "Relationship of Self-Esteem of the Disadvantaged to School Success." Journal of Negro Education, 40:117-120, 1971.
- Gehring, Donald D. "Prediction of Roommate Compatibility." The Journal of College Student Personnel, January, 1970.
- Gividen, G. M. "Stress in Airborne Training as Related to the Self-Concept, Motivation and Biographical Factors." Unpublished Masters Thesis, Vanderbilt University, 1959.
- Gough, H. G. Manual for the California Psychological Inventory. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1957. (Revised 1969).
- Gough, Harrison G. and Heilbrun, Jr., Alfred B. The Adjective Check List (Manual). Palo Alto, Calif.: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1971.
- Grant, W. Harold and Eigenbrod Jr., Frederick. "Behaviorial Changes Influenced by Structured Peer Group Activities." Journal of College Student Personnel, 10-11:291-95, July 1970.
- Greenleaf, E. A. "Co-Educational Residence Halls: An Evaluation." National Association of Women Deans and Counselors Journal, 25:51-57, 1962.

Hall, Robert L. and Willerman, Ben. "The Educational Influence of Dormitory Roommates." Sociometry, 1963.

Hardt, David and Hunt, Robert. "The Effects of Upward Bound Programs on the Attitudes, Motivation, and Academic Achievement of Negro Students." Journal of Social Issues, 25(3), 1969.

Havighurst, Robert and Thomas Moorefield. "The Disadvantaged in Industrial Cities." In: P. S. Witty (Ed.) The Educationally Retarded and Disadvantaged. Sixty-sixth Yearbook Part I. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1967.

Herron, Orley R. New Dimensions in Student Personnel Administration. Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Textbook Company, 1970.

Herskovitz, F. S. "The Effects of an Educational-Vocational Rehabilitation Program Upon the Self Concept of Disadvantaged Youth." Doctoral Dissertation. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania, 1969.

Herson, P. F. "Assessment of Changes in Achievement Motivation Among Upward Bound Participants at the University of Maryland." Journal of Negro Education, 37(4):383-91, 1968.

Hunt, David and Robert Hardt. "The Effect of Upward Bound Programs on the Attitudes, Motivation and Academic Achievement of Negro Students." Journal of Social Issues. 25:117-129, 1969.

Jensema, Carl and Lunneborg, Clifford. "Preliminary Investigation of a Special Education Program for Minority Group University Students." Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance, 3(2):326-331, 1972.

Jersild, A. T. Child Psychology. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1960.

Kinch, John. "A Formalized Theory of the Self Concept." Journal of Sociology. 68:481-486, 1963.

Klingelhofer, E. L. and Longacre, Brenda J. "A Case in Point - Educational Opportunity Programs." The Research Reporter, 7:3, 1972.

- Larsen, Suzanne W. and Montgomery, James R. "A Study of Cluster Grouping." The Journal of Experimental Education, 37:4, 1969.
- Lecky, Prescott. Self Consistency, A Theory of Personality. Edited by Dr. John F. A. Taylor. New York: Island Press, 1945.
- Levy, L. "The Meaning and Generality of Perceived Actual-Ideal Discrepancies." Journal of Consulting Psychology, 20:396-398, 1956.
- Leyden, Ralph C. "The Stephens College House Plan." Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 25 January 1962.
- Lipton, Aaron. "Cultural Heritage and the Relationship to Self-Esteem." The Journal of Educational Sociology, 1963.
- Long, Barbara H. and Henderson, Edmund H. "Self-Social Concepts of Disadvantaged School Beginners." The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 113:41-51, 1968.
- Lozier, G. Gregory. "Compatibility of Roommates Assigned Alphabetically Versus Those Assigned According to Educational Goals or Extracurricular Plans." The Journal of College Student Personnel, July, 1970.
- Lynch, Ann. "Perception of Peer Leadership Influence." Journal of College Student Personnel, 11:3:203-205, 1970.
- Lynch, Robert C. "Coed Dorms are Happier Places." College Management, 6:6, June, 1971.
- Magarrell, Jack. "CUNY Board Approves Mergers, End to Open Admissions." Chronicle of Higher Education. 12 April, 1976.
- May, Eugene P. "Type of Housing and Achievement of Disadvantaged University Students." College Student Journal, 8:2, April-May 1974.
- ✓ Mead, G. H. Mind, Self and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.
- Miller, Theodore K. and Prince, Judith S. The Future of Student Affairs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1976.

Nuttall, Ronald L. Do the Factors Affecting Academic Achievement Differ by the Socio-Economic Status or Sex of the Student? Final Report. Puerto Rico, June, 1972.

O'Brien, Gail M. "Students Occupy Office, Picket Buildings at SUNY." Chronicle of Higher Education. 12 April, 1976.

Olsen, Henry. "Effects of Changes in Academic Roles on Self-Concept-of-Academic Ability of Black and White Compensatory Education Students." Journal of Negro Education, 41:365-68, 1972.

"The Effect of Compensatory Education Upon the Self-Concept-of-Academic Ability of Black and White Pre-College Students." Dissertation Abstracts Inter., 32 (3-A) 1971.

Olson, Leroy A. "Living-Learning Units, As Seen by the Faculty." Journal of Higher Education, 35:2, February, 1964.

Pace, Theron. "Roommate Dissatisfaction in Residence Halls." The Journal of College Student Personnel, March, 1970.

Paschal, Billy and R. H. Williams. "Some Effects of Participation in a Summer Upward Bound Program on the Self Concept and Attitudes of the Disadvantaged Adolescent." Journal of Negro Education, 39:34-45, 1970.

Pearson, Kenneth V. "The Effect of the Upward Bound Project on Selected Factors of Pupil Growth of a Group of High School Students." Doctoral Dissertation: University of Tennessee. (Abstracted in Dissertation Abstracts, Education 3283-A) 1969.

Peterson, Carl D. "The Development and Achievement of Equal Opportunity Program Students." Journal of College Student Personnel, 14:1, January, 1973.

Powell, Evan R. and White, William F. "Affect Structure and Achievement in a Select Sample of Rural Negro Children." Journal of Negro Education, 41:53-56, 1972.

Rogers, Carl. Client-Centered Therapy. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1951.

- Rosenberg, Morris. Society and the Adolescent Self-Image. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1965.
- Rosenthal, Robert Alan. Pathways to Identity: Aspects of the Experience of Black Youth. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1971.
- Sanford, Nevitt. Where Colleges Fail. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1967.
- Schoemer, J. R. and McConnell, W. A. "Is There a Case for the Freshman Women's Residence Hall?" Personnel and Guidance Journal, 49:35-40, 1970.
- Schroeder, C. C. and LeMay, M. L. "The Impact of Coed Residence Halls on Self-Actualization." Journal of College Student Personnel, 14:105-110, 1973.
- Schroeder, Charles C. and Wills, Byron S. "An Attempt to Use a Measure of Self-Actualization in the Selection of Resident Assistants." The Journal of College and University Student Housing, 3:1, January, 1973.
- Selby, James E. "Relationships Existing Among Race, Student Financial Aid, and Persistence in College." Journal of College Student Personnel, 14:1, January, 1973.
- Shaffer, Phyllis E. "Academic Progress of Disadvantaged Minority Students: A Two Year Study." Journal of College Student Personnel, 14:1, January, 1973.
- Siegel, A. E. and Siegel, S. "Reference Groups, Membership Groups, and Attitude Change." Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1957.
- Soares, Anthony T. and Soares, Louise M. "Self Perception of Culturally Disadvantaged Children." American Educational Research Journal, 6:5, January, 1969.
- Sullivan, Harry Stack. The Interpersonal Theory of Psychology. New York: Norton, 1953.
- Summerskill, John. "Dropouts From College" in Nevitt Sanford (Ed.), The American College. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.

- Symonds, P. M. The Ego and the Self, New York: Appleton Century Crofts, Inc., 1951.
- Tannebaum, Abraham J. "Social and Psychological Consideration in the Study of the Socially Disadvantaged." Journal of Education. 3:40-63, 1967.
- Taylor, D. M. "Consistency of Self Concept." Doctoral Dissertation, Nashville: Vanderbilt University, 1953.
- Taylor, R. G. "Experimental Housing and Tutoring: Effects on Achievement and Attrition." Journal of College Student Personnel. 12(4):271-8, 1971.
- Taylor, R. G. and Hanson, G. R. "Environmental Impact on Achievement and Study Habits." The Journal of College Student Personnel. 12:6, Nov, 1971.
- Thompson, Warren. Correlates of the Self Concept. Nashville: Dede Wallace Center Monograph, 6:92, 1972.
- Thorsen, K. "Co-Ed Dorms, An Intimate Revolution in Campus Life; Oberlin College, Ohio, With Report." Life, 69:21, November 20, 1970.
- Toupin, Elizabeth and Luria, Zella. "Coed Housing: A Conflict for Black Parents?" Journal of College Student Personnel, September, 1975.
- Volkwein, J. F. "Freshmen Roommates: Random vs Matched Pairs." Journal of College Student Personnel, 7:145-46, 1966.
- White, Francine and White, James R. "A Study of Bisexual Relationships Developed by Residents of a Coed Living Arrangement." The Journal of College and University Student Housing, 3:2, Fall, 1973.
- Williams, Robert. "What Are We Learning From Current Programs for Disadvantaged Students?" Journal of Higher Education, XL(4):274-85, 1969.
- Williams, Robert and Cole, Spurgeon. "Self Concept and School Adjustment." Personnel and Guidance Journal, 46:1, 1967-1968.

Wills, Dr. Vernon L. "Living and Learning: A Program to Reduce Alienation." School and Community, 57:8, April, 1971.

Wilson, Ralph. "The Effects of Special Tutoring and Counseling on the Academic Success of Negro Freshmen at Southern State College." Doctoral Dissertation. (Abstracted in Dissertation Abstracts, Special Education 2765-AA) 1970.

Witty, Paul A. "The Educationally Retarded and Disadvantaged." The Sixty-Sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, 1967.

Ziller, R., Hagey, J., Smith, D. C. and Long, B. H. "Self Esteem: A Self-Social Construct." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 13(1):84-95, 1969.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Dear Applicant,

I am pleased to inform you that your application for admission to the Educational Opportunities Program (EOP) at Oregon State University has been reviewed and accepted by the EOP Admissions Committee. Your application has now gone to the OSU Admissions Office for further processing. They will notify you regarding your admission to the University in the near future.

At this time, our office is making plans for housing next fall. As you may know, the University has a policy requiring all single freshmen students who matriculate into the University within one year of high school graduation to live in University housing. Starting next fall, EOP freshmen will have a chance to live together in one residence hall. The EOP, in conjunction with the OSU Housing Office, has provided two floors (Sackett B-C) for freshmen EOP students (one floor for females and one floor for males). These students also will take two college introductory classes as a group and these classes will be taught in the residence hall. This means that EOP freshmen will be given a choice of living together in one residence hall, rather than being spread throughout campus in different residence halls.

The EOP staff feels most college freshmen usually experience problems adjusting to college life. We also feel that students' housing arrangements affect in part how fast students overcome those initial fears and concerns about attending college and how well students succeed in college their first year. The purpose for creating special floors in one residence hall for EOP freshmen is to minimize as much as possible those problems freshmen students have in adjusting to college life.

Although all EOP freshmen are strongly encouraged to participate in our special floors, you do have a choice. I have enclosed a housing packet. This packet contains: A) housing contract information, B) a letter from Mr. Edward Bryan, Director of Housing, explaining residence hall room and board rates and a contract completion guide, C) a contract, D) a notice about your first housing payment, and E) a form for you to indicate whether you will participate in the special group living situation. I have also enclosed an addressed envelope for you to return your completed contract and form.

As you will notice on the housing contract, the first hall preference has been marked 04-Sackett. Indicate your 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th preferences on the contract. Also indicate on the EOP housing form whether you would or would not like to participate in the special living group situation, then you will be assigned to Sackett B or C, provided there is space available. If you indicate that you would not like to participate in the EOP special living group experience, then you will be assigned to your 2nd, 3rd, 4th or 5th residence hall preference. Please return contract and EOP housing form in the self-addressed envelope within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this letter.

If you have any questions or concerns about your housing for next fall, please do not hesitate to write or phone me.

Sincerely yours,

Lawrence F. Griggs
Financial Aid/Admissions Coordinator
Educational Opportunities Program
Oregon State University

APPENDIX B

TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE

INSTRUCTIONS

On the top line of the separate answer sheet, fill in your name and the other information except for the time information in the last three boxes. You will fill these boxes in later. Write only on the answer sheet. Do not put any marks in this booklet.

The statements in this booklet are to help you describe yourself as you see yourself. Please respond to them as if you were describing yourself to yourself. Do not omit any item! Read each statement carefully; then select one of the five responses listed below. On your answer sheet, put a circle around the response you chose. If you want to change an answer after you have circled it, do not erase it but put an X mark through the response and then circle the response you want.

When you are ready to start, find the box on your answer sheet marked time started and record the time. When you are finished, record the time finished in the box on your answer sheet marked time finished.

As you start, be sure that your answer sheet and this booklet are lined up evenly so that the item numbers match each other.

Remember, put a circle around the response number you have chosen for each statement.

Responses-	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and Partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
	1	2	3	4	5

You will find these response numbers repeated at the bottom of each page to help you remember them.

Page 1

Item
No.

1.	I have a healthy body.	1
3.	I am an attractive person	3
5.	I consider myself a sloppy person	5
19.	I am a decent sort of person.	19
21.	I am an honest person	21
23.	I am a bad person	23
37.	I am a cheerful person	37
39.	I am a calm and easy going person	39
41.	I am a nobody	41
55.	I have a family that would always help me in any kind of trouble	55
57.	I am a member of a happy family	57
59.	My friends have no confidence in me	59
73.	I am a friendly person	73
75.	I am popular with men	75
77.	I am not interested in what other people do	77
91.	I do not always tell the truth	91
93.	I get angry sometimes	93

Page 2

2.	I like to look nice and neat all the time	2
4.	I am full of aches and pains	4
6.	I am a sick person	6
20.	I am a religious person	20
22.	I am a moral failure	22
24.	I am a morally weak person	24
38.	I have a lot of self-control	38
40.	I am a hateful person	40
42.	I am losing my mind	42
56.	I am an important person to my friends and family	56
58.	I am not loved by my family	58
60.	I feel that my family doesn't trust me	60
74.	I am popular with women	74
76.	I am mad at the whole world	76
78.	I am hard to be friendly with	78
92.	Once in a while I think of things too bad to talk about	92
94.	Sometimes, when I am not feeling well, I am cross	94

Responses-	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and Partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
	1	2	3	4	5

Page 3

Item
No.

7.	I am neither too fat nor too thin	7
9.	I like my looks just the way they are	9
11.	I would like to change some parts of my body	11
25.	I am satisfied with my moral behavior	25
27.	I am satisfied with my relationship to God	27
29.	I ought to go to church more	29
43.	I am satisfied to be just what I am	43
45.	I am just as nice as I should be	45
47.	I despise myself	47
61.	I am satisfied with my family relationships	61
63.	I understand my family as well as I should	63
65.	I should trust my family more	65
79.	I am as sociable as I want to be	79
81.	I try to please others, but I don't overdo it	81
83.	I am no good at all from a social standpoint	83
95.	I do not like everyone I know	95
97.	Once in a while, I laugh at a dirty joke	97

Page 4

8.	I am neither too tall nor too short	8
10.	I don't feel as well as I should	10
12.	I should have more sex appeal	12
26.	I am as religious as I want to be	26
28.	I wish I could be more trustworthy	28
30.	I shouldn't tell so many lies	30
44.	I am as smart as I want to be	44
46.	I am not the person I would like to be	46
48.	I wish I didn't give up as easily as I do	48
62.	I treat my parents as well as I should (Use past tense if parents are not living)	62
64.	I am too sensitive to things my family say	64
66.	I should love my family more	66
80.	I am satisfied with the way I treat other people	84
96.	I gossip a little at times	96
98.	At times I feel like swearing	98

Responses-	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and Partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
	1	2	3	4	5

Page 5 Item
 No.

13.	I take good care of myself physically	13
15.	I try to be careful about my appearance	15
17.	I often act like I am "all thumbs"	17
31.	I am true to my religion in my everyday life	31
33.	I try to change when I know I'm doing things that are wrong	33
35.	I sometimes do very bad things	35
49.	I can always take care of myself in any situation	49
51.	I take the blame for things without getting mad	51
53.	I do things without thinking about them first	53
67.	I try to play fair with my friends and family	67
69.	I take a real interest in my family	69
71.	I give in to my parents. (Use past tense if parents are not living)	71
85.	I try to understand the other fellow's point of view	85
87.	I get along well with other people	87
89.	I do not forgive others easily	89
99.	I would rather win than lose in a game	99

Page 6

14.	I feel good most of the time	14
16.	I do poorly in sports and games	16
18.	I am a poor sleeper	18
32.	I do what is right most of the time	32
34.	I sometimes use unfair means to get ahead	34
36.	I have trouble doing the things that are right	36
50.	I solve my problems quite easily	50
52.	I change my mind a lot	52
54.	I try to run away from my problems	54
68.	I do my share of work at home	68
70.	I quarrel with my family	70
72.	I do not act like my family thinks I should	72
86.	I see good points in all the people I meet	86
88.	I do not feel at ease with other people	88
90.	I find it hard to talk with strangers	90
100.	Once in a while I put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today	100

Responses-	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and Partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
------------	---------------------	-----------------	------------------------------------	----------------	--------------------

1

2

3

4

5

PLEASE NOTE:

Pages 144-149," The Adjective Check
List", copyright 1952 by Harrison
G. Gough, not photographed at request
of author. Available for consultation
at the library of Oregon State University.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS INTERNATIONAL

The Adjective Check List

by

HARRISON G. GOUGH, Ph.D.

University of California (Berkeley)

Name Age Sex

Date Other

DIRECTIONS: This booklet contains a list of adjectives. Please read them quickly and put an **X** in the box beside each one you would consider to be self-descriptive. Do not worry about duplications, contradictions, and so forth. Work quickly and do not spend too much time on any one adjective. Try to be frank, and check those adjectives which describe you as you really are, not as you would like to be.



CONSULTING PSYCHOLOGISTS PRESS

577 College Ave., Palo Alto, Calif.

Copyright 1952 by Harrison G. Gough

APPENDIX D

Means, Standard Deviations, and Reliability Coefficients

Tennessee Self Concept Scale

Subscore	Mean	Standard Deviation	Reliability
Self Criticism	35.54	6.70	.75
Row 1	127.10	9.96	.91
Row 2	103.67	13.79	.88
Row 3	115.01	11.22	.88
Column A	71.78	7.67	.87
Column B	70.33	8.70	.80
Column C	64.55	7.41	.85
Column D	70.83	8.43	.89
Column E	68.14	7.86	.90
Total Variability	48.53	12.42	.67
Column Total V	29.03	9.12	.73
Row Total V	19.60	5.76	.60
Total Positive	345.57	30.70	.92

APPENDIX E

A comparison of change in self concept between Group I (N=13), Group II (N=10), and Group III (N=31) after one quarter of college as measured by the TSCS.

Scores	Group	\bar{d}	Significance of F
Identity	1	-5.59	.053
	2	-6.75	
	3	-.02	
Self Satisfaction	1	-2.19	.863
	2	-.13	
	3	-.48	
Behavior	1	-1.52	.927
	2	-2.52	
	3	-1.38	
Physical Self	1	-1.45	.944
	2	-.98	
	3	-.82	
Moral-Ethical Self	1	-2.21	.402
	2	-3.13	
	3	-.57	
Personal Self	1	-1.78	.899
	2	-2.47	
	3	-1.38	
Family Self	1	-.63	.929
	2	.21	
	3	-.60	
Social Self	1	-2.98	.171
	2	-2.55	
	3	.31	
Total Positive	1	-8.19	.772
	2	-8.59	
	3	-3.99	
Self Criticism	1	-1.50	.575
	2	.14	
	3	-1.83	
Total Variability	1	-2.98	.003
	2	-2.55	
	3	.31	
Column Variability	1	-4.44	.007
	2	-8.31	
	3	.39	
Raw Variability	1	.07	.030
	2	-4.70	
	3	.18	
Distribution	1	-.89	.023
	2	-11.95	
	3	4.34	

\bar{d} = pre/post mean difference

APPENDIX F

A comparison of change in college adjustment between Group 1 (N=13), Group 11 (N=10) and Group 111 (N=31) after one quarter of college as measured by the ACL.

Scores	Group	\bar{d}	Significance of F
NO CKd	1	-5.21	.267
	2	-.28	
	3	-1.86	
Df	1	-1.03	.984
	2	-1.15	
	3	-.73	
Fav	1	-4.00	.415
	2	-.44	
	3	-.79	
Unfav	1	-1.11	.808
	2	.74	
	3	.02	
S-Cfd	1	-2.81	.863
	2	-2.35	
	3	-1.66	
S-Cn	1	-2.24	.948
	2	-2.55	
	3	-1.82	
Lab	1	-3.65	.145
	2	.37	
	3	1.17	
Per Adj	1	-2.21	.506
	2	-.62	
	3	.40	
Ach	1	-4.67	.158
	2	-.74	
	3	-.20	
Dom	1	-.93	.866
	2	-.05	
	3	-1.78	
End	1	-1.65	.983
	2	-1.21	
	3	-1.61	
Ord	1	-1.12	.319
	2	2.04	
	3	-1.03	
Int	1	-3.38	.355
	2	-.51	
	3	-.06	
Nur	1	-3.32	.860
	2	-3.92	
	3	-2.59	
Aff	1	-4.65	.582
	2	-1.07	
	3	-1.02	