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CHAPTER I

Introduction

Functioning as a service unit in the area of post-secondary education, colleges and universities throughout the nation have sought means to deal with the problems and concerns in the larger society. Some of the most prevalent problems and concerns are: technological changes, population explosion, urbanization and federal legislation. For example, though there has been a general decrease in college attendance, the number of persons demanding university and college experiences remain high and diversified. As a result of higher earnings and increased employment, there generally exists a greater affordability for higher education. The problem of increased enrollment from the population generally has been compounded by a large segment of the population that heretofore had not been considered as a part of what has been called the traditional student population at many universities. This population has been identified by various descriptions ranging from the culturally deprived to the economically disadvantaged.

The motivation for higher education found among greater numbers of persons is not without cause itself. The very nature of social organizations (universities, colleges, community colleges, junior colleges, technical institutes, industrial, community agencies) of modern society and the tremendous technological advances requiring
greater specificity of skills have been compelling forces for increasing and extensive preparations in the area of skills development. Consequently, for reasons of security, economic and social advantage larger segments of our society are looking toward the colleges and universities for post-secondary educational experiences.

Historically, many colleges and universities have relied on a process of selective admission of students as a means of quality and quantity control. However, as the result of political pressure, federal interventions and the realization of an expanded need factor, especially among the disadvantaged, universities and colleges have adopted more flexible admission policies. These policies have resulted in the emergence of several problem areas that vary in complexity and nature. The increased enrollment demanded an increase in facilities and academic personnel. Curricula expansion among the colleges and universities was a necessary consequence of increased societal needs and technological advancement. This in turn called for a larger body of personnel with skills to meet the needs of the reorganized and expanded curricula. In short, in the past two decades, we have witnessed a process of bureaucratization which has been a dominant force leading to impersonalization within institutions of higher learning. Though bureaucratic formation made possible a more efficient means for dealing with a larger and more diversified college population, it did little in the way of resolving human problems. For example, the socio-cultural variance within the student population called more for special academic cultural attention than for efficient means and new technological devices. There emerged the feeling of alienation, decline in
retention rate, problem of racial and class discrimination, and low academic performances. This area of supportive services began receiving wider attention with the admission of more students from disadvantaged and culturally varied backgrounds.

Universities and colleges began to realize that the mere relaxation of admission policies and recruitment from a more culturally and economically diverse population was only the beginning in steps towards meeting the needs of groups who heretofore had not sought the college experience. Therefore, there evolved the need on the part of universities and colleges to become aware of and understand the historical, sociological, psychological and economic backgrounds of students who came from ethnic and cultural settings new to college academic personnel. Additionally, it became necessary to understand those affective elements in order to develop programs that provided emotional and technical assistance necessary to overcome transitional problems resulting from environmental change, cultural change, and poor academic backgrounds.

The increased variation in student needs has also caused universities and colleges to focus attention upon the need for providing more effective supportive services. More specifically, Brown (1972) noted that among the many supportive services, academic adjustment counseling was receiving wider attention among colleges and universities. The objectives of these programs have been and still are to maximize the probability of academic success for students less likely to succeed under the traditional academic program. In an attempt to deal with the above-mentioned problems on a large scale, The Ohio State
University organized the Office of Developmental Education in 1971 to provide supportive services.

The Office of Developmental Education provides many types of services: academic, personal and social counseling, tutoring, peer counseling, a reading and study skills center, an English Center and specially designed courses (Math 101B01, English 194A&B, Psychology 120) to assist students in the development of skills necessary for success in future courses. This study will examine the peer counseling component of Developmental Education in order to measure the relationship between those students utilizing peer counseling and those students who did not utilize peer counseling.

Peer counseling in a university setting is a relatively new concept. Peer counseling is a program that provides upperclassmen with skills necessary for assisting incoming freshmen with their personal, social and academic concerns. Peer counselors, then, are those upperclassmen (sophomores, juniors and seniors) who have been identified and trained by the staff of the Office of Developmental Education to engage in the process of peer counseling.

Within The Ohio State University College complex, the Office of Developmental Education is the only program utilizing peer counselors to facilitate the student counseling process. A study completed by Malcolm (1974) took an in-depth look at the criteria used to select peer counselors for the Developmental Education peer counseling program. The potential value of peer counselors in assisting students to adjust to university life is unlimited according to Brown (1972), Malcolm (1974) and Zunker (1966).
Statement of the Problem

The major purpose of this study was to analyze the peer counseling program in the Office of Developmental Education at The Ohio State University. This study also analyzed the differences between students who utilized peer counselors and those who did not utilize peer counselors on selected characteristics.

The peer counselor program was analyzed as it relates to grade point average and student retention at The Ohio State University. Those two dependent variables were analyzed as they related to the following independent variables:

1. age
2. frequency of contact with peer counselor
3. sex
4. residence hall status
5. student evaluation of peer counselor program

The following questions were answered in this study as they relate to students who utilized the peer counselor services:

1. What is the relationship between frequency of contact with peer counselors and grade point averages?
2. What is the relationship between age and grade point average?
3. What is the relationship between sex and grade point average?
4. What is the relationship between place of residence and grade point average?
5. What is the relationship between student evaluation of peer counselor program and grade point average?
6. What is the relationship between frequency of student contact with peer counselors and retention?

7. What is the relationship between age and retention?

8. What is the relationship between sex and retention?

9. What is the relationship between Residential Hall Status and retention?

The following question was answered as it relates to the students who utilized peer counselor services and students who did not utilize the peer counselor services:

1. What are the differences between students who utilized peer counselor services and students who did not utilize peer counselors on the following variables?
   a. age
   b. sex
   c. grade point average
   d. retention
   e. residential hall status

This study did test the following null hypotheses:

1. General Hypothesis - There will be no significant differences between the students who had access to peer counselors and used them, and students who had access to peer counselors and did not utilize them.

Specific Hypotheses:

Ho1 There are no differences between grade point averages of students who utilized the services of peer counselors and the grade point averages of students who did not utilize the services of peer counselors.
$H_02$ There is no difference between retention of students who did not utilize peer counselors and students who utilized peer counselors.

$H_03$ There is no difference between the age of students who utilized the peer counselor services and the age of students who did not utilize the peer counselor services.

$H_04$ There is no difference between the sex of students who utilized the peer counselor services and the sex of students who did not utilize the peer counselor services.

$H_05$ There is no difference between the place of residence of students who utilized the peer counselor services and the place of residence of students who did not utilize the peer counselor services.

$H_06$ There is no relationship between frequency of contact of students who utilized peer counselor services with the student grade point average.

$H_07$ There is no relationship between the age of students who utilized peer counselor services with their grade point average.

$H_08$ There is no relationship between the sex of students who utilized peer counselor services with their grade point average.

$H_09$ There is no relationship between the place of residence of students who utilized peer counselor services with their grade point average.
Ho$_{10}$ There is no relationship between student's evaluation by those students who utilized peer counselor services with their grade point average.

2. General Hypothesis - There is no significant relationship between frequency of contact, age, sex and place of residence with retention of students who utilized peer counselors.

Specific Hypotheses:

Ho$_{11}$ There is no relationship between frequency of student contact of students who utilized peer counselor services with the peer counselor and retention.

Ho$_{12}$ There is no relationship between the age of students who utilized peer counselor services with retention.

Ho$_{13}$ There is no relationship between the sex of students who utilized peer counselor services with retention.

Ho$_{14}$ There is no relationship between the place of residence of students who utilized peer counselor services with retention.

Need for the Study

In addition to the other component analysis of the Developmental Education Program, this study provides needed information concerning the relationship between peer counselors and counselees. This component analysis will also provide additional data necessary for an overall program analysis in assessing the impact of the Office of Developmental Education on students needing supportive services. The results of this study should yield:
1. Pertinent and relevant data that will provide a better basis for determining the effectiveness of the peer counseling program in the Office of Developmental Education.

2. Evidence to administrators as to the impact of the peer counseling program.

3. Aid the Office of Developmental Education by providing empirical data on retention rate, grade point average, relationship of frequency of contact between counselor and counselee and academic success.

4. Facilitation of the counseling process through the provision of data that can be utilized in the counselor training program.

As coordinator of the peer counseling program during the 1973-74 academic year, the researcher was often questioned as to the effectiveness of the peer counseling program. To analyze such a program not only is important for reporting to funding agencies, but also to improve the overall counseling program. However, this study will focus only on the peer counseling component of Developmental Education and its effectiveness as observed within the student population served during the 1973-74 academic year.

During the 1973-74 academic year, twenty peer counselors were selected to assist the approximately four hundred entering freshmen within the Office of Developmental Education. The selection of persons to serve as peer counselors was based on criteria developed as a result of a survey conducted during 1973 by Roy Malcolm. These criteria included:
1. Classification (academic rank of peer counselors)
2. Scholastic Achievement (2.40 and above grade point average)
3. Race and Ethnic Background (same as counselee)
4. Age (older than counselee)
5. Pre-Service Training (mandatory for counselors)
6. Sex (not significant)
7. Residence Status (preference for on campus counselors)
8. Previous Counseling Experiences

The general characteristics of the person selected were:
1. Upperclassmen
2. A 2.4 cumulative grade point average
3. Afro-American
4. 19-24 years old
5. Did have pre-service training
6. 70% females
7. Half lived in the residence halls
8. Half lived in off campus housing
9. Had previous experience working with people
   (e.g., peer counselors, camp leaders, or residence advisors)

The need for peer counselors to work with other students on predominantly white campuses grows as the number of minority group students increases. This is not to say only minority students need peer counseling services. Brown (1972), Siege (1968) and Freedman (1956) show that any student with academic deficits could benefit from a supportive service program. Peer counselors need to be equipped with effective skills that may be used in a variety of ways to facilitate in
their students (counselee) the development of strong self-identities, realistic goals, and abilities to work within The Ohio State University. Peer counselors must exhibit a willingness to help others, empathy, patience and understanding.

Peer counselors are not to replace the academic adviser/counselor; instead, they will serve as a liaison between the student and academic adviser/counselor.

In working with students, the objectives are to:

1. Move each student from where he is to what he can become.
2. Assist the student to assume responsibility for his actions (independence).
3. Help each student develop a sense of self-worth through greater self-awareness of his inner resources.
4. Develop students' flexibility in evaluating goals maturely and realistically.
5. Listen intuitively and non-judgmentally to students.
6. Reduce social isolation and increase involvement and interaction.
7. Serve as a model of a successful student.

General

The responsibility of the peer counselors in the Office of Developmental Education is three-fold. These responsibilities include their responsibility to the students, to the academic adviser/counselors and to the total organization of Developmental Education.

Specific

Peer counselor responsibilities are (to students):
1. Establish a sincere helping relationship with each student.

2. Keep a record of student's room number, phone number and quarterly schedule.

3. Meet with your students weekly.

4. Keep a record of student contacts on contact sheets.

5. Involve the students in campus and personal activities.

6. Assist the students with academic, personal, social and residence hall concerns.

7. Give accurate information about University procedures and Curricular Academic Program (CAP) area information.

8. Establish and maintain a working relationship with residence hall personnel.

9. Help the students and their academic adviser/counselor establish a good relationship.

10. Make referrals when student's concerns require more assistance (to academic adviser/counselor, counseling center, college offices, financial aids, etc.).

(To Academic Adviser/Counselors)

1. Provide feedback to the academic adviser/counselor about each student during weekly meetings.

2. Submit contact sheets to program coordinator every two weeks.

3. Participate, according to academic adviser/counselor's need, in University College and the University College Survey Course (UVC 100).

4. Perform administrative tasks according to academic adviser/counselor's need.
5. Cooperate with academic adviser/counselor in any other way according to academic adviser/counselor's need.

(To Developmental Education)

1. Attend peer counselor staff meetings.
2. Attend peer counselor in-service training sessions.
3. Submit time sheets every two weeks to program coordinator.
4. Participate in an evaluative study each quarter to assess the effectiveness of the peer counselor program.
5. Consult with the program coordinator concerning the peer counseling program.

The implementation and development of the peer counselors in the Office of Developmental Education has been observed by administrators, faculty, staff, and other educators from surrounding institutions of higher education. The most pertinent question asked about the peer counselor program is whether or not the program is assisting in the facilitation of the goals and objectives set forth by the Office of Developmental Education. (See goals and objectives on Pages 11 and 12.)

As a result of increased concerns for the total program in Developmental Education, it is imperative that an in-depth look be taken to facilitate the ever-increasing needs of this program. However, this study will focus on one component of this program -- that being an analysis of the peer counseling program in the Office of Developmental Education at The Ohio State University.
Limits of the Study

One major limitation of this study was that the research was limited to minority freshmen students at The Ohio State University who enrolled in the Developmental Education Program during the 1973-74 academic school year.

A second limitation was that the study did not provide any controls for possible intervening variables that could have affected the peer counseling program.

A third limitation was that the grade point, dropout retention, student evaluation, frequency of contact, age, sex, and place of residence were the only variables that were examined in this study.

Definition of Terms Used in This Study

In order to facilitate an assurance of clarity of the terms used in this study, the following definitions are provided:

1. Peer Counselors - Selected upperclassmen who assist freshmen students with their personal, social, and academic adjustment as it relates to their survival at the University.

2. Peer Counseling - The process of selected upperclassmen assisting incoming freshmen with their personal, social, and academic concerns as they relate to the University.

3. Developmental Education - A specialized program designed to provide supportive services for freshmen identified as having academic or adjustment problems.

4. Academic Adviser/Counselors - Graduate student counselors overseeing the peer counselors and their counselees.
5. University College - A non-degree granting unit of OSU in which all freshmen students of the university must enroll for at least one quarter.

6. Minority student - A student belonging to one of the following groups: Afro-American, Appalachian White, American Indian, Mexican American, Puerto Rican, Oriental.

Organization of the Dissertation

Chapter I of this study includes: (1) an introduction to the investigation, (2) a statement of the problem, (3) the need for the study, (4) limits of the study, (5) definition of the terms used, and (6) organization of the dissertation.

Chapter II deals with a review of the related literature and reports.

Chapter III describes the population and other demographic information pertinent to this study. Also the methods and procedures that were employed.

Chapter IV contains an analysis of the finding of this study.

Chapter V presents the researcher's summary, conclusions and recommendations.

The final section of this dissertation lists bibliographic references and the appendices exhibiting the instruments used in the study.
CHAPTER II

Review of Related Literature

A thorough review of the literature as it relates to peer counseling has revealed only a few studies that relate directly to this study. However, numerous studies have indicated the use of peer counselors on various levels of education. Only a few studies have been found that analyzed the effectiveness and use of peer counselors.

After searching the literature intensively relative to the topic of this study, it was found that most of the pertinent literature dealt mainly with peer counseling and not peer counseling effectiveness.

One of the first studies to investigate peer counseling in higher education was conducted by Hardee and Powell (1956). National comprehensive study of the use of student counselors in senior colleges and universities was undertaken by Brown and Zunker (1966). Both surveys found organized student-to-student counseling to be in wide use on the nation's college campuses. A comparison of the two studies indicates that there is an increasing concern for the selection and training of student counselors. However, both studies found that institutions were employing haphazard procedures in the selection, training and the supervision of their student counselors.

Between 1959 and 1968, six investigations were conducted at Southwest Texas State College to assess the effectiveness and acceptability or student-to-student counseling. Each investigation took an
in-depth look at four unique elements of the counseling program.

These unique elements included:

1. The effectiveness and acceptability of counseling being done by student academic counselors (peer counselor).

2. The comparative effectiveness and acceptability of male and female student academic counselors (peer counselor).

3. The effectiveness and acceptability of student and professionals as academic adjustment counselors (peer counselor).

4. The student counselor's (peer counselor) effectiveness and acceptability with freshmen identified as potential drop-outs.

The conclusion of these studies as it relates to the four elements under investigation reveals that:

1. Student-to-student counseling or peer counseling is an effective and acceptable counseling procedure for beginning college freshmen.

2. Female student counselors are significantly less effective and less accepted than male student counselors in giving academic adjustment guidance to opposite sex.

3. Student counselors were as effective as professional counselors in all criteria of counseling productivity employed in this study.

4. Student-to-student counseling designed to improve study skills, scholastic motivation, and academic achievement is a practical and productive means of aiding the student whose potential for successfully completing college is questionable.

Lynch (1972) conducted a study to determine relationships between the student characteristics of race, socio-economic background and sex
and student use of university academic counseling services. The respondents in this study were undergraduate students enrolled at Indiana University and Purdue University at Indianapolis who had completed at least twenty-seven credit hours. This study revealed that university students use of academic counseling facilities, their perception of the benefits derived from these services are not related to the student's race, sex, or socio-economic background. Instead, they are related to the subject area in which the student is majoring.

Froman (1971) conducted a study to evaluate the effects of peer tutoring and individual and group counseling both with and without reinforcement (praise) on the academic achievement of 104 risk (disadvantaged, non-traditional) college students at the University of Tennessee.

His study revealed that those risk students who receiving tutoring and reinforced individual counseling earned higher weekly quiz grades than risk students in other treatment groups. However, they failed to obtain significantly higher final grades than members of other treatment groups. Counseling was also found to be an effective deterrent of freshman default. The drop-out rate for students receiving counseling was one-third the rate for non-counseled risk students.

Week-to-week achievement of risk students was enhanced by providing them with individual reinforced counseling and peer tutoring. Final grades were not significantly affected by these treatments.

Wargen (1971) conducted a study to gather data from existing programs and other sources that might be helpful in developing a paraprofessional counseling program. Materials concerning paraprofessional
counseling were gathered by reviewing the literature and looking at actual operational programs. The results revealed that:

1. Selection of peer counselors should be on the basis of "natural traits" of the candidates as demonstrated through behavior during the selection process.

2. The major portion of the training should be continuous on-the-job supervision.

3. The paraprofessional's role will be determined by the needs of the students, judgment of the supervising counselor, and capacity of the paraprofessional.

Akers (1970) conducted a study of the student population at Purdue University to determine answers to the following questions:

1. What are the concerns and worries that students feel?

2. To what extent do they think they have experienced problems serious enough to warrant professional assistance?

3. Where would they turn if it were available?

Akers also included additional objectives of the study; to determine student awareness and use of counseling services and reasons why students did not utilize available counseling services at Purdue.

The findings of the study revealed that students had significant problems in the areas of adjustment to college work.

The finding also revealed that sources not directly labeled as Purdue services were most often selected to help with personal problems. However, for certain specific problems, students perceived some Purdue services as a prime source of help. Additionally, the study revealed that students indicated that the academic adviser and residence hall
counselor had been used most as Purdue sources of help with personal problems. Students frequently indicated that they did not use Purdue counseling services because they felt they could or should be able to handle their problem by themselves, or they were unaware of available services.

Morris (1971) conducted an investigation to determine the effectiveness and usefulness of pairing clients with counselors in university counseling centers on the basis of their scores on the Inner-Directed Support scale of the Personal Orientation Inventory by E. L. Shostrom.

This study was conducted in the counseling centers of the University of Idaho and Washington State University during the 1969-70 academic year. The finding showed that responses of high inner-directed clients (high self-motivation) differed from the responses of low inner-directed clients (little self-motivation) on some of the scales of client's attitude questionnaire. The counselors responded as though they understood their high inner-directed clients better than their low inner-directed clients. Satisfaction with the counseling experience was significant for clients from both high and low inner-directed groups who remained in counseling for a number of interviews. Additionally, the counselor and client inner-directedness did not appear to be a promising variable for use as a base for the effective matching of counselors and clients in college and university counseling centers.

Faulkenberry (1968) conducted a study to compare the judged effectiveness of counselor behavior in a counseling interview as rated
by supervisors, counselors, counselees and the counselor's peer group.

The population of his study consisted of educators attending an Equal Educational Opportunities Institute at Purdue University. The sample included 30 participants, 15 Black and 15 Caucasian attending the 1966 summer session. The supervisors were Negro and Caucasian counselor educators.

The results of this study revealed that:

1. Race identity as a factor in rating counselor behavior made no significant difference in evaluation.

2. Supervisors were found to have greater agreement in evaluation than other group evaluators (educators).

3. There was very little relationship shown between evaluation of counselor behavior and counselors' scores on dogmatism and social distance.

4. On characteristics which involved warmth, understanding, and acceptance and in an overall gestalt evaluation, the supervisors were more consistent in agreement than the other group evaluators.

Kern (1970) conducted a study to determine the effect of a group counseling procedure employing peers as helpers to the counselor would have on the improvement of elementary school children with adjustment problems and to compare this group counseling procedure with the more commonly employed counselor-oriented group counseling procedure.

The finding of this study revealed that the only significant value was obtained on the group procedure variable in relation to the pre- and post-test total adjustment scores on the teacher rated Behavior Checklist. Further analysis indicated that the teachers
perceived the children who were involved in the Peer Helper Group Counseling Procedure as making significantly higher gains on the Behavior Checklist than the children involved in the Counselor-Oriented Group Procedure or the Control Group. There was no significant difference between pre- and post-test total adjustment scores on the Behavior Checklist when comparisons were made between the Counselor-Oriented Group Counseling Procedure and the Control Group.

Vriend (1968) conducted a study to evaluate a supervised program of peer leadership in counseling and study groups with selected students in an inner-city high school in Detroit, Michigan. Three criteria were used to evaluate the academic achievements of selected students. They included grade point averages on college ability test, vocational and educational aspirations and expectations, and classroom skills. The results of this study indicated that students in the demonstration group had a significantly greater increase in academic achievement as measured by grade point average. Students in the demonstration group also showed improved classroom skills and there were significantly greater increases in educational and vocational aspirations and expectations over the control group who showed decrease in the same measures.

Denton (1971) conducted a study that attempted to measure the dimensions of intensity and intimacy in the counseling interpersonal relationship as related to effective results or observable behavior of the counselee.

The major conclusions were:

1. Observable behaviors changed from the first interview to interviews four and five and from the second to the fifth interview.
In all other instances the observable behaviors were significantly related.

2. Intensity and intimacy in the beginning interviews had a statistically significant relationship with counseling effectiveness.

A study completed by Malcolm (1974) took an in-depth look at the criteria used to select peer counselors for the Peer Counselor Training Program in the Office of Developmental Education at The Ohio State University. His findings revealed that the criteria utilized in the selection of peer counselors should include the peer counselee's perception of the role of the peer counselor. Additionally, Zunker (1966), Brown (1972) and Malcolm (1974) found that the potential value of peer counseling is unlimited in the area of student development.

Hall (1971) examined the financial aid program provided for students entering the Developmental Education Program. His findings revealed that the security of financial assistance is an important factor in student motivation and academic success. Joyner (1972) utilized the Nelson-Denney Reading Test to measure the reading level of students entering the Developmental Education Program. His findings indicated that students seeking supportive services were in need of academic assistance and counseling. Franklin (1973) examined the relationship of planned supportive services for minority students and grade point averages of students within the Developmental Education Program. Based on his research, Franklin noted that achievement in social studies and the sciences is dependent upon reading and comprehension and that remedial English was a helpful factor in improving performance in the regular college course English 100.
Summary

The emphasis in this review of literature has been on research related to the utilization of peer counseling to facilitate the counseling process of students in their adjustment to the college, university and other educational environments. Although the research on peer counselor utilization is somewhat limited, the various studies and reports indicate that various methods and procedures are used to determine if students can benefit from utilizing peer counselor services.

There appear to be few studies emphasizing a great need to evaluate peer counseling programs based on the utilization of peer counselors and the effect the peer counselors had on the students served.

In summary, the following studies were reviewed as they relate to peer counselor utilization: (1) Selection and Training of Peer Counselors by Brown, Zunker, Hardee and Powell (2) Effectiveness and Acceptability of Peer Counselors by Lynch (3) Relationships Between Student Characteristics (Race, Socio-economic Background, Sex) with Student Use of University Counseling Services by Froman (4) A Study to Evaluate a Supervised Program of Peer Leadership in Counseling by Vriend and (5) A Study to Measure the Dimensions of Intensity and Intimacy in the Counseling Interpersonal Relationship by Denton.
CHAPTER III
DESIGN, PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents a discussion of the overall design, procedures and methodology used in this study to analyze the peer counseling program in the Office of Developmental Education at The Ohio State University. The instrument used, methods of gathering data and statistical operation for data analysis are also presented in this chapter. The following major and minor hypotheses were tested:

$H_0^1$ There is no difference between grade point averages of students who utilized the services of peer counselors and the grade point averages of students who did not utilize the services of peer counselors.

$H_0^2$ There is no difference between retention of students who did not utilize peer counselors and students who utilized peer counselors.

$H_0^3$ There is no difference in age between students who utilized the peer counselor services and students who did not utilize the peer counselor services.

$H_0^4$ There is no difference in sex between students who utilized the peer counselor services and students who did not utilize the peer counselor services.
H05 There is no difference in place of residence between students who utilized the peer counselor services and students who did not utilize the peer counselor services.

H06 There is no relationship between frequency of peer counselor contact with students and their grade point average.

H07 There is no relationship between the age of students who utilized peer counselor services with their grade point average.

H08 There is no relationship between the sex of students who utilized peer counselor services with their grade point average.

H09 There is no relationship between the place of residence of students who utilized peer counselor services with their grade point average.

H010 There is no relationship between the students evaluation by those students who utilized peer counselor services and return their survey instrument with their grade point average.

H011 There is no relationship between frequency of peer counselor contact of student with retention.

H012 There is no relationship between age of student who utilized peer counselor services with retention.

H013 There is no relationship between the sex of students who utilized peer counselor services with retention.
H0\textsubscript{14} There is no relationship between the place of residence of students who utilized peer counselor services with retention.

\textbf{Research Setting}

The Office of Developmental Education at University College of The Ohio State University was the setting for this study. The office had its beginning on July 1, 1972, with operations on all of the University's regional campuses. Student participation in the program is completely voluntary. Its purpose is to provide those student services that are not a part of the traditional University College service arena; more specifically, its purpose is to provide services for those students who have been identified as a minority and need assistance in their academic, personal and social adjustment in a university setting. The office is headed by an associate dean who is responsible for the overall planning and coordination of the program on the Columbus and regional campuses. Refer to Figure for the complete picture of the organization and components functions. The component of peer counseling was developed on the Columbus Campus. During the 1973-74 academic year, 326 minority students were enrolled in the program, 191 of these students utilized the peer counselor services, while the remaining 135 chose not to utilize these services.
Figure 1.
Development of Data Collection and Instrumentation

The initial step taken was to define and acquire necessary resources that enabled the researcher to commence such a study required a considerable amount of reading, research, meditation and consultation of some people with a dearth of experiences and knowledge in the areas of counseling and student personnel services. With the assistance and cooperation of the associate and assistant deans of the university in charge of the Office of Developmental Education and other members of the Developmental Education staff, a needs assessment was conducted which reflected the peer counseling component of the program as being highest on the priority list in terms of evaluation. The needs assessment reflected several areas of concern that were identified as being related to peer counseling. The concerned areas were:

(1) Differences between students who utilized peer counseling services and those who did not utilize peer counseling services as it relates to:
   (a) Age
   (b) sex
   (c) place of residence
   (d) grade point average
   (e) retention

(2) Relationship between students who utilized peer counseling services as it relates to:
   (a) age
   (b) sex
   (c) place of residence
(d) grade point average  
(e) frequency of peer counseling services  
(f) student attitude survey  

All items listed in the action were acquired from:

(1) student record folder, (2) permanent record folder, (3) internal records in the Office of Developmental Education, (4) the Office of Records in University College, (5) members of the Developmental Education staff, (6) the researcher's experiences as an undergraduate student, high school teacher, graduate student and an academic counselor, (7) members of the researcher's advisory committee, (8) members of the faculty of Special Services and (9) a researcher who had conducted a study at other universities on peer counseling.

The development of an instrument that would allow the recipients of the peer counseling services some input into the overall evaluation of the peer counseling program required an extensive amount of time and consultation with the same sources mentioned above. The instrument was designed to acquire the recipients' attitudes as they relate to their experiences in the peer counseling program. The instrument was carefully constructed for simplicity and clarity to enable participants to be objective in their responses. In order to make sure that the instrument covered areas of concerns, the instrument was presented to a panel of judges who have knowledge in the areas of peer counseling, Developmental Education and student services. The judges were:

(1) Dr. W. H. Watson (The late Associate Dean of University College and Administrator of the Developmental Education Program,
(2) Dr. M. Stewart (Acting Associate Dean of University College
and Administrator of the Developmental Education Program).
(3) Ms. C. Clark (Ph.D. candidate in Counselor Education)
(4) Mr. W. Wilson (Ph.D. candidate in Student Personnel)
(5) Ms. A. Neal (Ph.D. candidate in Adult Education/Student
Personnel)
(6) Ms. S. Shands (Ph.D. student in Student Personnel and Adult
Education)
(7) Ms. O. Thomas (Ph.D. student in Counselor Education)
(8) Mr. J. Montes (Ph.D. candidate in Developmental Psychology)
(9) Ms. R. Moore (Ph.D. student in Student Personnel Services)
(10) Ms. B. Lewis (Coordinator of the Reading and Study Skills
Center)
(11) Dr. Roy Malcolm (Registrar at Oakwood College)

The judges were asked to respond to the instrument in terms of:
(1) clarity
(2) stability
(3) uniformity
(4) totality
(5) consistency
(6) whether each statement was negative or positive

Initially the researcher had developed 46 statements, but after
receiving responses from the judges and consultation with the advisory
committee, the statements were narrowed to twenty-nine. After making
the necessary changes, the researcher then conducted a pilot study
with 20 participants as a part of the validation process. These
persons were randomly selected from the total enrollment in the Office of Developmental Education. The Kuder-Richardson test of reliability was used to analyze the responses of the pilot study. The result of the test indicated that the instrument had a test of reliability of 0.9190.

The statements used in the instrument are an adaptation of statements in an instrument developed by Professor Brown at Southwest Texas University and used with his permission. (See Appendix C.)

Population

The population for this study consisted of 326 minority freshman students who participated in activities of the Office of Developmental Education program at the University College of The Ohio State University during the 1973-74 academic year. For the purpose of this study, the population was basically divided into two groups: (1) those who utilized peer counseling services (this group consisted of 191 students) and (2) those who did not utilize peer counseling services (this group consisted of 135 students). The elements of attrition and mobility within the campus community causes the status of many students to change. Therefore, those students who utilized peer counselors were divided into three groups:

(1) non-accessibles - those students who for reasons of attrition or mobility, the researcher was unable to reach;

(2) non-respondents - those students who did not respond to the instrument;
(3) respondents - those students who responded to the instrument.

All of the participants of this study were specifically recruited minority students who had been defined as being from a low socio-economic, educationally deprived and disadvantaged backgrounds.

Study Sample and Data Collection Procedures

Prior to the commencing of this study, the researcher was advised to secure permission to conduct privileged research within University College at The Ohio State University. Based on this advice, the researcher requested and obtained written permission from the Executive Committee of University College to proceed with the investigation and to use necessary resources of University College to assist in the successful completion of this study. (See Appendix B.)

Data were collected from all 326 students. Since all students did not belong to one group, it was necessary to collect data as it pertained to each group.

For the non-accessible and non-respondent students, the following data were gathered:

(a) age
(b) sex
(c) grade point averages for each quarter and also the yearly accumulative point hour ratio for the 1973-74 academic year
(d) frequency of peer counselor contact
(e) place of residence during the 1973-74 academic year
(f) curricula academic program.
For the respondent students, the following data were gathered:

(a) age
(b) sex
(c) grade point averages for each quarter and also the yearly accumulative point hour ratio for the 1973-74 academic year
(d) frequency of peer counselor contact
(e) place of residence during the 1973-74 academic year
(f) curricula academic program
(g) student attitudinal survey.

For the students who did not utilize the services of the peer counselor program, the following data were gathered:

(a) age
(b) sex
(c) grade point averages for each quarter and also the yearly accumulative point hour ratio for the 1973-74 academic year
(d) place of residence during the 1973-74 academic year
(e) curricula academic program.

Analysis

In order to accept or reject a hypothesis, it was necessary to choose the appropriate statistical procedures. In this study, appropriate statistical procedures were employed to test the hypotheses that were proposed. The analyses of the data were made in relationship to the objectives of the study.

Simple percentages were computed on all demographic variables and are presented in Appendix A.
Analysis of variance was used to determine differences between grade point averages of the students that utilized peer counselors and the students that did not utilize peer counselors, retention of students who utilized peer counselors and retention of students who did not utilize peer counselors, sex of students who utilized peer counselors and students who did not utilize peer counselors, place of residence of students who utilized peer counselors and the place of residence of students who did not utilize peer counselors.

All data collected for this study were gathered from records in the Office of Developmental Education and the main Records Office of University College, with the exception of the Student Evaluation Survey. The Student Evaluation Survey instrument was mailed to off-campus students and hand delivered to those students who lived on campus. A total of 191 students were eligible to participate in the student evaluation survey, but because addresses for 44 of these students could not be located, the total number of students to whom the survey was administered was 147. Thirty-nine of the students or 26.5% who received questionnaires did not respond, while 108 students or 73.5% did respond. A code number was assigned to participants and placed on the instrument for follow-up purposes. Seven days following the initial distribution and mailing of the instrument, a telephone call was made to all participants who had not responded. Five days later, a follow-up telephone call was made to those participants who had not responded.

Data from all instruments were coded for machine compilation and statistical analysis at the Instruction and Research Computer Center on The Ohio State University Campus.
Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were used to describe the relationship between the age of students who utilized peer counselors with the age of students who did not utilize peer counselors, frequency of students' contact with grade point averages and the age of students with grade point averages.
CHAPTER IV
Analysis and Results

The major purpose of this chapter is to present an analysis of the findings for this study. Findings are reported for each of the null hypotheses stated in Chapter III. Each null hypothesis is restated to eliminate referring to the earlier text.

The primary purpose of this study was to analyze the differences and relationships between students who utilized the peer counseling program as opposed to students who did not utilize the peer counseling program in the Office of Developmental Education.

Several hypotheses were advanced and many statistical analyses were applied to test the hypotheses -- including Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient, Chi Square and the Analysis of Variance.

The general demographic characteristics of the research participants are presented below. For specifics of each demographic variable, the reader should refer to the appropriate table within Appendix A.

1. Sex - The total population consists of 326 students, 120 males and 206 females or 36.8% and 63.2% respectively. (Table 1, Appendix A.)

2. Age - The ages of the research participants were 237 or 72.7% between the ages of 18-20, 60 or 18.4% between the ages of 21-23, 23 or 7% between the ages of 24-26, 2 or 0.6% between the ages of 27-29 and 4 or 1.2% between the ages of 30-35. (Table 2, Appendix A.)
3. Curricular Academic Program - The major academic areas of the research participant included 193 or 59% in the areas consisting of General Baccalaureate Curricula (GBC), Administrative Sciences (ADM) and Arts and Sciences (ASC); 89 or 28% in the areas consisting of Allied Medical Professions (AMP), Education (EDUC), Nursing (NUR) and Social Work (SWK); 44 or 13% in the following areas of Agriculture (AGR), Architecture (AHR), Art (ART), Dentistry (DEN), Dental Hygiene (DHY), Engineering (ENG), Home Economics (HEC), Medicine (MED), Music (MUS), Natural Resources (NRE), Optometry (OPT) and Veterinary Medicine (VME). (Table 3, Appendix A.)

4. The Residential Status of the Research Participants were (1) for those students who utilized the peer counselor services, 123 (64.4%) lived on campus and 68 (35.6%) lived off campus (2) for those students who did not utilize the peer counselor services, 70 (51.9%) lived on campus and 65 (48.1%) lived off campus. (See Table 4, Appendix A.)

5. Mean Grade Point Averages of Research Participants for Autumn, Winter and Spring Quarters - 2.020, 1.796, 2.058 respectively; yearly grade point average was 1.951. (See Tables 5, 6, 7, 8, Appendix A.)

6. Student Contact with Peer Counselor - During Autumn Quarter, 1973, one hundred seventy-eight (178) students contacted their peer counselor 01-05 times, 6 between 6-10 times and 2 between 11-15 times. During Winter Quarter, 1974, one hundred seventeen (117) students contacted their peer counselor 01-05 times,
2 between 06-10 times, 2 between 11-15 times and 1 between 16-20 times. During Spring Quarter, twenty-nine (29) students contacted their peer counselor 01-05 times; the remaining 162 students did not contact their peer counselor during Spring Quarter, 1974. (See Tables 9, 10, 11, 12, Appendix A.) All students not receiving contact are noted by (99) in all Tables.

The following tables present the data analysis for the hypotheses defined. The established level of significance used to test each hypothesis was set at $p < 0.05$ alpha level.

$H_0$ There is no difference between grade point averages of students who utilized the services of peer counselors and the grade point averages of students who did not utilize the services of peer counselors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autumn</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Students who utilized services of the peer counselor.</td>
<td>2.048</td>
<td>1.769</td>
<td>2.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students who did not utilize the services of the peer counselor.</td>
<td>1.978</td>
<td>1.837</td>
<td>2.018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mean and standard deviation are presented in Table 1 comparing the result of the grade point analysis for Autumn, Winter and Spring Quarters for Group 1 students who utilized peer counselor services and Group 2 students who did not utilize peer counselor services.

There appeared to be a difference between Group 1 and Group 2 grade point averages for the Autumn, Winter and Spring Quarters.

Further data analysis utilizing the one-way repeated measurement analysis of variance design was performed to determine if the difference between the mean was significant at the .05 alpha level. The results are summarized in Table 2.

**TABLE 2**

ANOVA OF GRADE POINT AVERAGES FOR AUTUMN, WINTER AND SPRING QUARTER BY PEER COUNSELOR UTILIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (treatment)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.778</td>
<td>3.778</td>
<td>.0318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (subject)</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>3.010</td>
<td>1.189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (repeated measure)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.734</td>
<td>2.367</td>
<td>4.3617*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB (interaction)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.183</td>
<td>1.091</td>
<td>2.0117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC (residual)</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>2.746</td>
<td>5.427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 326

* p > .05

The F value associated with the A (treatment) variable at 1/506 (df) was not significant .0318 < .05 level of significance, the F value associated with the B (repeated measurement) variable at 2/506 (df) was significant 4.3617 > .05 level of significance, and the F value
associated with the AB (interaction) at 2/506 (df) was not significant at 2.0117.

Interpretation of the results indicate that there is no significant difference at the .05 level between treatment groups; students who utilized peer counselor services and students who did not utilize peer counselors as it relates to grade point averages. The researcher did not find a significant difference at the .05 level between the repeated measure variable, which reflects variances between Autumn, Winter and Spring Quarter grades. The variance could not be attributed to group treatment, therefore the evidence failed to reject Ho

\[ H_0 \] There is no difference between retention of students who utilized peer counselors and students who did not utilize peer counselors.

### TABLE 3

PERCENTAGES AND NUMBERS OF STUDENTS WHO WITHDREW AND DID NOT WITHDRAW FROM THE UNIVERSITY FOR GROUP 1 STUDENTS WHO DID AND GROUP 2 STUDENTS WHO DID NOT UTILIZE PEER COUNSELORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Students who withdrew from the University 1 or more times</th>
<th>Students who did not withdraw at any time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students who utilized the services of the peer counselor.</td>
<td>28            15%</td>
<td>163          85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students who did not utilize the services of the peer counselor.</td>
<td>37            27%</td>
<td>98           73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>65            15.4%</td>
<td>261          84.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 presents the number and percentages of students who withdrew from the university for one or more quarters and those students who did not withdraw from the university for three quarters; for Group 1 students who utilized peer counselors and Group 2 students who did not utilize peer counselors.

TABLE 4
PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF THE GROUP OF STUDENTS THAT UTILIZED PEER COUNSELORS AND THE GROUP OF STUDENTS THAT DID NOT UTILIZE THE PEER COUNSELORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N-</th>
<th>Pearson r</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>326</td>
<td>0.1181</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p<.05

Table 4 presents the results from the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient. The evidence as reported indicated that there is some association between retention and peer counselor contact. Therefore, Ho2 is rejected.

Ho3 There is no difference between age of students who utilized the peer counselor services and the age of students who did not utilize the peer counselor services.
Table 5 presents the $X^2$ analysis of association for the variable age of (Group 1) students who utilized the peer counselor services and (Group 2) students who did not utilize the peer counselor services. The evidence suggests that there is no association at the .05 level between age and students who utilized or did not utilize the peer counselor services. Therefore, $H_0$ is accepted. No significant difference exists between the two groups.
There is no difference between sex of students who utilized the peer counselor services and the sex of students who did not utilize the peer counselor services.

**TABLE 6**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Students who utilized the services of the peer counselor.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students who did not utilize the services of the peer counselor.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 191 for Group 1

N = 135 for Group 2

\(X^2 = 0.03538\)

df = 1

S = 0.8508

\(P > .05\)

Table 6 presents the \(X^2\) analysis of association for the variable. Sex of Group 1 students who utilized and Group 2 students who did not utilize the peer counselor services. The evidence is not sufficient to assure that any relationship exists between sex and utilization of the peer counselor services. Therefore, \(H_0^4\) is accepted that no significant differences exist between the two groups.
There is no difference between the place of residence of students who utilized the peer counselor services and the place of residence of students who did not utilize the peer counselor services.

### TABLE 7

**CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATION BETWEEN THE RESIDENCE STATUS OF STUDENTS WHO UTILIZED THE SERVICES OF THE PEER COUNSELOR AND STUDENTS WHO DID NOT UTILIZE THE SERVICES OF THE PEER COUNSELOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>On Campus</th>
<th></th>
<th>Off Campus</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students who utilized the services of the peer counselor.</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students who did not utilize the services of the peer counselor.</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 191 for Group 1

N = 135 for Group 2

χ² = 6.24012

df = 2

S = 0.0442

P < .05

Table 7 presents the χ² analysis of association for the variable Residence Status and Group 1 students who utilized and Group 2 students who did not utilize the peer counselor services. The evidence is sufficient to assure that there is a relationship between residence status and students who utilized and those students who did not utilize the peer counselor services. Therefore, H₀⁵ is rejected.
Ho6. There is no relationship between the frequency of peer counselor contact with students and their grade point average.

### TABLE 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Counselor Contact</th>
<th>Autumn GPA</th>
<th>Winter GPA</th>
<th>Spring GPA</th>
<th>Year GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During Autumn Quarter (1973)</td>
<td>r=0.1343</td>
<td>r=0.0060</td>
<td>r=0.0995</td>
<td>r=0.1075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=186*</td>
<td>n=171</td>
<td>n=158</td>
<td>n=186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Winter Quarter (1974)</td>
<td></td>
<td>r=0.919</td>
<td>r=0.0193</td>
<td>r=0.0542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=121</td>
<td>n=111</td>
<td>n=123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Spring Quarter (1974)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r=0.1984</td>
<td>r=0.4054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=30</td>
<td>n=3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Year 1973-74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r=0.1135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=191*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Table 8 presents the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient Analysis of the association between the variable peer counselor contact and students who utilized peer counselor with grade point averages. The evidence suggests that there is an association at the point .05 level between: (1) peer counselor contact during Autumn Quarter and Autumn Quarter grade point average (2) peer counselor contact during Spring Quarter and the year grade point averages for 1973-74 (3) peer counselor contact during the academic year 1973-74 and yearly grade point average. The evidence also suggests that there is not sufficient evidence assure that there is any relationship between grade point averages and
peer counselor contact at the .05 level for any other periods under investigation, therefore, \( H_0 \) is rejected.

\( H_0 \) There is no relationship between the age of students who utilized peer counselors with their grade point averages.

**TABLE 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Pearson r</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Age</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Yearly GPA</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students who utilized the peer counselor services.</td>
<td>-0.0580</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>20.1414</td>
<td>1.9429</td>
<td>1.951</td>
<td>0.648</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( p > .05 \)

Table 9 presents the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient Analysis of the association between the variable age with cumulative grade point averages of students who utilized the peer counselor services. The evidence suggests that there is no association at the .05 level between the two variables, therefore the evidence failed to fail to reject \( H_0 \).

\( H_0 \) There is no relationship between the sex of students who utilized peer counselors with their grade point average.

**TABLE 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Pearson r</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>No. and % of male</th>
<th>No. and % of female</th>
<th>Yearly GPA</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students who utilized the peer counselor services.</td>
<td>0.0734</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>69 or 36.1%</td>
<td>122 or 63.9%</td>
<td>1.951</td>
<td>0.648</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( p > .05 \)
Table 10 presents the Pearson Moment Correlation Coefficient Analysis of the association between the variable sex with cumulative grade point averages of students who utilized the peer counselor services. The evidence suggests that there is no association at the .05 level between the two variables, therefore the evidence failed to reject \( H_0 \).

\[ H_0 \text{ There is no relationship between the place of residence of students who utilized peer counselor services with their grade point average.} \]

### Table 11

**PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENT OF PLACE OF RESIDENCE WITH CUMULATIVE GRADE POINT AVERAGES OF STUDENTS WHO UTILIZED PEER COUNSELORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson r</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>No. and %</th>
<th>No. and %</th>
<th>Yearly GPA</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students who utilize the peer counselor services.</td>
<td>-0.0732</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>123 or 64.4%</td>
<td>68 or 35.6%</td>
<td>1.951</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( p > .05 \)

Table 11 presents the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Analysis of the association between the variable residence status with yearly grade point averages of students who utilized the peer counselor services. The evidence suggests that there is no association at the .05 level between the two variables, therefore the evidence failed to reject \( H_0 \).

\[ H_{10} \text{ There is no relationship between the student's evaluation survey by those students who utilized peer counselor services and returned their survey instrument with their grade point average.} \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATION BETWEEN THE AUTUMN, WINTER, SPRING QUARTER AND YEAR GRADE POINT AVERAGE WITH THE STUDENT EVALUATION SURVEY BY STUDENT WHO UTILIZED THE PEER COUNSELOR PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autumn Quarter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s=0.3577</td>
<td>s=0.8081</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X²=30.12</td>
<td>X²=21.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s=0.2363</td>
<td>s=0.7301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X²=32.98</td>
<td>X²=23.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s=0.6266</td>
<td>s=0.6669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X²=25.02</td>
<td>X²=24.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s=0.4245</td>
<td>s=0.9062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X²=28.77</td>
<td>X²=18.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square for Survey Items with Grade Point Averages
## TABLE 12 (Cont'd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autumn Quarter</strong></td>
<td>$X^2 = 28.92$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 23.68$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 26.25$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 34.95$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 29.01$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 28.50$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 29.52$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 28.68$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 32.28$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade Point</strong></td>
<td>df = 28</td>
<td>df = 28</td>
<td>df = 28</td>
<td>df = 28</td>
<td>df = 28</td>
<td>df = 28</td>
<td>df = 28</td>
<td>df = 28</td>
<td>df = 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>$s = 0.4165$</td>
<td>$s = 0.6982$</td>
<td>$s = 0.5592$</td>
<td>$s = 0.1712$</td>
<td>$s = 0.4120$</td>
<td>$s = 0.4385$</td>
<td>$s = 0.3963$</td>
<td>$s = 0.4289$</td>
<td>$s = 0.2634$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winter Quarter</strong></td>
<td>$X^2 = 22.59$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 31.95$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 22.78$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 23.55$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 24.69$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 32.16$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 28.74$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 18.93$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 19.42$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade Point</strong></td>
<td>df = 28</td>
<td>df = 28</td>
<td>df = 28</td>
<td>df = 28</td>
<td>df = 28</td>
<td>df = 28</td>
<td>df = 28</td>
<td>df = 28</td>
<td>df = 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>$s = 0.7532$</td>
<td>$s = 0.2765$</td>
<td>$s = 0.0740$</td>
<td>$s = 0.7050$</td>
<td>$s = 0.6446$</td>
<td>$s = 0.2681$</td>
<td>$s = 0.4257$</td>
<td>$s = 0.9004$</td>
<td>$s = 0.8846$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring Quarter</strong></td>
<td>$X^2 = 28.86$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 22.63$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 24.73$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 22.47$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 32.42$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 21.86$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 38.01$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 30.17$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 30.30$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade Point</strong></td>
<td>df = 28</td>
<td>df = 28</td>
<td>df = 28</td>
<td>df = 28</td>
<td>df = 28</td>
<td>df = 28</td>
<td>df = 28</td>
<td>df = 28</td>
<td>df = 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>$s = 0.4197$</td>
<td>$s = 0.7512$</td>
<td>$s = 0.6695$</td>
<td>$s = 0.7593$</td>
<td>$s = 0.2579$</td>
<td>$s = 0.7877$</td>
<td>$s = 0.0982$</td>
<td>$s = 0.3550$</td>
<td>$s = 0.3490$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year</strong></td>
<td>$X^2 = 20.00$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 15.30$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 23.66$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 27.49$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 31.52$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 19.22$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 15.45$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 21.17$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 28.54$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade Point</strong></td>
<td>df = 28</td>
<td>df = 28</td>
<td>df = 28</td>
<td>df = 28</td>
<td>df = 28</td>
<td>df = 28</td>
<td>df = 28</td>
<td>df = 28</td>
<td>df = 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>$s = 0.8645$</td>
<td>$s = 0.9757$</td>
<td>$s = 0.6996$</td>
<td>$s = 0.4915$</td>
<td>$s = 0.2943$</td>
<td>$s = 0.8911$</td>
<td>$s = 0.9732$</td>
<td>$s = 0.8181$</td>
<td>$s = 0.4361$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autumn Quarter</strong></td>
<td>$X^2=35.27$</td>
<td>$X^2=36.46$</td>
<td>$X^2=41.76$</td>
<td>$X^2=32.98$</td>
<td>$X^2=28.29$</td>
<td>$X^2=24.11$</td>
<td>$X^2=27.84$</td>
<td>$X^2=37.35$</td>
<td>$X^2=19.03$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade Point</strong></td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>s=0.1621</td>
<td>s=0.1312</td>
<td>s=0.0457</td>
<td>s=0.2365</td>
<td>s=0.4490</td>
<td>s=0.6759</td>
<td>s=0.4728</td>
<td>s=0.1113</td>
<td>s=0.8973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winter Quarter</strong></td>
<td>$X^2=21.83$</td>
<td>$X^2=24.76$</td>
<td>$X^2=46.35$</td>
<td>$X^2=24.49$</td>
<td>$X^2=18.76$</td>
<td>$X^2=27.94$</td>
<td>$X^2=26.36$</td>
<td>$X^2=25.67$</td>
<td>$X^2=26.88$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade Point</strong></td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>s=0.7892</td>
<td>x=0.6407</td>
<td>x=0.0160</td>
<td>s=0.6553</td>
<td>s=0.9055</td>
<td>s=0.4679</td>
<td>s=0.5533</td>
<td>s=0.5911</td>
<td>s=0.5249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring Quarter</strong></td>
<td>$X^2=17.61$</td>
<td>$X^2=27.20$</td>
<td>$X^2=29.80$</td>
<td>$X^2=21.83$</td>
<td>$X^2=19.32$</td>
<td>$X^2=19.50$</td>
<td>$X^2=24.40$</td>
<td>$X^2=28.50$</td>
<td>$X^2=30.88$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade Point</strong></td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>s=0.9355</td>
<td>s=0.5076</td>
<td>s=0.3730</td>
<td>s=0.7891</td>
<td>s=0.8880</td>
<td>s=0.8820</td>
<td>s=0.6600</td>
<td>s=0.4383</td>
<td>s=0.3223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year</strong></td>
<td>$X^2=18.82$</td>
<td>$X^2=21.81$</td>
<td>$X^2=35.29$</td>
<td>$X^2=24.50$</td>
<td>$X^2=15.00$</td>
<td>$X^2=23.22$</td>
<td>$X^2=26.49$</td>
<td>$X^2=19.13$</td>
<td>$X^2=24.09$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade Point</strong></td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
<td>df=28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>s=0.9037</td>
<td>s=0.7900</td>
<td>s=0.1616</td>
<td>s=0.6550</td>
<td>s=0.9784</td>
<td>s=0.7219</td>
<td>s=0.5460</td>
<td>s=0.8939</td>
<td>s=0.4081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarter</td>
<td>$X^2$</td>
<td>$df$</td>
<td>$s$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn Quarter</td>
<td>46.98</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.0138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Quarter</td>
<td>31.60</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.2913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Quarter</td>
<td>27.64</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.4836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>27.65</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.4834</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$s$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autumn Quarter</td>
<td>34.75</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.1771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Quarter</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.8822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Quarter</td>
<td>23.76</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.0643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>29.15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.4050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
p > .05
Table 12 presents the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient Analysis of the Association between the variables Autumn, Winter, Spring Quarter and Yearly Grade Point Averages with the student evaluation survey by students who utilized the peer counselor program. The evidence suggests that (1) for Autumn Quarter there is an association between grade point average and Items 21 and 28 (My peer counselor did not like to discuss problems created by dormitory life. I feel that my grades improved as a result of my peer counselor's experiences.), respectively. Evidence further suggests that there is no association at the .05 level between all remaining items and grade point averages during Autumn Quarter 1973; (2) for Winter Quarter there is an association at the .05 level between grade point averages and Item 21 (My peer counselor did not like to discuss problems created by dormitory life.). Evidence further suggests that there is no association at the .05 level between all remaining items and grade point averages during Winter Quarter 1974; (3) for Spring Quarter there is an association between grade point average and Item 3 (Discussing my academic attitudes with my peer counselor has made me more tolerant of teacher deficiencies.). Evidence further suggests that there is no association at the .05 level between all remaining items and grade point average during Spring Quarter 1974, and (4) for the year grade point average, there is no association at the .05 level between grade point average and Items 1 thru 29, therefore the evidence failed to reject $H_{0_{10}}$.

$H_{0_{11}}$ There is no relationship between frequency of peer counselor contact of student with retention.
**TABLE 13**

PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENT, MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF PEER COUNSELOR CONTACT AND RETENTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Counselor Contact - Quarter</th>
<th>Pearson r</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autumn Quarter</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>2.6989</td>
<td>2.8645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Quarter</td>
<td>-0.0372</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>2.6557</td>
<td>1.6553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Quarter</td>
<td>0.2469</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.0690</td>
<td>1.0327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Year</td>
<td>0.1316</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>4.6387</td>
<td>3.3040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P > .05

Table 13 presents the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient, mean and standard deviation of the association between peer counselor contact during Autumn, Winter and Spring Quarter and Yearly Contact with Retention. The evidence suggests that there is no association at the .05 level between peer counselor contact during any period with retention, therefore evidence failed to reject $H_{011}$.

$H_{012}$ There is no relationship between the age of students who utilized peer counselor services with retention.
Table 14 presents the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient, Mean and Standard Deviation Analysis of the association between age of students who utilized peer counselor services with retention. The evidence suggests that there is no association at the .05 level between age of students who utilized the peer counselor services with retention. Therefore, the evidence failed to reject $H_0_{12}$.

$H_{13}$ There is no relationship between the sex of students who utilized peer counselor services with retention.

Table 15 presents the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient and Percentage Analysis of the Association between the sex of students who utilized the peer counselor services with retention. The evidence suggests that there is no association at the .05 level between
the sex of students who utilized the peer counselor services with retention. Therefore, the evidence failed to reject $H_{013}$.

$H_{014}$ There is no relationship between the place of residence of students who utilized peer counselor services with retention.

**TABLE 16**

**PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENT AND PERCENTAGES OF STUDENTS WHO LIVE ON AND OFF CAMPUS WITH RETENTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Residence</th>
<th>Pearson r</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>No. and % On Campus</th>
<th>No. and % Off Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.0539</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>123 or 64.4%</td>
<td>68 or 35.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p > .05$

Table 16 presents the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient and Percentage Analysis of the association between the place of residence of students who utilized the peer counselor services with retention. The evidence suggests that there is no association at the .05 level between the place of residence of students who utilized peer counselor services and retention. Therefore, the evidence failed to reject $H_{014}$. 

CHAPTER V
Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

This final chapter of the dissertation will present a summary, list of conclusions drawn from the analysis of the data of this study and make recommendations for additional research in the area that was investigated.

This study investigated the relationship and differences between the students within Developmental Education in University College of The Ohio State University, Columbus Campus, who utilized the peer counseling services and those students who did not utilize the peer counseling services. Developmental Education at The Ohio State University was designed to facilitate and increase the probability of success of freshman and sophomore minority students whose background had been defined as disadvantaged prior to entering the University.

The study commenced in the Autumn Quarter of 1973. The population of the study consisted of 326 specially recruited minority students, as defined in this study.

The criteria used in the study to determine the relationship and differences between students who utilized the peer counselor services and students who did not utilize the peer counselor services were:

(1) age
(2) sex
(3) place of residence
(4) grade point average (Autumn, Winter, Spring and Year)

(5) Retention

Not only did this study investigate relationship and differences between the students that utilized and did not utilize the peer counseling services, it also examined the relationship that existed between grade point average and retention of students who utilized the peer counseling services with age, sex, place of residence, frequency of peer counselor contact and the Student Attitudinal Survey, respectively.

Data for this study were gathered two ways: (1) University records with permission of the Executive Committee of the University College of The Ohio State University and (2) by means of a questionnaire developed and critiqued by eleven judges with expertise in the areas of counseling and student personnel. Data gathered from University records for students who utilized and who did not utilize the peer counseling program consisted of age, sex, place of residence, grade point averages for three consecutive quarters, cumulative grade point average, peer counselor contact for three consecutive quarters and cumulative peer counselor contacts.

Since all students did not participate in the peer counseling program, only those students who did (191) were eligible to receive a questionnaire concerning their attitudes about their experiences in the peer counseling program. After examining the list of eligible students, it was found that 44 of the students eligible could not be located. One hundred forty-seven were mailed questionnaires. The questionnaires were designed to solicit student responses on a 5-point scale (Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly Disagree) with regard to
their experiences in the peer counseling program.

One hundred eight (73.5%) of the students to whom questionnaires were mailed returned them. Thirty-nine or 26.5% of the students chose not to return the questionnaires.

A review of the related literature revealed a scarcity of studies that relate directly to the relationship and differences between students who utilize and students who do not utilize peer counseling programs as a vehicle to facilitate and increase the probability of success in a university setting.

Fourteen minor hypotheses were tested. The chi-square, analysis of variance, Pearson Moment Correlation Coefficient were employed to test the hypotheses, using the facilities of The Ohio State University Computer Services.

**Findings**

The null hypotheses that were tested and their findings are:

Ho\(_1\) There is no difference between grade point averages of students who utilized the services of peer counselors and the grade point averages of students who did not utilize the services of peer counselors.

Finding: The finding revealed that there was no significant difference between Autumn, Winter and Spring Quarters and cumulative grade point averages, but further data analysis utilizing the one way repeated measurement analysis of variances; the mean grade point averages were significantly different at the .05 alpha level. The significance found was due to a difference between quarters and not necessarily due to a difference between the treatment of the two groups of students received. Therefore, Ho\(_1\) was accepted.
Ho2 There is no difference between retention of students who utilized peer counselors and students who did not utilize peer counselors.

Finding: The finding revealed that 15% of the students utilizing peer counseling services withdrew while 27% of the students who did not utilize peer counseling services withdrew. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients Analysis revealed that the difference was significant at the .05 alpha level.

Ho3 There is no difference between the age of students who utilized the peer counselor services and the age of students who did not utilize the peer counselor services.

Finding: The chi-square analysis revealed that the age of students who utilized the services of peer counselors and the age of students who did not utilize the services of peer counselors was not significantly different at the .05 alpha level. Therefore, the hypothesis was accepted as stated.

Ho4 There is no difference between the sex of students who utilized the peer counselor services and the sex of students who did not utilize the peer counselor services.

Finding: Hypothesis was accepted as stated because the chi-square value is not significant at the .05 alpha level. The evidence suggests that the sex of Group 1 and Group 2 was evenly distributed among the groups.

Ho5 There is no difference between the place of residence of students who utilized the peer counselor services and the place of residence of students who did not utilize the peer counselor services.

Finding: The hypothesis was rejected because the chi-square analysis revealed that some association existed, between the students who lived
on campus and peer counselor utilization. One hundred ninety-one (191) students utilized the peer counselor services, 64.4% of these students lived on campus and 35.6% of these students lived off campus. One hundred thirty-five (135) students did not utilize the peer counselor services, 51.9% of these students lived on campus and 48.1% of these students lived off campus.

H₀₆ There is no relationship between the frequency of contact of students who utilized peer counselor services with the student's grade point average.

Finding: The findings for this hypothesis revealed that some association existed between frequency of contact and grade point averages for those students utilizing peer counselor services. The association was between frequency of contact Autumn Quarter and Autumn Quarter grades, frequency of contact Spring Quarter and cumulative grade point average, and cumulative frequency of contact and cumulative grade point average for the 1974-75 school year. Therefore, the hypothesis was rejected for those quarters.

H₀₇ There is no relationship between the age of students who utilized peer counselors with their grade point average.

Finding: Based on the findings of the study, evidence indicated that no relationship existed between the age of students utilizing peer counselor services and their respective grade point average. The hypothesis was accepted as stated.

H₀₈ There is no relationship between the sex of students who utilized peer counselor services with their grade point average.
Finding: The evidence associated with this hypothesis indicates that no association exists between sex and grade point averages of students utilizing peer counselors. The sex of students was not a factor related to individual grade point differences within this group. Therefore, the hypothesis was accepted.

\( H_0 \) There is no relationship between the place of residence of students who utilized peer counselor services with their grade point average.

Finding: The finding revealed that there was no association at the .05 level between the place of residence of students who utilized peer counselor services with their cumulative grade point average. More specifically, where the student lived had no association at the .05 level with his grade point average. Therefore, the evidence failed to reject \( H_0 \).

\( H_{10} \) There is no relationship between the student's evaluation survey by those students who utilized peer counselor services and returned their survey instrument with their grade point average.

Finding: The finding revealed that the only items associated with the student grade point average were Items 21 and 28 for Autumn Quarter, Item 21 for Winter Quarter and Item 3 for Spring Quarter. The evidence also suggested that there was no association between grade point average and all remaining items. Therefore, the evidence failed to reject \( H_{10} \).

\( H_{11} \) There is no relationship between frequency of student contact of students who utilized peer counselor services with the peer counselor and retention.
Finding: Hypothesis 11 was accepted since there was no association at the .05 level between the peer counselor contact during Autumn, Winter and Spring Quarter and year or students who utilized peer counselor services with retention.

H_{12} There is no relationship between the age of students who utilized peer counselor services with retention.

Finding: The finding revealed that the age of students who utilized peer counselor services had no association at the .05 level with retention. Therefore, the evidence failed to reject H_{12}.

H_{13} There is no relationship between the sex of students who utilized peer counselor services with retention.

Finding: The evidence failed to reject H_{13}. Therefore, the researcher concluded the sex of students who utilized the peer counselor services had no association at the .05 level with retention.

H_{14} There is no relationship between the place of residence of students who utilized peer counselors with retention.

Finding: The finding for Hypothesis 14 revealed that the place of residence of students who utilized the peer counselor services had no association at the .05 level with the student's retention.

Conclusion

The findings of this study seem to justify the following conclusions:

The conclusions of this study are based on the findings and considerations for the limits which are stated in Chapter I. They are listed prior to the conclusions.
Limits of the Study

One major limitation of this study was that the research was limited to minority freshmen students at The Ohio State University who enrolled in the Developmental Education Program during the 1973-74 academic school year.

A second limitation was that the study did not provide any controls for possible intervening variables that could have affected the peer counseling program.

A third limitation was that the grade point, dropout retention, student evaluation, frequency of contact, age, sex, and place of residence were the only variables that were examined in this study.

Conclusions

1. The grade point averages for the Autumn, Winter and Spring Quarters and the yearly grade point averages of students who did not utilize and did utilize the peer counselor service were not significant however, the mean grade point average was significantly different. Therefore, the students who utilized the peer counselor services did better academically.

2. There is greater dropout rate among students who do not utilize the services of peer counselors than students who utilize the services of peer counselors.

3. The age of students does not determine whether he or she can benefit from utilizing the peer counseling services.

4. The sex of students does not determine whether he or she can benefit from utilizing the peer counseling services.
5. The probability of utilizing the services is greater among the students who live on campus.

6. The amount of contact a student received from his/her peer counselor makes a difference in his/her grade point average.

7. Among the students who utilized the peer counselor services, age had nothing to do with their grade point averages.

8. The sex of students utilizing peer counselors was not a factor affecting difference in their grade point averages within the group that utilized peer counselor services.

9. The fact that a student who utilized the peer counselor services lived on or off campus made no difference in his/her grade point average.

10. The scores on the survey instrument were not related to grade point averages of students who utilized the services of peer counselors.

11. The amount of peer counselor contact a student received did not determine whether a student stayed in school or dropped out.

12. There is no difference between the ages of students who drop out of school and those who remain in school or students who utilize the peer counselor services.

13. Sex was not a factor that determined whether students who utilized the peer counseling services remained in school or dropped out.

14. The place of residence of students who utilized peer counselor services did not affect their retention.
The grade point averages for the Autumn, Winter and Spring quarters, the yearly grade point averages, age, and sex of students who utilized the services of peer counselors are not significantly different at the .05 level from those of students who did not utilize the services of peer counselors.

The mean grade point averages for the Autumn, Winter and Spring quarters, yearly grade point averages, retention and place of residence of students who utilized the services of peer counselors are significantly different from those of students who did not utilize the services of peer counselors.

In summary, a description of students who utilize peer counselors can be defined as those students who will: (a) more likely live on campus (b) remain in school longer and (c) will perform better academically, while a description of students who will not utilize the services of peer counselors as those students who will: (a) more likely live off campus (b) more likely drop out of school and (c) not do well academically.
Recommendations

Every study usually leaves or gives rise to many unanswered and very pertinent questions. This study attempted to answer some questions, but there remain others which need the attention of future researchers. This component addresses itself to a few of these areas of concern.

First, it would be useful to study the pre-college (high school rank) entry level of students who utilize the peer counseling program with the grade point average at the end of one academic year.

A second study could be an analysis of the background between students who utilize peer counselor services with students who do not utilize the peer counselor services. This study could answer such questions as:

1. Are the socio-economic backgrounds of the students who utilized peer counselors different from the socio-economic backgrounds of the students who did not utilize peer counselors?

2. Are the geographical locations prior to college entry of students who utilized peer counselors different from the geographical locations prior to college entry of students who did not utilize peer counselors?

3. Are the grade point averages of students who utilized only peer counselors different from the grade point averages of students who utilized only professional counselors?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Accessable</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondents</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Utilize Peer Counselor</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2

**Age of Participants Research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Ages 18-20</th>
<th></th>
<th>Ages 21-23</th>
<th></th>
<th>Ages 24-26</th>
<th></th>
<th>Ages 27-29</th>
<th></th>
<th>Ages 30-35</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Accessible</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondent</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Utilize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


TABLE 3

Curricular Academic Program

Different Major of Research Participant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>GBC</th>
<th>ADM</th>
<th>AGR</th>
<th>AHR</th>
<th>AMP</th>
<th>ASC</th>
<th>ART</th>
<th>DEN</th>
<th>DHY</th>
<th>EDUC</th>
<th>ENG</th>
<th>HEC</th>
<th>MED</th>
<th>MUS</th>
<th>NRE</th>
<th>NUR</th>
<th>OPT</th>
<th>DHR</th>
<th>SWK</th>
<th>VME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group 1 = Total
Group 2 = Non-Accessible
Group 3 = Non-Respondent
Group 4 = Respondent
Group 5 = Did Not Utilize Peer Counselor
## TABLE 4

Residential Status of Research Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>On-Campus</th>
<th>Off-Campus</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Accessible</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondents</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Utilize Peer Counselor</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 5

Grade Point Averages for Autumn Quarter 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.000-</td>
<td>0.501-</td>
<td>1.001-</td>
<td>1.501-</td>
<td>2.001-</td>
<td>2.501-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Accessible</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Utilize</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Group Mean Grade Point Average - 2.020
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Accessible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Utilize Peer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 5 (Cont'd)
Grade Point Averages for Autumn Quarter 1973
TABLE 6

Research Participants' Grade Point Averages During Winter Quarter 1974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.501</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>1.501</td>
<td>2.001</td>
<td>2.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Accessible</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Utilize Peer Counselor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Group Mean Grade Point Average - 1.796
TABLE 6 (Cont'd)

Research Participants' Grade Point Averages During Winter Quarter 1974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>3.000-3.500</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>3.501-4.000</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>9.999 =WD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Accessable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Utilize Peer Counselor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 7

Grade Point Averages During Spring Quarter 1974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>(1) 0.000-0.500</th>
<th>(2) 0.501-1.000</th>
<th>(3) 1.001-1.500</th>
<th>(4) 1.501-2.000</th>
<th>(5) 2.001-2.500</th>
<th>(6) 2.501-3.000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Accessible</td>
<td>5 11.4%</td>
<td>5 11.4%</td>
<td>5 11.4%</td>
<td>5 11.4%</td>
<td>3 6.8%</td>
<td>5 11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondents</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>1 2.6%</td>
<td>5 12.8%</td>
<td>6 15.4%</td>
<td>8 20.5%</td>
<td>9 23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>4 3.7%</td>
<td>8 7.4%</td>
<td>15 13.9%</td>
<td>21 19.4%</td>
<td>12 11.1%</td>
<td>22 20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Utilize Peer Counselor</td>
<td>12 8.9%</td>
<td>10 7.4%</td>
<td>13 9.6%</td>
<td>18 13.3%</td>
<td>16 11.9%</td>
<td>18 13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21 6.4%</td>
<td>24 7.4%</td>
<td>38 11.7%</td>
<td>50 15.3%</td>
<td>39 12.0%</td>
<td>54 16.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Group Mean Grade Point Average = 2.058
TABLE 7 (Cont'd)

Grade Point Averages During Spring Quarter 1974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>(8)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>9.999</th>
<th>=WD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Accessable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Utilize Peer Counselor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8

Grade Point Averages During Yearly GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) 0.000-</th>
<th>(2) 0.501-</th>
<th>(3) 1.001-</th>
<th>(4) 1.501-</th>
<th>(5) 2.001-</th>
<th>(6) 2.501-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Accessable</td>
<td>3 6.8</td>
<td>4 9.1</td>
<td>10 22.7</td>
<td>10 22.7</td>
<td>15 34.1</td>
<td>1 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondents</td>
<td>1 2.6</td>
<td>2 5.1</td>
<td>3 7.7</td>
<td>17 33.3</td>
<td>13 33.3</td>
<td>5 12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>1 0.9</td>
<td>4 3.7</td>
<td>9 8.3</td>
<td>40 37.0</td>
<td>32 29.6</td>
<td>14 13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Utilize Peer Counselor</td>
<td>3 2.2</td>
<td>14 10.4</td>
<td>18 13.3</td>
<td>41 30.4</td>
<td>31 23.0</td>
<td>17 12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 2.5</td>
<td>24 7.4</td>
<td>40 12.3</td>
<td>104 31.9</td>
<td>91 27.9</td>
<td>37 11.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Group Mean Grade Point Average - 1.951
TABLE 8 (Cont'd)

Grade Point Averages During Yearly GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(7) 3.000-3.500</th>
<th></th>
<th>(8) 3.501-4.000</th>
<th></th>
<th>9.999 =WD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Accessible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Utilize Peer Counselor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 9

Peer Counselor Contact During Autumn Quarter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>(1) 01-05</th>
<th>(2) 06-10</th>
<th>(3) 11-15</th>
<th>(4) 16-20</th>
<th>(5) 21-25</th>
<th>99</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Accessable</td>
<td>N 40 %90.9</td>
<td>N 3 %6.8</td>
<td>N 0 %0</td>
<td>N 0 %0</td>
<td>N 1 %2.3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondents</td>
<td>N 36 %92.3</td>
<td>N 0 %0</td>
<td>N 1 %2.6</td>
<td>N 0 %0</td>
<td>N 2 %5.1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>N 102 %94.4</td>
<td>N 3 %2.8</td>
<td>N 1 %0.9</td>
<td>N 0 %0</td>
<td>N 2 %1.9</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 10

Peer Counselor Contact During Winter Quarter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>(1) 01-05</th>
<th>(2) 06-10</th>
<th>(3) 11-15</th>
<th>(4) 16-20</th>
<th>(5) 21-25</th>
<th>99</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Accessible</td>
<td>21 47.7%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondents</td>
<td>29 74.4%</td>
<td>1 2.6%</td>
<td>1 2.6%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>67 62.0%</td>
<td>1 0.9%</td>
<td>1 0.9%</td>
<td>1 0.9%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 11

Peer Counselor Contact During Spring Quarter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>(1) 01-05</th>
<th>(2) 06-10</th>
<th>(3) 11-15</th>
<th>(4) 16-20</th>
<th>(5) 21-25</th>
<th>99</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Accessible</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondents</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>(1) 01-05</td>
<td>(2) 06-10</td>
<td>(3) 11-15</td>
<td>(4) 16-20</td>
<td>(5) No Contact</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Accessible</td>
<td>N 31</td>
<td>% 70.5</td>
<td>N 13</td>
<td>% 29.5</td>
<td>N 0</td>
<td>% 0.0</td>
<td>N 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondents</td>
<td>N 24</td>
<td>% 61.5</td>
<td>N 14</td>
<td>% 35.9</td>
<td>N 1</td>
<td>% 2.6</td>
<td>N 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>N 68</td>
<td>% 63.0</td>
<td>N 38</td>
<td>% 35.2</td>
<td>N 1</td>
<td>% 0.9</td>
<td>N 108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr. William H. Watson  
Associate Dean  
University College  
154 West Hall  
1050 Carmack Road

Dear Dr. Watson:

In recent years great emphasis has been placed in higher education on meeting the needs of multi-cultural groups. Many institutions of higher education are not financially able to provide the needed counseling services necessary for the adequate growth of these groups. Through the use of peer counseling, these concerns can be minimized, if administered correctly.

The Ohio State University, recognizing this need, organized the Office of Developmental Education, through which many services are provided to meet the needs of students. Special attention should be given to the Peer Counseling component of the program, which I feel is essential to facilitate the goals and objectives of the program. There is a lack of empirical data on the effectiveness of the Peer Counseling program; therefore I propose to conduct a study that will provide answers to many questions.

I hereby request permission to use records and other materials necessary to complete this study. Confidentiality will be observed, per University regulations.

Respectfully yours,

Harold R. Benson
Adviser/Counselor
Developmental Education
University College
012 West Hall

cc: J. Mount  
    M. Stewart  
    J. Tootle
December 4, 1974

Mr. Harold R. Benson  
Adviser/Counselor  
Developmental Education  
University College  
1050 Carmack  
CAMPUSS

Dear Mr. Benson:

This acknowledges receipt of your letter requesting permission to do research in University College through the Office of Developmental Education. Please be advised that an ad hoc committee has been identified to review your request and make a recommendation to Dean Mount.

I shall urge the committee to act very promptly, and will advise you if additional details should be given the committee by you personally.

Sincerely,

W. H. Watson  
Associate Dean  
University College

WHW/ac
I thereby request permission to do privileged research on University College students as described in the attached research proposal. The proposed research may be briefly described as follows:

An analysis of the effectiveness of the Peer Counseling (paraprofessional) Program in the Office of Developmental Education at The Ohio State University. (See attached)

I have read the Guidelines and Procedures for the Approval of Privileged Research in University College, and am willing to abide by all of the conditions stated in that document.

Date 12/10/74 Signature Harold J. Benson

II. (To Be Signed By Graduate Adviser if Applicant is a Graduate Student):

I hereby certify that the above-referenced proposed research involving access to student records and/or students in University College is sound in its design and is worthy of approval.

Date 12/10/74 Signature William O'Donnell
Title Professor of Education

III. (To Be Signed By University College Secretary):

I have reviewed the above-referenced proposal, and am satisfied that it could be undertaken without disrupting normal work procedures in the Main Records Area.

Date 12/10/74 Signature

IV. (To Be Signed By Appropriate Associate Dean):

I have reviewed the above-referenced proposal, and find that insofar as the proposed research affects operations for which I am responsible, it is acceptable under the Guidelines.

Date 12/10/74 Signature
Associate Dean

V. (To Be Signed By the Dean of University College):

In view of the representations made above, the above-referenced request is hereby approved.

Date 12/10/74 Signature
Dean, University College
Harold R. Benson  
University College  
Campus  

Dear Harold:

I am happy to inform you that your request of December 10, 1974, to do privileged research in University College has been reviewed favorably by our screening committee, and forwarded to me for approval. After reviewing your proposal, I am pleased to approve it under the conditions set forth in the guidelines and procedures for the approval of such research projects in University College.

With the guidance of Professor Dowling, Dr. Stewart and Dr. Watson, I have every reason to believe that you will do a thorough, first-rate study. It is understood that in addition to normal distribution, a copy of your research project must be posited in my office files for future reference.

My best wishes go out to you as you launch your research project, and please feel free to contact me at any point along the way if you think I might be helpful.

Sincerely,

John T. Mount, Dean  
University College

CC: Dr. Watson  
Dr. Dowling  
Dr. Stewart
January 31, 1975

Mr. Harold R. Benson  
1050 Carmack Road  
152 West Hall  
Ohio State University  
Columbus, Ohio 43210  

Dear Mr. Benson:

I hereby give you permission to adapt and reproduce copies of the Counseling Evaluation Questionnaire which appears as Appendix Q in my book, *Student-to-Student Counseling*, published in 1972 by the University of Texas Press. It is my understanding that said adaptation-reproduction is for the purpose of providing an evaluation instrument to be used in your dissertation research. It is also my understanding that you will provide an appropriate credit line on the questionnaire cover page and that no copies of the resulting questionnaire are to be offered for sale.

I shall be looking forward to learning the results of your study. Please do let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Cordially yours,

William F. Brown  
Professor of Education

WFB/11b  
Encls.
APPENDIX C
March 5, 1975

Dear Fellow Staff:

As a part of the Validation Process for my instrument that will be used in my dissertation, I need some input from you.

Please analyze the following survey and determine if items 1 - 46 fall in the following areas:

(1) Academic
(2) Personal
(3) Social
(4) Undecided

Each person should use the separate sheet of paper provided.

Use the following notations:

A = Academic
P = Personal
S = Social
U = Undecided

Please return your responses before sending it to the next person.

Thanks for your help!

H. R. Benson
1. I benefited from hearing the views of my peer counselor on the problems that were discussed.  

2. Discussing desirable study habits with my peer counselor has made me more conscious of the time I waste each day.

3. The discussion of attitudes toward school and teachers with my peer counselor was time well spent.

4. Discussing my academic attitudes with my peer counselor has made me more tolerant of teacher deficiencies.

5. My peer counselor and I were unable to agree on how to improve one's study methods.

6. I did not have an adequate opportunity to present my views on problems that were discussed with my peer counselor.

7. Discussing my academic attitudes with my peer counselor has increased my ambition for academic accomplishment.

8. Discussing my test scores (from classes) with my peer counselor has enabled me to better plan my educational and vocational future.

9. My peer counselor and I were unable to agree on how to improve one's academic motivation.

10. My peer counselor did not give sufficient explanation of the various forms during counseling sessions.

11. I gained very little from hearing the questions and comments of my peer counselor.

12. An excessive amount of time was wasted with my peer counselor in discussing things that were irrelevant or unimportant.
13. My peer counselor failed to discuss the academic adjustment problems that trouble most students.

14. My peer counselor spent too much time on telling me how to study.

15. My time with my peer counselor was largely wasted because my problems are different from the ones she discussed.

16. I didn't have a chance to ask questions or discuss problems that were bothering me with my peer counselor.

17. I would prefer to discuss my (test scores) with the academic counselor individually instead of my peer counselor.

18. I didn't feel relaxed or comfortable during much of the counseling sessions with my peer counselor.

19. I had difficulty tying together all the information that I received from my peer counselor.

20. The discussions with my peer counselor would have been improved had they been of the opposite sex.

21. Our peer-counseling sessions were too short to permit me to state my views on the topics being discussed.

22. My peer counselor's group was too large for me to work efficiently.

23. My peer counselor talked too rapidly to permit effective discussion.

24. I had difficulty understanding what my peer counselor was talking about.

25. My peer-counselor appeared to lack understanding and interest of my needs.

26. My peer counselor tended to be overbearing at times.
27. At times my peer counselor seemed to be unsure of himself (herself).

28. My peer counselor did not allow enough discussion of the ideas that were presented.

29. My peer counselor tried to distribute his time and attention equally among all those whom he or she served.

30. My peer counselor was well prepared to discuss the problems a student encounters in adjusting to college.

31. I had difficulty tying together all the information that I received from my peer counselor as it related to university procedures.

32. My peer counselor did not like to discuss problems created by dormitory life.

33. My peer counselor appeared to doubt the value of some of the materials being used.

34. Discussing my scores with my peer counselor on the effective study test started me thinking about how to improve my study skills.

35. My peer counselor and the effective study guide helped me to better understand some of the reasons for my academic difficulties.

36. Discussing the organization of my study area with my peer counselor was a waste of time and effort.

37. I found my peer counselor to be tiresome and boring.

38. I didn't get enough useful information from my peer counselor to make any real decisions.

39. Some straight advice would help me more than this program of peer counseling.
40. All entering freshmen should be given an opportunity to discuss their academic adjustment problems with a peer counselor.

41. I expect my grades to improve as a result of my peer counseling.

42. My counseling session with my peer counselor lasted longer than was really necessary.

43. My peer counselor gave me a realistic picture of my academic strengths and weaknesses.

44. I would like to discuss other adjustment problems with a peer counselor when I have the time.

45. I feel that my grades improve as a result of my peer counselor's experiences.

46. If I had not had a peer counselor, I would have dropped out of school my freshman year.

THE END

Thanks for your cooperation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COUNSELEE EVALUATION SURVEY

Sex    ____Female    ____Male

Age    ____

CAP Area ____

Did you live in a residence hall?  ____yes  ____no

Directions

The statements found in this attitudinal survey are designed to elicit your responses which will enable the researcher to determine your attitude toward your peer-counseling experiences. This instrument has been coded for research purposes only. Your identity will remain anonymous. Please respond as honestly and accurately as possible.

You are to indicate the extent to which you agree with each statement. Read each statement and decide how you feel about it. Then circle your answer on the space provided.

If you strongly agree, circle "SA"
If you agree, circle "A"
If you are undecided or uncertain, circle "?"
If you disagree, circle "D"
If you strongly disagree, circle "SD"
1. I benefited from hearing the views of my peer counselor on the problems that were discussed.  
2. Discussing desirable study habits with my peer counselor has made me more conscious of the time I waste each day.  
3. Discussing my academic attitudes with my peer counselor has made me more tolerant of teacher deficiencies.  
4. My peer counselor and I were unable to agree on how to improve one's study methods.  
5. Discussing my test scores (from classes) with my peer counselor has enabled me to better plan my educational and vocational future.  
6. My peer counselor did not give sufficient explanation of the various forms during counseling sessions.  
7. I gained very little from hearing the questions and comments of my peer counselor.  
8. An excessive amount of time was wasted with my peer counselor in discussing things that were irrelevant or unimportant.  
9. My peer counselor failed to discuss the academic adjustment problems that trouble most students.  
10. My peer counselor spent too much time on telling me how to study.  
11. My time with my peer counselor was largely wasted because my problems are different from the ones she discussed.  
12. I didn't have a chance to ask questions or discuss problems that were bothering me with my peer counselor.  
13. I would prefer to discuss my (test scores) with the academic counselor individually instead of my peer counselor.
14. I didn't feel relaxed or comfortable during much of the counseling sessions with my peer counselor.

15. I had difficulty tying together all the information that I received from my peer counselor.

16. My peer counselor talked too rapidly to permit effective discussion.

17. My peer counselor appeared to lack understanding and interest of my needs.

18. My peer counselor tended to be overbearing at times.

19. At times my peer counselor seemed to be unsure of himself (herself).

20. I had difficulty tying together all the information that I received from my peer counselor as it related to university procedure.

21. My peer counselor did not like to discuss problems created by dormitory life.

22. Discussing my scores with my peer counselor on the effective study test started me thinking about how to improve my study skills.

23. My peer counselor and the effective study guide helped me to better understand some of the reasons for my academic difficulties.

24. Some straight advice would help me more than this program of peer counseling.

25. All entering freshmen should be given an opportunity to discuss their academic adjustment problems with a peer counselor.

26. I expect my grades to improve as a result of my peer counselor.

27. My peer counselor gave me a realistic picture of my academic strengths and weaknesses.
28. I feel that my grades improve as a result of my peer counselor's experiences.  
SA A ? D SD 37

29. If I had not had a peer counselor, I would have dropped out of school my freshman year.  
SA A ? D SD 38

THE END

Thanks for your cooperation.
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