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INTRODUCTION

Background of Project

The role identity of the college and university counseling center has been in a state of evolution for the past few years and a reconceptualized role for the college and university counselor is beginning to emerge. This evolution is the result of rapid change taking place within society and in higher education. In recent research such authors as Morrill and Oetting (1970) have noted that the programs of counseling centers in the colleges and universities are not changing along with the rest of the college environment today and programs are thus becoming more and more outdated and irrelevant. Along with other facets of institutions of higher learning, the college counseling center is going to be evaluated as to relevance for today's education. It is simply getting more and more difficult to justify a counselor spending his day in his office dealing with students on a one-to-one remedial basis. In addition, we have had substantial increases nationally in terms of the number of students per counselor. This alone makes it necessary to reevaluate the role of the counselor and of the counseling center. Much of the current research suggests that the counselor assume a preventative and developmental role aimed at both students and the institution itself. In fact, there is now considerable evidence that many counseling centers have become dissatisfied with the traditional remedial role and are now adopting an orientation that places more

In February of 1971 this writer applied to the Counseling Center at Colorado State University for the opportunity of having the Weber State College Counseling Center participate in a National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) study. The study was designed to encourage counseling centers to develop relevant counseling services, which would hopefully later serve as a model for other colleges of our particular size and structure. Notification was subsequently made that we had been accepted to participate in the NIMH Outreach Project. This writer was designated as Project Director. Weber State College was one of nine centers named nationally as an experimental group, while three other centers were named as control groups.

Outreach Philosophy

Most traditional counseling has as its focus of intervention the individual student. Furthermore, the time of intervention is typically after a problem has developed or during a crisis situation. In addition, the type or method of intervention is typically direct, that is with the student himself. This writer has tended to reject this particular type of intervention as the only way of working through the mental health environment of a college institution. For example, it is believed to be possible to intervene with the students' primary or associational groups or even with the institution itself. And it is also believed that
there are preventative interventions that may occur before a problem develops and even developmental interventions which have both a present and future orientation which do not involve a problem orientation. It is also believed that the intervention may be indirect; that is, through the consultation or training of others who deal with the student. Although many professionals have carried on outreach type activities, only recently has a model for this type of intervention been developed which tends to describe and categorize these interventions in a systematic and meaningful way. (See Figure 1). Morrill, Oetting, and Hurst (1971) have provided a readily useable model describing the preventative and developmental dimensions of counseling intervention as well as the traditional remedial aspect.

Project Overview

The first phase of this project was a thorough review of the literature, as to the national status of college and university counseling programs and how they relate, if at all, to current student needs. This phase was accomplished by the grant directors at Colorado State University.

The second phase of the Outreach Project involved a detailed assessment of the nature and scope of the Weber State College Counseling Center services as they are provided at this time. Dr. Clyde Parker of the University of Minnesota, acting as a consultant to the NIH Outreach Project, completed this phase by an on-site visit and through randomly sampling faculty, administration, and students with a Q-sort on various perceptions of current Counseling Center practices.
I. Time of Intervention

1. The focus of the intervention referring to the possibility of intervening with the individual, his primary or associational groups, or the institutional or societal groups that influence his behavior.

2. The time of the intervention referring to interventions of a remedial nature occurring after a problem has developed, those of a preventative nature occurring before the problem has occurred and those of a developmental nature having both a present and future orientation and not involving a problem orientation.

3. The type or method of intervention, whether direct or indirect. That is, whether the counselor is directly involved in initiating or doing the intervention or if he is indirectly involved through consultation or training of others or through the use of media.

Figure 1. Outreach Model
The third phase of the project involved research and review of the literature to identify our local Outreach Project, then implementing and evaluating the program on the Weber State College campus.

The fourth phase of the project involved a post-assessment of the program and Counseling Center by Dr. Clyde Parker, again through an on-site visit and the administration of a Q-sort to faculty, administration and students.

It is the third phase of the NIMH Outreach Project that is encompassed by this thesis.

**Institutional Background**

A brief description of the institution is given here to assist the reader in understanding the setting in which the study was conducted.

Weber State College was founded in Ogden, Utah as Weber State Academy on January 7, 1889. The 1933 Utah Legislature established Weber as a state junior college and placed it under the control of the State Board of Education. The 1959 Utah Legislature authorized the addition of upper division courses which resulted in the first junior class in 1962-63 and the first senior class in 1963-64. When the school opened on January 7, 1889, a total of 98 students appeared before two instructors. Today, 355 faculty members instruct more than 10,000 students in a wide variety of subjects.

Weber State College is basically a community college, with approximately 90 percent of its students coming from a commuter population within a geographical radius of some 50 miles. As a four-year state institution, Weber State College cooperates with the people of the
surrounding community in ascertaining their educational needs for professional, vocational, and cultural education and training, and organizes programs to meet those needs in the following areas:

1. Academic and vocational curriculums meeting baccalaureate degree requirements.

2. One and two year curriculums in the vocations preparing students for positions in business and industry upon completion of required courses.

3. An adult program organized primarily for personal improvement and occupational efficiency.

4. To provide a counseling program to guide students in the major fields compatible with their aptitudes and interests and also with occupational opportunities.

As a community college and public institution, any high school or GED graduate within the state may be admitted to Weber State College. In addition, Weber State College is in very close proximity to two major universities in the state. These factors, together with the broad spectrum of educational opportunities at Weber State College ranging all the way from six weeks of vocational training through the baccalaureate program, brings together a studentbody with a wide range of academic ability including opportunities for a large number of marginal students.

Program Selection

An institutional research program was conducted in cooperation with the American College Testing Program (ACT) covering such areas as instruction, college policy, student personnel services, registration
orientation, library services, and others in order to evaluate areas of concern or need. The ACT Institutional Self-Study instrument (ISS) as a research tool was very compatible with our own research objectives. The ISS is a specially designed questionnaire consisting of 247 items. The three stated objectives of ACT in formulating and validating this instrument were to (1) enable an institution to see itself through the eyes of the student, (2) to aid in the appraisal of college students' development, and (3) to help the institution to observe and explore longitudinal trends in student development and opinions on campus. Another factor which had a bearing on the decision to use the ISS was the availability of a data baseline which had resulted from the participation of Weber State College with ACT in the norming of the ISS in 1968. By using the ISS again in 1971 we were enabled to assess the present situation locally in relation to national norms and we were also able to provide a longitudinal comparison over a period of some three years to measure the change in student attitude and perceptions, again with both local and national norms. In addition, a questionnaire was used consisting of locally-designed items, specifically on Counseling Center services. These two questionnaires were administered to a randomly selected sample of 600 sophomore, junior, and senior students. At the same time a student steering committee set out independently to identify their number one priority for the attention of the Outreach Program. The ISS research data and Counseling Center questionnaire and the student steering committee identified freshman orientation and academic/career planning as the primary concerns of students on the campus. The research from the Counseling Center and student committee indicated that efforts
in these areas on the part of the college were far from adequate in meeting student needs. These areas appeared to be surrounded by a great deal of frustration and disappointment on the part of students. Based on subjective feelings, it was the consensus of the Counseling Center staff and the student steering committee that the ISS had been rather sensitive in identifying the areas of concern.

Program Implementation

The data from the pre-program evaluation had thus identified freshman orientation and career planning as the two primary concerns of students on the Weber State College campus. Orientation and career planning fit the following dimensions of the Outreach model: (1) the individual student as the focus of intervention, (2) the time of intervention as developmental, and (3) the method of intervention as direct. A project was subsequently developed which utilized these specific dimensions of the Outreach model. The two general goals were to first, personalize orientation and make the students' entrance into the system more fluid and personally satisfying, and to "teach the system and how to cope with it" in a practical way; and secondly, to introduce a decision-making model in order to enable students to determine feasible choices for majors and careers and to facilitate a long-range plan for attainment of these goals.
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Orientation treatments vary a great deal as to the programs, philosophy, a multiplicity of goals, and the way in which these programs are implemented. This great variety leads to a number of apparent contradictions in the alleged value and success of these programs. Many of the contradictions occur simply because of the differences in methods of implementation, philosophy, or goals and are not really contradictions at all. However, there are some studies which present contradictory information about the value and success of the specific programs in question. Therefore, the writer has reported substantially those articles which shaped the development of the orientation program. The purpose in reviewing the literature was not geared to determining whether orientation was necessary but was conducted to help avoid some of the mistakes of the past and to implement apparently helpful procedures where possible. Basically the research was utilized to determine that the major objectives would be to personalize orientation through the use of small groups and to introduce a decision-making model in order to enable students to determine feasible choices for a major.

According to Arbuckle (1949), historically speaking, the first orientation course was inaugurated at Brown University in 1888; and there is some indication that by the late thirties most colleges were offering some type of orientation program.

Tyler (1953) reports that the responsibility for orientation evolved as a function of college personnel services, and further includes a
summary from the American Council on Education which at that time formulated a list of college personnel functions:

1. Interpreting institutional objectives and opportunity to prospective students and their parents and to workers in secondary education.

2. Admitting students in cooperation with secondary school.

3. Orienting the new student to his college environment and keeping him continuously and adequately informed of the educational opportunities and services available to him.

4. Providing counseling services which with the aid of diagnostic facilities and other referral agencies, assist the student in adjusting to and planning for his educational, vocational, emotional, social, and religious growth.

5. Determining the physical and mental health status of the student and providing appropriate health service.

6. Providing and supervising an adequate housing program for students.

7. Providing and evaluating an adequate food service for students.

8. Developing, supervising, evaluating a program for student activities.

9. Assembling and making available information to be used in improvement of instruction and in making the curriculum more adjustable to the needs of students.

10. Supervising and coordinating programs of financial aid and part-time employment of students and counseling the student who needs to obtain such help.

11. Assisting the student to find appropriate employment when he leaves the institution and following up on the student after he has left the institution.

12. Keeping student personnel records and making them available to the proper persons.

13. Maintaining student group morale by evaluating, understanding, and developing student morals.

14. Carrying on research studies designed to evaluate and improve personnel functions and services.
The first, third, and fourth statements seem to emphasize and perhaps justify the necessity for orientation programs. Judging from the number of such programs, many schools have felt this necessity. As of 1953 Plutchik and Hofmann (1958) report that 70 percent of the colleges in the Midatlantic states had freshman orientation programs with an average duration of one semester. Greene (1954) made a survey of small colleges in thirty states. He reported that 52 percent had an orientation course and that 36 percent of those without the course planned to make one. He added,

The practice of giving students academic credit for freshman orientation course is not widely used. Fifty-five percent of the colleges reported giving no academic credit and 44 percent of the colleges' freshmen received academic credit from one unit to three units per semester or quarter.

Arbuckle (1953) states,

Orientation is a 'must' for every college and it should utilize the services of the entire faculty and some of the studentbody. It should not be either student dominated or faculty dominated, but both the faculty and the student should work together to assist the incoming students as much as possible.

Wrenn (1951) defined orientation as, "... assisting students in acquiring techniques for living at college, in achieving beneficial balance among all the demands and opportunities of college life, and in gaining perspective and a sense of purpose." He agreed with authors of other studies at the time in that,

The general trend is toward expecting less of the freshmen days and extending the process over a semester engaging in more activities in which there is an immediate interest for students and crowding less particularly of lectures and formal information into the schedule of freshman days.
Mueller (1961) has made the statement, "It is easier to plan and carry out a campus orientation program than to describe the complex of underlying theories." It is apparent from the literature that some of the wide variety of programs can be attributed to the very different kinds of goals for such programs.

Fitzgerald and Busch (1963) have made one of the few attempts to specify these underlying theories.

There appear to be at least two philosophical theses implemented in orientation programs . . . the microcosmic 'definition' is expressed by the institutional concern to orient, or to direct the student to his immediate relationship to the institution. In operation, this is manifest by emphasis upon placement testing, pre-registration, advising, introductory convocation, how-to-study and note-taking lectures, campus tours, and student activities.

The macrocosmic emphasis is designed to place a student in position within the institution in terms of functions and goals of higher education. In this type of program emphasis is placed upon intellectual challenge and development, philosophical treatment of the student role and relationship with the institution, 'great books' and 'issues' discussions, purposes and values of higher education and general education, and the responsibility for the appropriate student scholarship and leadership.

Student reactions to each of these supports the contention that both must be accomplished. The microcosmic approach has resulted in disillusionment for new students with the accompanying feelings that the individual is involved in a mass production line and that vocational preparation is a singularly important idea. The impact of the macrocosmic program is frustration and confusion resulting from intangible programs dealing with values and philosophical discussions, which did not meet the student's immediate concerns.

One would have to agree with Mueller in that there are and have been few attempts to publish any statement of philosophy. On the other hand, however, the literature is abundant with statements of objectives or goals for orientation programs.
Black (1964) has listed four basic aims of orientation programs which, according to other similar articles, would certainly be described as somewhat longstanding aims for orientation. They are:

1. To aid the student in becoming acquainted with educational facilities offered by the college or university.

2. To give the educational institution an opportunity to evaluate each student.

3. To acquaint the student with the campus personality and community

4. To acquaint the student with himself, his aspirations, and potential.

In spite of evidence indicating the rather extensive use of orientation programs and in spite of the lofty goals and aims expressed for orientation outcomes, there is some rather challenging data in the literature regarding the value of such programs.

Brown (1961) cited the remarks by Dean William L. Durren of the University of Virginia in summing up the findings of an American Council on Education Conference on Student Orientation Programs. He commented as follows:

... This conference ... has deepened my skepticism of the effectiveness of the conventional freshman orientation program as a means of introducing students to the intellectual life of the college ... It has impressed me with the fact that what any one orientation program can accomplish is at best limited.

As several people have observed, if there is a genuine intellectual life the student will find it out; if there is no real intellectual life the student will find that out too. ... Thus the problem really becomes one of strengthening and creating an intellectual climate throughout the whole institution.

Nothing in this statement by Dr. William L. Durren is particularly contradicted by the findings of most studies regarding various orientation treatments.
Cole and Ivey (1967) have observed in their own studies regarding differences between students attending and not attending pre-college orientation that perhaps it is appropriate to state that orientation programs appear to "serve well as public relations devices." Orientation programs generally tend to be popular with students who are invited to participate. Students generally indicate on questionnaires and other devices of measurement that they believe they have profited in some way from the orientation procedure. Cole and Ivey further commented,

Perhaps some real benefit is derived from the reduction of pre-college 'jitters' in those who attend. It may be that in these factors there is justification enough. Perhaps the best that can be hoped for is some improvement in parent-student attitude towards the university, its agenda, and personnel--a worthwhile goal in itself.

Cole and Ivey further discuss their findings; namely, that attendance at a college orientation program appears to make little difference in college student attitudes and success in college and that in general differences between attenders and non-attenders are minimal. A number of longitudinal studies also support the above findings. Donk and Hinkle (1971) studied the impact of orientation over a period of three and one-half years and their findings indicate that even some of the significant differences found immediately after orientation programs are no longer present in students' responses to their study at any point in time after two years. They conclude that orientation programs make no appreciable difference in college students' attitudes or success in college and that perhaps the only real benefit of college orientation is as a public relations device for the college or university.

In spite of the apparent fact that college orientation programs in general do not provide significant differences in their participants
as opposed to those students who do not attend, there is ample evidence
to indicate that there are certain aspects of college orientation
programs that students respond to in a rather positive way. There is
also ample evidence to indicate that students tend to enjoy and relate
well to pre-college orientation programs and consistently express rather
positive response sets about such programs. Reiter (1964); Smith,
Perkins, and Ziegler (1957); and Zwicky (1965) all provide a good deal
of data to this effect.

One of the writer's major concerns here at Weber State College was
whether to approach orientation with the typical large group assemblies
or to utilize small group and individual meetings to accomplish this
task. There is a good deal of research that indicates that objectives
such as those outlined earlier are better met through a small group
procedure. Illustrative of this research is a study of student responses
to various types of orientation programs by Miller and Ivey (1967).
The authors indicated that,

The primary differences in student attitude were
noted in responses to large group assemblies as compared
with small group or individual meetings... Individual
conferences and small group meetings with counselors,
faculty, college deans, and faculty advisors were consistently
rated higher and received more favorable comments than other
organizational approaches.

These findings suggest the possibility that any well organized
pre-college program would probably be accepted positively by students.

Wrenn (1951) indicated that large group lectures are generally
ineffective, and that small groups led by student advisors with the
help of consultants are needed and are more likely to help students
gain a new orientation toward themselves and their goals. Wrenn's
study also indicated that the laboratory method is also likely to be even more effective. The laboratory method entails students first appraising their need for certain kinds of practice and instruction and then planning their individual programs.

The type of organizational planning does appear to have an effect upon favorable responses from participants. Small group meetings and individual sessions were consistently responded to more favorably than were large group meetings regardless of the type of activity or the program. In fact, the studies conducted with regard to this variable suggest that it might be well to eliminate all of the assemblies or large group information meetings. The recommendation is made by Miller and Ivey that "program directors should be sufficiently informed as to the information needed by participants so that the required information could then be distributed in written form or verbally by leaders of small groups."

The research indicates no benefit in having information disseminated by administrators, and in fact, there is considerable data to contra-indicate this practice. Arbuckle (1953) indicated his belief that students should carry a major share of the load in orientation programs.

There is no other personnel service with the exception of student activities that can be so effectively organized and administered by students as the orientation program. An orientation committee should be made up of responsible adults together with the chief personnel officer and other faculty directly concerned with orientation. A student representative should be elected by the students and they will probably outnumber the faculty members. Sophomores should be well represented on the committee since they have had the most recent impression of their orientation experience.

Arbuckle further states that such programs are faculty planned and dominated by the faculty on the assumption that they know better what
a student's problems are than do the students themselves.

As the writer considered the second major goal, that of assisting students to articulate a sound academic-vocational plan, it was believed possible to utilize a rational value decision model for vocational and academic choices. Such a model has been developed by Dr. Milton O. Meux, Gary Casper, James Chadwick, Gerald R. Coombs, et. al., of the University of Utah. These authors have been doing validation, norming and standardization procedures with their programmed materials with various school districts in Salt Lake City. There was sufficient evidence from their research to indicate that this value decision model would be valid and effective for use in the orientation program. Metcalf, editor of the 1971 Yearbook for the National Council for Social Study, contributed the entire Forty-first Annual Yearbook to the value decision model. With contributions from the authors who developed the model, Metcalf presents information on the rationale, strategies, and procedures for the use of the model. The reader is referred to this yearbook for comprehensive information on the model.

Suggestions and recommendations for introducing decision making to students have been evident for years. Super (1960) recommended "curriculum approaches which foster planfulness". Super observed that the awareness of factors requisite for making sound vocational decisions was simply not adequate and suggested students be exposed to "vocational counseling of the decision-making type that might involve exploratory decisions on a step-at-a-time basis".

Gelatt (1962) suggested that decision making could serve as a conceptual framework for counselors because,
Through decision-making counseling students are required to learn more about themselves and their environment as this information is related to the decision and by participating in the decision-making process they can learn to make decisions more independently and accept the proper responsibility.

Stefflre (1966) in a similar vein discusses ten propositions about vocational choice and notes the need for a binding theory. He states that decision making may provide a binding theory "since it tends to be concerned with wise choices as well as helping students understand themselves."

Thorensen and Mehrens (1967) get even more specific in cautioning that one cannot assume that a person can utilize good and abundant information effectively; rather they feel that the individual needs assistance in acquiring "effective strategy for analyzing, organizing, and synthesizing the information in order to make good decisions."

Dillenbeck (1969) offered a general program outline for a decision-making program in his Title Report to the Trustees of the College Entrance Examination Board Guidance Services, 1968. Dillenbeck focused on the evidence that many individuals make educational plans and decisions without adequately taking into account their knowledge either of self or educational opportunities. He urged, "Services are needed to help individuals learn and practice rational processes for making educational plans and decisions and integrating self understanding and information about educational opportunities."

In addition, one can infer a number of possibilities from other numerous studies that have focused upon student decision making. For example, Ryan (1968) working with 300 junior college students found subjects in counseling groups using simulation materials and receiving
counselor reinforcements scored significantly higher on vocational decision tests than students receiving reinforcement without simulation materials. It was especially interesting that Ryan controlled for initial decision-making behavior by limiting the population to those whose educational and vocational plans were not decided. An important finding in the study was the identification of active intervention in the decision-making process as an important variable. While Ryan studied the junior college students, other studies give support to the idea of intervention at an even earlier point in the school career.

Krumboltz (1967) found problem-solving career kits consistently produce more interest and more occupational information seeking in high school students. Lower social economic status students were particularly responsive to problem-solving approaches.

Gribbons (1960) used Martin Katz's decision-making workbook, You--Today and Tomorrow, with eighth-grade students and found, "pupils in the study made significant increases both in awareness and accuracy in appraisal of their abilities, values, and interests".

Additional literature explores the various components that generally appear in the decision-making process. For example, Barbara Vance (1967) stresses the need for setting objectives and identifying problems before learning experiences can be arranged.

Allport (1966), who has repeatedly advocated the teaching of values in schools, emphasized the importance of values in realizing one's best potentiality and warns, "some individuals seem to give evidence of being almost unconscious of their value system perhaps because they have become so accustomed to them".
Clark, et. al. (1965) stresses the need for good data in decision-making and Circourel and Kitsuse (1964) seemed to make a strong case for teaching students decision making skills when they conclude in their study, The Education Decision Makers, that "the professional orientation of counseling tends to lead to a managed student in all areas of life".

It is somewhat ironic that decisions relative to academic majors and vocations must be made prior to the time when most students have the experience to be able to insure their decision will be sound. How, then, it may be asked, may a student be reasonably sure that the decisions made regarding these areas are sound? Furthermore, what does the term "reasonably sure" mean? These are not simple questions to answer, but the importance of the consequence of such questions certainly argues for attempts to discover such answers. Various decision-making models have been developed to aid in making decisions under conditions of uncertainty. The decision-making model developed by Dr. Milton Meux and his associates deals specifically with questions of values; i.e., those questions where a decision must be made that requires evaluation in terms of what is of worth or value to the decision maker, or in other words what is good or bad, desirable or undesirable.

Casper (1970) authored a programmed self-instruction text as a masters thesis and his contribution to the total decision model. It is proposed that a derivation and modification of this programmed self-instruction be used in the program.
METHODS

The purpose of this study was to conduct a project on the Weber State College campus consistent with the Outreach philosophy described in the Introduction. Pre-evaluation research identified freshman orientation and career choice as the two main areas of student concern. Therefore, a program of freshman orientation was designed with the following major objectives:

1. To personalize orientation and make a student's entrance into the system more fluid and personally satisfying.

2. To introduce a decision making model in order to enable a student to determine feasible choices for careers and to facilitate long-range plans for the attainment of these goals.

Consistent with the design of the orientation program and the review of literature, the following hypotheses were formulated.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses, both basic and related, are stated in the null form. It is hypothesized that there will be no significant differences between the experimental group and the control group in regard to the following considerations.

Basic Hypotheses

1. Subjects' overall rating of the Freshman Orientation Program as to how useful the experience was and how well worth the time it was.

2. Subjects' stated opinion as to how helpful the information was which was presented in orientation.
3. Subjects' judgment as to the appropriateness of the amount of information covered in orientation.

4. Subjects' opinion as to how well the Orientation Program informed them about academic and scholastic policies (grading, homework, warning, and probationary status).

5. Subjects' opinion as to how well the Orientation Program informed them about the campus, faculty, and administration.

6. Subjects' opinion as to how free and comfortable they felt to ask questions or get individual attention for their problems.

7. Whether or not the subjects' reported having had a conference with their advisor or group leader either during or at the end of the Orientation Program.

8. Subjects' opinion as to the extent the Freshman Orientation Program helped them decide upon a major.

9. Subjects' degree of certainty about their choice of major at the time they enrolled in the college.

10. Subjects' opinion as to whether their advisor or group leader helped them to formulate an overall academic program for graduation.

11. Subjects' degree of certainty about their choice of major at the present time. (Post study evaluation at the end of the first quarter.)

12. Subjects' belief as to the effect of the Orientation Program in producing a change in their original choice of major; e.g., strengthening or weakening their original choice of a major.

Related Hypotheses

1. Subjects' judgment as to how lively and interesting the presenters were.

2. Subjects' opinion as to how well the Orientation Program informed them about social activities on campus.

3. Subjects' opinion as to what areas they would have preferred more information during Freshman Orientation. The alternatives were: grading, homework, registration, change of class schedules, dropping and adding classes, academic standards policies, warning, probation, and suspension.

4. Subjects' satisfaction with the amount of time spent with them by their presenters.
5. Subjects' knowledge of the physical location of their advisor.

6. Subjects' opinion about the value of the following services: academic advisement (selecting courses, planning course schedules, adjusting schedules, etc.)

7. Subjects' expression of the degree of difficulty in adjusting to college.

8. Subjects' expression of their degree of satisfaction with the college as a whole.

9. Subjects' opinion of registration process as to its simplicity and convenience.

10. Subjects' degree of acquaintance with the Counseling Center.

11. Subjects' degree of satisfaction with the courses suggested by their advisor or group leader.

12. Subjects' satisfaction with the courses they personally selected.

13. Subjects' degree of understanding the specific graduation requirements for their major and minor fields.

14. Subjects' report of having outlined the specific course requirements for their specific major.

15. The number of subjects who declared a change of major.

16. Whether or not subjects who changed their major have completed the official paperwork required by the college for such a change.

17. The attrition of the subjects as to their enrollment in college measured at the end of the second quarter.

18. Grade-point average (GPA) measured after one quarter.


Identification of Subjects

One thousand, seven hundred, sixty-two new freshmen students applied for admission to Weber State College Autumn Quarter of the 1971-72 school year. A random table of numbers was used to select an experimental population of 100 students (50 male and 50 female). The random table of numbers was also used to select a control population of 100 students (50 male and 50 female).
Procedures

Staffing and Training

Inasmuch as the Outreach Program consisted of orienting students to the college and taking them through a decision-making process relating to their academic program, it was believed necessary to obtain the services of people who are knowledgeable in these areas. Therefore, the regular college counseling staff plus the director of the Guided Studies Program and the Assistant to the Dean of Students were selected to serve as group leaders. The Guided Studies director and the Assistant to the Dean of Students both have counseling backgrounds and a large part of their role is defined as counseling students. Ideally, it would have been beneficial to utilize a number of students, but because of some difficulties in locating desirable students at the beginning of Autumn Quarter and the lack of time for adequate training, the staff of group leaders was limited to the above-mentioned professionals.

Mr. Reed Morrill of the Psychology Department at Utah State University provided training for the group leaders in group processes and aided in deciding some of the steps necessary to achieve the objectives of the study. Mr. Morrill's background consists of a great deal of research and work with freshman orientation at the university level. In addition, Dr. Gary Casper of the Data Processing Department at Weber State was hired to provide training in the use of the value decision-making model. Dr. Casper was one of Dr. Milton Meux' associates at the University of Utah when this model was developed and he specifically authored the programmed text for the model. A condensed version of the value decision-making model used to define the experimental procedure is found in Appendix A.
Experimental Subjects

The entering freshmen students in the experimental group were assigned to subgroups consisting of 9 to 15 students each and were subsequently assigned to a group leader of the professional staff previously identified. The experimental subgroups were all processed through a uniform treatment consisting of steps designed to achieve the two major objectives listed under Methods. Behavioral goals for first objective:

1. **Attend** a small group orientation session for two six-hour days.

2. **Identify** either (a) the three major requirements for a two-year associate degree, or (b) the five major requirements necessary to complete a bachelors degree.

3. **Locate, familiarize, and discuss** with a group leader the functions and services of the following people's offices.
   a. President
   b. Academic and Administrative Vice Presidents
   c. Dean of Students
   d. Counseling Office
   e. Financial Aids Office
   f. Health Services
   g. Housing Office
   h. Advisement Office
   i. Placement Office

4. **Meet** with an advisor to identify courses for fall quarter.

5. **Select** classes which you would like for fall quarter.

6. **Register** for fall quarter.

7. **Discuss** the procedure for
   a. Dropping classes
   b. Adding classes
   c. Explain the procedures and policies for academic warning, probation, and suspension

Behavioral goals for second objective:

1. **Make** a series of six individual and/or small group appointments with the group leader. (The sixth session would culminate in
2. **Review** a list of occupational and career titles.

3. **Select** and copy down on paper all occupations which attract your interest.

4. **Rank** order the occupations as to the top ten most interesting.

5. **Analyze** your occupations in your list as to which of the following categories they fall in:

   a. **Artistic-Literary** (art, drama, music, designing, photography, TV, radio, news reporting, law, writing, library work, drafting, etc.)
   
   b. **Business, Clerical, Sales** (data processing, accounting, typing, office work, selling, management, etc.)
   
   c. **Social-Personal Service** (social work, teaching, nursing, police, probation, recreation, cosmetology, stewardess, chef, etc.)
   
   d. **Agricultural-Conservation** (wildlife, forestry, farming-ranching, ecology, mining, logging, etc.)
   
   e. **Mechanical** (construction, repairing, operating equipment, aviation, transportation, assembling, etc.)
   
   f. **Scientific** (medicine, engineering, mathematics, electronics, etc.)

6. **State** the rationale for why you selected the top three occupations.

7. **Assemble** purported facts concerning your top three occupations and be able to give responses to the following questions:

   a. What is the working environment?
   
   b. What are the prospects for future occupations?
   
   c. What is a typical day's activity?
   
   d. What are the qualifications necessary for entry into this field?
   
   e. What are the specific course requirements?
   
   f. What will your annual income be five years after entering?
   
   g. What types of opportunities are available?
   
   h. What steps have to be taken (other than education) or what jobs held before you get to the job you want?
   
   i. How crowded is the field?
   
   j. How much money is necessary for education or training?
   
   k. How many years of preparation is required?
   
   l. Where will one need to go or need to live in order to find employment in this field?
   
   m. What moral questions or issues are attached to the work?
   
   n. What type of benefits or sacrifices will be requested of the family?
   
   o. What are the political ramifications involved?
   
   p. What health or safety hazards are associated with this work?
8. Make available information concerning your interest and aptitude by completing the following tests:

   a. Kuder Interest Inventory
   b. Strong Vocational Interest Blank
   c. General Aptitude Test Battery or American College Test (ACT)

9. Compare listed interests to the inventories completed.

10. Evaluate and discuss with your group leader or group your progress to this point.

11. Return and complete Steps 2, 3, and 4 once again if necessary.

12. Assess the truthfulness of your purported facts by discussing with a group leader the accuracy of the data in the following areas:

   a. Where did you obtain your data?
   b. How recently was it written?
   c. How authoritative is it?
   d. What changes have transpired since this authority was written?

13. Compare a list of purported facts as to their positive and negative aspects as they apply to you.

14. Rank order both the negative and positive characteristics as they might affect you.

15. Arrange, visit, and spend at least one-half day on the job site of each of the top three occupations which you have listed at this point.

16. State your final career decision.

17. List your required preparatory courses.

18. Complete a written schedule for completing preparatory program.

At the end of the Autumn Quarter, a post study self-report questionnaire was administered to the experimental subjects. This questionnaire will be found in Appendix B.

Control Subjects

The identity of the control subjects was not made known and they were allowed to go through the traditional large group orientation procedure
conducted by the administrative officers of the college. This treat­
ment consisted of meeting all of the students in an auditorium setting
for three sessions of some three to four hours in length during which
time administrators such as the Dean of Admissions, the Registrar, the
Dean of each of the academic schools and some studentbody and alumni
officers presented information they believed to be of importance
regarding policies and procedures in their respective areas. This
treatment varies a great deal as to the content from year to year
although substantially the same administrative officers are involved.
An investigation of this large group treatment reveals that there is
no research based criteria for deciding content. The content then
appears to be a totally subjective decision.

At the end of the Autumn Quarter, a post study self-report
questionnaire was administered to the control subjects. This questionnaire
will be found in Appendix B.
RESULTS

Collection and Treatment of the Data

All of the experimental and control subjects were administered a questionnaire at the completion of the Autumn Quarter, 1972. This self-report questionnaire is presented in Appendix B. In addition, clerical checks were made from computer records on such items as attrition, change of major, grade point average, etc. A chi-square analysis was performed to test the hypotheses. See Table 1 for a summary of the results of chi-square. It should be noted that in testing for significant differences, two violations of the chi-square procedure were observed. The first was a violation of the assumption that the individual measures must be independent of each other. It is recognized that there were some repeated measures on the same students. The second violation occurred in that there were not always five or more expected frequencies. Blalock (1960) states "whenever any of the expected frequencies are five or less it is highly advisable that some kind of modifications be made." As may be observed on the Chart of the Summary of the Results of Chi-Square, Table 1, the cells were modified for our test. For those questions in which there were less than five expected frequencies, the cell was collapsed and in almost every case, a higher significance level was produced. In no case was there a lower significance level produced by making this adjustment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis Number</th>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Modified Significance Level</th>
<th>Response Number Ignored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Basic)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>NR,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>NR,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>NR,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>2, 4, 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.2 (NS)</td>
<td>.2 (NS)</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>NR, 1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Related)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NR, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>3, 4, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>NR, 1, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NR, 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NR, 1, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>NR, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.2 (NS)</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NR, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>NR, 1, 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.1 (NS)</td>
<td>1, 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>29 Retention</td>
<td>.5 (NS)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>30 GPA</td>
<td>.5 (NS)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>31 Completed</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS = Not Significant
NR = No Response
N/A = Not Applicable

*The Statistics Department in the Bureau of Educational Research at the University of Utah used a taped, pretested chi-square program for discontinuous data.*
Findings

A complete summary of the questionnaire results and weighted means are presented in Appendix C. When percentages are cited, they are rounded off to the nearest percent. The reader is encouraged to review Appendix C for a thorough breakdown of the percentages in the various response categories.

Basic Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1 was rejected. Regarding the subjects' overall rating as to how useful the orientation program was, 34 percent of the experimental group indicated that it was "quite helpful" as opposed to 4 percent of the control group. Sixty-one percent of the control group indicated that it was "somewhat helpful" as opposed to 40 percent in the experimental group.**

Hypothesis 2 was rejected. Regarding the subjects' opinion as to how helpful the information was which was presented in orientation, 45 percent of the experimental group indicated that the information was "quite helpful" as opposed to 5 percent of the control group. Fifty-five percent of the control group indicated that the information was "somewhat helpful" as opposed to 25 percent of the experimental group. Only slightly more of the control group indicated that the information was "not very helpful" or "not at all helpful" than did the experimental group.**

Hypothesis 3 was rejected. With regard to the appropriateness of the amount of information covered in orientation, 57 percent of the

**Statistically significant at the .01 level of confidence.
subjects in the control group responded that their presentation was "too long" as opposed to 25 percent of the experimental group. Seventy percent of the experimental group responded that the length of their presentation was "about right" as opposed to 32 percent of the control group. No subjects in either group indicated that their presentation was "too short". *

Hypothesis 4 was rejected. Regarding the subjects' opinion as to how well the orientation program informed them about academic and scholastic policies, 32 percent of the experimental group indicated that the information was "very informative" as opposed to 7 percent of the control group. Twenty-four percent of the control group indicated that the information was "not informative" as opposed to 11 percent in the experimental group. *

Hypothesis 5 was rejected. Regarding the subjects' opinion as to how well the orientation program informed them about the campus, faculty, and administration, 34 percent of the experimental group indicated that the information was "very informative" as opposed to 8 percent in the control group. Twenty-four percent of the control group indicated that the information was "not informative" as opposed to 11 percent in the experimental group. **

Hypothesis 6 was rejected. Regarding the subjects' opinion as to how free and comfortable they felt in asking questions or getting individual attention for their problems, 64 percent of the experimental group indicated they felt "quite free" to ask questions and "successful

*Statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence.

**Statistically significant at the .01 level of confidence.
in getting individual attention" as opposed to 31 percent of the control group. Twenty-five percent of the experimental group indicated that they felt "somewhat free" to ask questions as opposed to 12 percent of the control group.**

Hypothesis 7 was rejected. Regarding whether the subjects reported having an individual conference with their advisor or group leader during or at the end of the orientation program, 73 percent of the experimental group responded that they did as opposed to 43 percent of the control group.**

Hypothesis 8 was rejected. With regard to the subjects' opinion as to the extent the freshman orientation program helped them decide upon a major, 91 percent of the subjects in the control group indicated that the freshman orientation "did not help them at all" while 66 percent of the subjects in the experimental group responded in this manner. Thirteen percent of the subjects in the experimental group indicated that freshman orientation had helped them decide upon a major to a "great extent" or a "noticeable amount" while no students in the control group made this response.**

Hypothesis 9 was rejected. With regard to the subjects' degree of certainty about their choice of major at the time they enrolled in college, 50 percent of the experimental group indicated that they were "very certain" as opposed to 35 percent in the control group. Twenty-six percent of the control group indicated that they were "very uncertain" as opposed to 5 percent in the experimental group. Even though this question was asked relative to the beginning of the quarter, there was **Statistically significant at the .01 level of confidence.
undoubtedly some contamination in the answers due to the work done in the experimental group about the selection of a career and college major.*

Hypothesis 10 was rejected. Regarding the subjects' opinion as to whether or not their advisor or group leader helped them to formulate an overall academic program for graduation, 39 percent of the experimental group "somewhat agreed" that their advisor or group leader did help formulate such a plan as opposed to 20 percent in the control group. Approximately the same percentage of subjects in both groups indicated their "strong agreement" that the advisor or group leader had helped to formulate such a plan. Thirty percent of the control group did not respond to this question as opposed to 7 percent in the experimental group, which when all factors are considered, tends to indicate that subjects in the control group generally did not have an opportunity or avail themselves of such an opportunity to formulate an overall academic plan.**

Hypothesis 11 was tentatively accepted. There was a significance level of .2 between the experimental and control groups in favor of the experimental group. This level is not regarded as statistically significant. Thirty-nine percent of the experimental group indicated that they were "very certain" of their choice of majors at the present time as opposed to 32 percent in the control group. Thirty percent of the experimental group indicated that they were "almost certain" as opposed to 22 percent in the control group.

*Statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence.

**Statistically significant at the .01 level of confidence.
Hypothesis 12 was rejected. Regarding the subjects' belief that the orientation program changed their original choice of major; e.g., strengthening or weakening their original choice, 5 percent of the experimental group indicated that their original choice of major was "strengthened" as opposed to 4 percent of the control group. Twenty percent of the experimental group indicated their choice was "strengthened slightly" as opposed to 3 percent in the control group. Fifty-five percent of the experimental group indicated "no change" in their original choice as opposed to 75 percent of the control group. Seven percent of the experimental group indicated their original choice was "weakened considerably" as opposed to 4 percent in the control group. When placed in perspective with the results of Hypotheses 8, 9, and 11, there is indication that the experimental orientation treatment and value decision-making model may have created a condition whereby students were able to evaluate and re-evaluate their career plans in light of a more appropriate and rational criteria and act accordingly. It appears that the impact of the decision-making model was favorable.*

Related Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1 was rejected. Regarding the subjects' judgment as to how lively and interesting the presenters were, 55 percent of the control group indicated that they were "somewhat dull and boring" as opposed to 27 percent of the experimental group. Six percent of the experimental group indicated that they were "quite lively and interesting" as opposed to 1 percent of the control group. Forty-five percent of the

*Statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence.
The experimental group indicated they were "somewhat lively and interesting" as opposed to 24 percent of the control group.*

Hypothesis 2 was accepted. There was no significant difference between the experimental and control groups as to the subjects' opinion about how well the orientation program informed them about social activities on campus. The response categories were almost even with just slightly more students in the experimental group indicating that the information in this regard was informative.

Hypothesis 3 was rejected. Regarding the subjects' opinion as to what areas they would have preferred to receive more information during freshman orientation, 20 percent of the experimental group indicated they would have liked more information about grading policies as opposed to 4 percent of the control group. Twenty-three percent of the control group indicated a preference for more information about registration as opposed to 16 percent in the experimental group. Eleven percent of the experimental group indicated an additional preference for more information about dropping and adding classes as opposed to 3 percent in the control group. It should be noted that 57 percent of the control group did not respond to this question as opposed to 34 percent of the experimental group, (very high percentages for nonrespondents in both groups) which may indicate that the experimental group had been more motivated and made more aware of possible areas of information. If so, hopefully this condition would be due to their treatment, but this question needs further investigation.*

Hypothesis 4 was rejected. Regarding the subjects' satisfaction with the amount of time spent with them by their presenters, 25 percent

*Statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence.
of the experimental group indicated that there was "plenty of time" and that they were "very pleased" as opposed to 11 percent of the control group. Forty-five percent of the experimental group indicated that the "time was ample" and that they were "pleased", as opposed to 23 percent of the control group. Twenty percent of the control group indicated that there was "not enough time" spent with them as opposed to some 9 percent in the experimental group.*

Hypothesis 5 was rejected. With regard to the subjects' knowledge of the physical location of their advisor, 89 percent of the experimental group indicated that they knew that location as opposed to 61 percent of the control group.*

Hypothesis 6 was rejected. Regarding the subjects' opinion about the value of academic advisement (selecting courses, planning course schedules, adjusting schedules, etc.) 11 percent of the experimental group indicated the service was "extremely valuable" as opposed to 4 percent in the control group. Thirty-nine percent of the experimental group found the service to be "worthwhile" as opposed to 25 percent in the control group. Fifty-eight percent of the control group reported never using this service as opposed to 20 percent in the experimental group. Approximately 3 percent of the subjects in both groups reported that the college "does not offer this service".*

Hypothesis 7 was accepted. There was no significant difference between the experimental and control groups. Regarding the subjects' opinion of the degree of difficulty in adjusting to college, 4 percent of the experimental group indicated "yes, to an extreme degree" as opposed to 3 percent of the control group who made this response.

*Statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence.
Nineteen percent of the control group indicated a "noticeable amount" of difficulty as opposed to 9 percent of the experimental group. Roughly 84 percent of the experimental group indicated "very little" or "no difficulty" as opposed to 74 percent in the control group. The data slightly favored the experimental group although it was not expected that this area could be affected in an orientation treatment.

Hypothesis 8 was accepted. There was no significant difference between the experimental and control groups. Regarding the subjects' expression of the degree of their satisfaction with the college as a whole, 74 percent of the experimental group indicated that they were "satisfied" or "completely satisfied" with the college as opposed to 79 percent of the control group. Twenty-five percent of the control group indicated an indifferent attitude to this question as opposed to 15 percent in the experimental group.

Hypothesis 9 was accepted. There was no significant difference between the experimental and control groups. Fourteen percent of the experimental group did "strongly agree" that registration was simple and convenient as opposed to 4 percent of the control group. Forty-six percent of the control group indicated that they "agreed" that registration was simple and convenient as opposed to 43 percent in the experimental group. Approximately the same percentages of subjects in both groups indicated that they either "disagreed" or "strongly disagreed" that registration was simple and convenient.

Hypothesis 10 was rejected. With regard to the subjects' degree of acquaintance with the Counseling Center, 19 percent of the subjects in the control group indicated that they were "not at all acquainted" with the Counseling Center as opposed to 5 percent in the experimental
group. Forty-four percent of the subjects in the control group indicated that they were "vaguely acquainted" as opposed to 23 percent in the experimental group. Thirty-nine percent of the subjects in the experimental group indicated that they were "moderately acquainted" as opposed to 24 percent in the control group. Twenty-five percent in the experimental group indicated that they were "fairly well acquainted" as opposed to 9 percent in the control group.*

Hypothesis 11 was rejected. With regard to the subjects' degree of satisfaction with the courses suggested by their advisor or group leader, 20 percent of the subjects in the experimental group indicated that they "strongly agreed" with the selection of courses, as opposed to 11 percent in the control group. Sixty-one percent of the experimental group indicated that they "somewhat agreed" with the selection of courses as opposed to 38 percent in the control group. It is interesting that 40 percent of the control group did not respond to this question as opposed to 4 percent in the experimental group, which when the treatment is considered, points to the possibility that subjects in the control group generally did not have an opportunity to formulate an academic plan with their advisor or group leader or did not avail themselves of such an opportunity.*

Hypothesis 12 was tentatively accepted. There was a significance level of .2 in favor of the experimental group regarding the subjects' satisfaction with the courses they personally selected. It is noted that this is not considered a statistically significant difference. Thirty-six percent of the experimental subjects indicated strong

*Statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence.
satisfaction with the courses they selected as opposed to 32 percent in the control group.

Hypothesis 13 was accepted. With regard to the subjects' degree of understanding of the specific graduation requirements for their major and minor fields (not comprehensive baccalaureate requirements) slightly more subjects in the experimental group, 25 percent, as opposed to 14 percent in the control group indicated that they did understand said requirements. Slightly more in the control group, 28 percent as opposed to 13 percent in the experimental group, indicated that they did not understand the graduation requirements in the major and minor fields. **Note:** This question was originally intended to determine the subjects' overall understanding of the associate degree and baccalaureate requirements, but its usefulness was contaminated by the addition of the words "major and minor fields". There was some discussion of major and minor requirements in the experimental treatment which may account for the small differences. This could be regarded as more favorable for the experimental treatment because the experimental treatment presented information about majors and minors in a general way while the academic advisors in the various departments had an opportunity to present specific instructions about their respective majors and minors to the control subjects. Given this circumstance, the control subjects could possibly be expected to understand the requirements more completely than the experimental subjects, yet reported that they did not.

Hypothesis 14 was accepted. There was no significant difference between the experimental and control groups. Approximately the same number, 37 percent, of both groups indicated that they had outlined
the specific requirements for their major. The balance of the subjects in both groups indicated that they had not outlined said courses.

Hypothesis 15 was rejected. Thirty-four percent of the subjects in the experimental group indicated a change of major or selection of a major during their first quarter as opposed to 18 percent of the subjects in the control group.*

Hypothesis 16 was accepted. There was no significant difference between the experimental and control groups. With regard to whether or not subjects who changed their major have completed the official paperwork required by the college for such a change, 7 percent of both groups indicated that they had completed the official paperwork. The balance indicated that they had not completed the paperwork or did not respond to the question.

Hypothesis 17 was tentatively accepted. With regard to the retention of subjects through their second quarter of college, there was a small significance level, .5, in favor of the experimental group. It is to be noted, however, that this level is not considered statistically significant. Seventy-one percent of the subjects in the experimental group were enrolled at the end of the second quarter as opposed to 55 percent of the control group. There does appear to be a trend and this will be watched longitudinally.

Hypothesis 18 was tentatively accepted. There is a small significance level, .5, in favor of a higher grade point average for the experimental group at the end of the first quarter. However, .5 is not regarded as statistically significant. The mean grade point average at the end of the first quarter for the experimental group was 2.40 as opposed to 2.18 for the control group. The GPA's for the experimental and control groups will be watched longitudinally. It is
hypothesized at this time that one of the longitudinal benefits of the
decision model will be more appropriately directed study, hence perhaps
higher GPA's.

Hypothesis 19 was accepted. There were no significant differences
between the experimental and control groups regarding the percentage
of subjects completing the self-report questionnaire. Seventy-nine
percent of the experimental group completed the questionnaire and
77 percent of the control group completed the questionnaire.
DISCUSSION

Of some 31 null hypotheses, 20 were rejected, which would appear to indicate that the experimental treatment in general was successful. The experimental subjects exhibited a much more supportive response set toward their orientation treatment and small group sessions than did the control group. For example, there was even much greater acceptance of the more lengthy experimental treatment than was anticipated. It will be recalled that the experimental group met with their small group leaders for several hours initially and also met with their small group leader either individually or on a group basis over a period of six weeks during the quarter. The experimental group subsequently reported that the amount of time spent with them was about right and that they were pleased about the scheduling of their orientation sessions. They did not report as did the control group that too much time was spent on orientation, even though they spent considerably more hours in the orientation process. This data is somewhat contradictory to a fairly recent decision of the college that orientation should not extend over the quarter but should only be an initial experience for the students.

The experimental group also reported that they were able to identify on a personal level with the experimental treatment and that they found it to be very "lively," "interesting," "helpful," "appropriate," and "useful," as an experience. In general, the experimental subjects reported that they had been better informed about important policies and practices on campus than did their counterparts in the control group.
The small group treatment for experimental subjects was substantially better received than the large group treatment for control subjects.

The experimental treatment produced a slightly better understanding of the registration procedure. However, that difference was not significant and was one of the disappointments of the program. It had been anticipated that by providing dummy packets, talking the students through the registration procedure, and then actually walking them through the procedure of actual registration, that a more positive attitude toward registration would be produced.

It was also hoped to achieve a better overall attitude from the experimental subjects as to their satisfaction with the college as a whole. This objective apparently was not achieved except as to specific areas previously cited.

The review of literature supports the use of some type of decision process to assist a student in articulating a career choice. However, the use of such a process in orientation is unique in the literature. When the relationships of certain aspects of the data are reviewed, it would appear that the decision-making model which was used with the experimental subjects did provide an opportunity for the students to rethink their initial choice of major or to seriously consider a criteria for the initial selection of such a major or career. The students in the experimental group made a great number of changes in their academic plans through the use of the decision-making model. As a result these students reported that they were more satisfied with their choice of major at the completion of their work with the decision-making model, and they also reported that orientation had significantly helped them in making this choice. It was the belief and general concensus
of the small group leaders that this decision-making model holds a great deal of potential for helping to meet students' needs where career choice is concerned. The subjects' responses would appear to vindicate the decision to introduce the career/major decision-making model into the orientation process.

While data produced only a trend in favor of the experimental treatment with regard to improved grade point averages and longer retention in school, it is likely that the decision-making model has had an important effect on the ability of the students to earn higher GPA's and to remain in school longer because of the long-range goals and motivation produced by having made an appropriate and acceptable choice of careers.
SUMMARY

Problem

The purpose of this study was to identify, implement, and evaluate a program of counseling intervention which could be described as preventative or developmental as opposed to remedial. An important consideration was the possibility of intervening with the student, the student's primary or associational groups, or the institutional groups that influence his behavior. A program of freshman orientation and career articulation was identified through institutional research, a review of literature, and the work of a student steering committee.

Method

An experimental population of 100 and a control population of 100 were selected from the 1971-72 entering freshman class at Weber State College. The experimental subjects were assigned to small groups (9-15) with a group leader.

The experimental groups were then processed through a set of behaviorally defined steps with the goal of personalizing orientation and enabling them to determine a feasible career choice. A programmed rational decision-making model was used as the mode for articulating the career choice and establishing long-range plans for achieving that goal. This model required participation throughout this quarter.

The control subjects were processed through the traditional large group, auditorium orientation. This treatment consists of three sessions
of some three to four hours in length. Various administrators present information on WSC policies and practices followed by a tour of the campus.

Main Findings

1. The experimental small group process was preferred much more than the large group process and allowed students to feel that their individual needs were better met.

2. Students in this experimental group also reported their treatment to be much more "helpful", "useful", and "informative."

3. The time spent with experimental subjects exceeded the time spent with control subjects by 3 to 1, yet the experimental subjects indicated that the time spent was "about right" while control subjects reported their presentations were "too long".

4. Experimental subjects reported that they were better informed about college services and policies than were control subjects.

5. Attitudes of general satisfaction with the college as a whole were not significantly improved by the experimental treatment.

6. Experimental subjects reported substantial gains over the control subjects in deciding a major or confirming previous plans and attributed these gains to their small group work with the decision-making model.

7. After the experimental subjects were processed through the decision model they reported that they were more certain of their choice of major than were the control subjects.

8. At the end of two quarters no statistically significant differences were determined about retention of subjects although approximately 16% more of the experimental subjects were still enrolled.
Conclusions

The review of literature presented a generally dismal picture as to the potential good to be derived from any orientation program. It was indicated that at best it may serve as a public relations function.

To the contrary, the data and experience from this study indicate that orientation may be much more meaningful to participants than previous evidence would indicate. Indeed, it is believed that the introduction of career selection through a rational, sound, and logical process probably strikes at the heart of what orientation could and possibly should be about.
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I. Introduction

Beginning your college life is an exciting experience. New people, places and ideas rapidly clamor for your attention. From a wide variety of possibilities that become available, you must decide upon those that will direct your activities for the term of your college life and even beyond. Because of the significance to your life of the decisions you must make, it is vital that these decisions be sound. Various decision-making models have been developed to aid in making decisions under conditions of uncertainty.

One such model has been developed to deal especially with questions of value, i.e., those questions where a decision must be made that requires evaluation in terms of what is of worth or "value" to the decision-maker, or in other words, what is good or bad, desirable or undesirable, etc. This model is described in the 41st Yearbook 1971 of the National Council of Social Studies entitled, "Values Education: Rationale, Strategies, and Procedures", edited by Lawrence Metcalf.

II. The Value Model

The value model will help you make rational or sound decisions such that you will be reasonably sure that it is sound and know why you're reasonably sure. You will be able to use this model whenever you are evaluating some object to make a value judgment about it. How can the model do this?
Before one can be reasonably sure he has made a *rational value judgment* he must be able to specify standards of rationality against which the value judgment can be measured. These standards establish the conditions which make a value judgment rational or defensible. Once these standards are established, evaluative tasks can be defined which will ensure adherence to the standards of rationality and culminate in a rational value judgment. Finally, then, a procedure might be defined to accomplish these tasks. Such standards, tasks, and a procedure will now be defined.

III. Four Standards of Rationality

In general terms the conditions which a value judgment must meet to qualify as a rational or defensible judgment:

1. **TRUTH OF FACTS**

   The purported facts supporting the judgment must be true or well confirmed.

2. **RELEVANCE OF FACTS**

   The facts must be genuinely relevant; i.e., they must actually have valence for the person making the judgment.

3. **RELIABILITY OF FACTS INCREASES DIRECTLY WITH RANGE OF FACTS**

   Other things being equal, the greater the range of relevant facts taken into account in making the judgment, the more adequate the judgment is likely to be.

4. **VALUE PRINCIPLE IMPLIED ACCEPTABLE TO EVALUATOR**

   The value principle implied by the judgment must be acceptable to the person making the judgment.

IV. Evaluative Tasks

In any evaluative decision making process, the following six tasks must be carried out:

1. **IDENTIFYING AND CLARIFYING THE VALUE QUESTION**

   This task involves the careful identification of the question being evaluated and the clarification of any vague or unclear terms or concepts.
2. ASSEMBLING (GATHERING AND ORGANIZATION) PURPORTED FACTS

This task involves the time and effort required to research and assemble a wide range of purported facts about the value question. Failure to carefully attend to this task virtually ensures irrationality if for no other reason because of its clear violation of the third standard of rationality.

3. ASSESSING THE TRUTH OF PURPORTED FACTS

This task is directly related to satisfaction of the first standard of rationality. Obviously, untrue or poorly confirmed facts seriously challenge the rationality of a decision.

4. CLARIFYING THE RELEVANCE OF FACTS

This task requires that the evaluator find facts that have valence for him. If the facts are not relevant, the second standard of rationality is violated.

5. ARRIVING AT A TENTATIVE VALUE DECISION

This task involves the evaluator weighing all the facts at his command and then actually making his decision concerning the value question in the face of these facts.

6. TESTING THE VALUE PRINCIPLE IMPLIED IN THE DECISION

The last task involves testing the value principle implied by the decision to determine if it's acceptable to the evaluator as required by the fourth standard of rationality. Clearly if the value principle is unacceptable to the evaluator, he cannot rationally defend or act in accord with it.

V. PROCEDURE**

Obviously the first step in the procedure must involve deciding upon the value question and then accomplishment of the task, which requires the question to be identified and clarified. In this particular instance, the value question involves which of all the possible majors offered at the college you wish to pursue. Therefore, the following

**Appropriate materials were provided for each step of the procedure—lists of available majors, minors, trade and technical programs, occupational exploration kits, interest test profiles, college catalogs, forms for exploiting assignments such as listing and ranking job facts, etc.
three objectives are postulated:

Objectives: (1) Select a major.

(2) Select a minor.

(3) Develop a planned schedule for completion.

To accomplish these objectives do the following:

1. Select 2 most interesting potential majors.

2. Gather facts about each major. Include list of required courses, both general education and major. Consider all applicable facts such as:

(a) List all required general education courses.
(b) List all required major courses.
(c) List all required minor courses.
(d) Formulate a tentative schedule.
(e) Search out job opportunities.
(f) Check salary schedules.
(g) Determine possible job locations.
(h) Obtain projections on growth of industry and upward mobility.
(i) What are the potentials for graduate school?

3. List purported facts which support a positive judgment and those which support a negative judgment.

(a) Make each of your statements clear enough so that you can tell what would show it to be true or false.

(b) Substitute factual statements for evaluative statements. (Technical assessment terms permitted--e.g., effective, valid, reliable, statistically significant.)

4. Identify concern associated with each purported fact.

5. Organize your purported facts by concern. Put in Value Analysis Chart.

6. Assess truth of purported facts. Ordinarily at this stage the evaluator assesses the purported facts by checking whether there is sufficient evidence to warrant them, and lacking evidence and arguments, he assesses the expertise, veracity, bias, and reliability of the source of the purported facts.
7. Rank positive facts within each concern. Rank negative facts within each concern.

8. Rank concerns.

9. Formulate possible solutions for the high priority negative statements.

10. Formulate tentative value judgment. (Recommendation: Use subsidiary value judgments for each concern if helpful.)

11. Contrast the two majors according to prior evaluation of each.

12. Select a major, minor, and finalize schedule.

13. Turn in schedule.

14. Work your plan.
ORIENTATION SELF-REPORT QUESTIONNAIRE

The following is a questionnaire concerning freshman Orientation. Please respond openly and freely to these questions, as it is only through your evaluation of this program that we can continue to improve the orientation in the years to come. We appreciate your cooperation and time.

Orientation Committee

SOC. SEC. NO. ________________________

AGE ________

On the following items please circle one number which identifies the appropriate response for your situation.

Hypotheses

1. Overall would you rate the Freshman Orientation Program
   1. A very useful experience and well worth the time
   2. A somewhat useful experience and probably worth the time
   3. A somewhat useless experience and probably not worth the time
   4. A quite useless experience and definitely not worth the time

2. Did you find the information presented in orientation
   1. Quite helpful
   2. Somewhat helpful
   3. Not very helpful
   4. Not at all helpful

3. Considering the nature and amount of information covered in orientation did you find it
   1. Too long
   2. About right
   3. Too short

4. Did the information you received during the orientation program inform you sufficiently about the academic and scholastic policies? (Grading, homework, warning and probationary status)
   1. Very informative
   2. Yes, moderately informative
   3. No
   4. Confused me more than helped
5. Did the information you received during the orientation program inform you sufficiently about the campus, faculty, and administration?
   1. Very informative
   2. Yes, moderately informative
   3. No
   4. Confused me more than helped

6. In the orientation program did your advisor or group leader make you feel
   1. Quite free to ask questions or get individual attention
   2. Somewhat free to ask questions or get individual attention
   3. Somewhat uncomfortable about asking a question or seeking individual attention
   4. Quite uncomfortable about asking a question or seeking individual attention

7. During or at the end of the orientation program did you have a conference with your advisor or group leader?
   1. Yes
   2. No

8. Did the freshman orientation program help you decide on a major?
   1. Yes, a great extent
   2. Yes, a noticeable amount
   3. Yes, but very little
   4. Not at all

9. How certain were you of a major at the beginning of this quarter?
   1. Very certain
   2. Almost certain
   3. Uncertain
   4. Very uncertain

10. My advisor or group leader helped me formulate an academic program for graduation
    1. Strongly agree
    2. Somewhat agree
    3. Somewhat disagree
    4. Strongly disagree

11. How certain are you of your choice of major at the present time?
    1. Very certain
    2. Almost certain
    3. Uncertain
    4. Very uncertain
12. The effect of the orientation program on your original choice of major was to

1. Strengthen it considerably  
2. Strengthen it slightly  
3. No change  
4. Weaken it slightly  
5. Weaken it considerably

13. Considering the kinds of information being conveyed in the orientation program did you find the presenters

1. Quite dull and boring  
2. Somewhat dull and boring  
3. Somewhat lively and interesting  
4. Quite lively and interesting

14. Did the information you received during the orientation program inform you sufficiently about social activities on campus?

1. Very informative  
2. Yes, moderately informative  
3. No  
4. Confused me more than helped

15. If you could have received additional information during Freshman Orientation, in what area(s) would you have requested it? (Circle one or more of the following responses)

1. Grading  
2. Homework  
3. Registration  
4. Changing class schedule  
5. Dropping classes and adding classes  
6. Academic Standards policy (warning, probation, suspension)

16. In the orientation program how did you feel about the amount of time your advisor or group leader spent with you

1. It was plenty - very pleased  
2. It was ample - pleased  
3. Wish I could have had more time  
4. It was not enough time  
5. He did not spend any time

17. I know the physical location of my advisor

1. Yes  
2. No
18. Please indicate your feelings about the following service: Academic Advisement (selecting courses, adjusting schedule, planning programs, etc.)

1. The service was extremely valuable to me
2. I found the service to be worthwhile
3. I received little benefit from the service
4. I never used this service
5. WSC does not offer this service

19. Are you encountering difficulty in adjusting to college?

1. Yes, to an extreme degree
2. Yes, a noticeable amount
3. Yes, but very little
4. No, not at all

20. How satisfied are you with WSC as a whole?

1. Completely satisfied
2. Satisfied
3. Indifferent
4. Dissatisfied
5. Completely dissatisfied

21. Registration was simple and convenient

1. Strongly agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Somewhat disagree
4. Strongly disagree

22. How well acquainted are you with the Counseling Center?

1. Very well acquainted
2. Fairly well acquainted
3. Moderately acquainted
4. Vaguely acquainted
5. Not at all

23. I am satisfied with the courses my advisor or group leader suggested

1. Strongly agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Somewhat disagree
4. Strongly disagree

24. I am satisfied with the courses I selected

1. Strongly agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Somewhat disagree
4. Strongly disagree
25. I understand the requirements for graduation in my major and minor field
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Somewhat agree
   3. Somewhat disagree
   4. Strongly disagree

26. Have you outlined the specific courses required for your choice of major and graduation requirements?
   1. Yes
   2. No

27. If you changed your major during the quarter, list the change from _________________ to _________________.

28. If a change of major is required during the quarter, have you completed the official paperwork required by the college for such a change?
   1. Yes
   2. No

Clerically Checked Items

29. Retention - Attrition after two quarters

30. Grade Point Average (GPA) measured after one quarter

31. Subjects' completion of the Self-Report Questionnaire
APPENDIX C
## Experimental Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer No.</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Weighted Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 10</td>
<td>Answer No.</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 11</th>
<th>Answer No.</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 12</th>
<th>Answer No.</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 13</th>
<th>Answer No.</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 14</th>
<th>Answer No.</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 15</th>
<th>Answer No.</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 16</th>
<th>Answer No.</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 17</th>
<th>Answer No.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 18</th>
<th>Answer No.</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 19</th>
<th>Answer No.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 20</th>
<th>Answer No.</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 21</td>
<td>Answer No.</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 22</th>
<th>Answer No.</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 23</th>
<th>Answer No.</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 24</th>
<th>Answer No.</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 25</th>
<th>Answer No.</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 26</th>
<th>Answer No.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 28</th>
<th>Answer No.</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Webster State College Computer Center
### Results of Test or Survey

#### Control Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1</th>
<th>Answer No.</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 2</th>
<th>Answer No.</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 3</th>
<th>Answer No.</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 4</th>
<th>Answer No.</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 5</th>
<th>Answer No.</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 6</th>
<th>Answer No.</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 7</th>
<th>Answer No.</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 8</th>
<th>Answer No.</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 9</th>
<th>Answer No.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>NR 1 2 3 4</td>
<td>30.4 8.6 20.2 11.5 28.9</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>31.8 21.7 24.6 21.7</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>NR 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>10.1 4.3 2.8 75.3 2.8 4.3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>NR 1 2 3 4</td>
<td>10.0 8.5 55.7 24.2 1.4</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>NR 1 2 3 4</td>
<td>10.0 8.5 40.0 40.0 1.4</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>NR 1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>57.1 4.2 4.2 22.8 4.2 2.8 4.2</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>NR 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>37.1 11.4 22.8 8.5 10.0 10.0</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>60.8 39.1</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>NR 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1.4 4.3 24.6 8.6 57.9 2.8</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>2.8 18.8 44.9 33.3</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>15.9 53.6 24.6 5.7</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 22</td>
<td>Answer No.</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 23</td>
<td>Answer No.</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 24</td>
<td>Answer No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 25</td>
<td>Answer No.</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 26</td>
<td>Answer No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 28</td>
<td>Answer No.</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>