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American colleges and universities have three historical missions, each derived from different antecedents. The English college was initially the model for higher education in the United States. English colleges were residential and emphasized well-rounded development through the study of liberal arts and religion. Thus Harvard was intentionally molded after Emmanuel College at Cambridge, and William and Mary after Queen’s College at Oxford. This larger notion of a holistic experience came to be known as "the collegiate way"--with its adherence to the residential emphasis and the propensity for rural, undisturbed settings, dormitories, communal dining halls and paternalistic mentoring. Later the emergence of the extracurriculum, with its emphasis on debating and literary clubs, fraternities, social life, recreation, and organized athletics served to broaden intentionally the domain of the collegiate experience (Rudolph, 1962). Nevertheless, the goal remained the same--well-rounded development.

While the English model was the first influence on American higher education, the German university, with its emphasis on scholarship and research, was the second fundamental model to influence higher education in the country. In fact, Rudolph (1962),
chronicler of American higher education movements, perceived the university movement in the United States as owing more to the German model. Rudolph notes that this influence was reflected in "the fundamental attachment to the graduate faculty of arts and science [and] to the idea of a body of scholars and students pushing forward the frontier of pure knowledge" (p. 334).

If the English tradition contributed to the concept of well-rounded development and the German idea was scholarship and research, then the American contribution was to make professional and vocational preparation a major purpose of the university. Thus colleges such as engineering, business, home economics, and education were added to German-oriented universities or English-oriented colleges, making the American hybrid college or university.

Student affairs professionals arose as a cadre of professional staff at colleges and universities as they became more specialized. These staff members increasingly took over the extracurriculum roles that their earlier faculty counterparts had included within the scope of their duties. As early as 1937 the American Council for Education published the Student Personnel Point of View, which asserted that higher education in general and student affairs in particular should be based upon a recognition of the holistic nature of well-rounded development, individual differences, and the need to start or design interventions based upon the student's present level of development. By the 1960s Nevitt Sanford reinforced the
1937 statement by asserting that the individual development of each student was the basic purpose of higher education and student affairs. Sanford elaborated on this goal by suggesting that such individual development could be best achieved in an environment which both challenged the individual student yet provided personal support as well (Sanford, 1967). In the 1970s the American College Personnel Association, through the Tomorrow's Higher Education project, developed a conceptual model and identified programs for a developmental emphasis in student affairs.

Today's student affairs professionals look to several kinds of developmental theories and research as bases for doing their practice (Delworth & Hanson, 1989; Morrill, Hurst & Oetting, 1980). These theories include person-environment interaction, psychosocial, cognitive-structural, and typological perspectives (Rodgers, 1980, 1989). By intentionally drawing upon theory bases to design practice, student affairs staff have addressed specific issues and problems that emerge from their work in higher education, in ways that hopefully enhance the personal growth of the students they serve.

Faculty and student affairs professionals both share an interest in the applied use of developmental theory. For example, Carole Widick (1975), in evaluating the linking of developmental theory to college teaching, noted an "inadequate conceptualization of instruction" which, on the one hand results in a failure to
acknowledge learner differences and, on the other, leads to a tendency to define instructional approaches in global terms (pp. 7-8). Widick suggests that theories of student development, as well as theories of knowledge acquisition and instruction methods need to be adopted in planning college instruction, and suggests the Attributor-Treatment Interaction (ATI) concept (Cronbach, 1957, 1967; Gagne, 1967; Messick, 1970) as a means of correcting this "inadequate conceptualization of instruction." By using such a model, which accounts for individual differences and alternative instructional treatments, Widick suggests that student development theory can be linked to the task of classroom instruction so as to account for learner differences and provide instruction in a focused, purposeful manner. Widick, Knefelkamp and Parker (1975) have done just this in applying cognitive developmental theory--specifically Perry’s scheme of intellectual development--to curriculum development. In their instructional intervention Widick, Knefelkamp and Parker (1975) used developmental theory in applying both their knowledge of developmental tasks and linking those tasks to what developmental theory states about the essentially dualistic cognitive structure of traditional college freshmen (Perry’s Stages 1, 2 and 3). By applying this knowledge to the curriculum design, the researchers were able to structure the content of their course in such a way that the dualistic assumptions of their students would be challenged by the relativistic perspectives with which students were confronted in
their reading and in class discussion. Experiential learning was emphasized so that the students were able to have concrete information with which to relate their learning. Hence, just as developmental theory is used by student affairs professionals to structure interventions--e.g., Rodgers and Widick's (1980) use of grounded formal theory approach to increase the effectiveness of a Career Planning Center in a residence hall--so, too, formal theory can be used in the classroom. In both interventions--whether in the student affairs context of the residence hall or the faculty context, such as the classroom, the same developmental theorists were employed--Perry for cognitive development theory and Erikson and Chickering for psychosocial theory. Developmental theory is, therefore, relevant to both contexts; what is needed is to relate theory to the formal, as well as the informal, learning settings of college more intentionally. It is in this role of linking theory to application that student affairs professionals can best assist their faculty colleagues. In fact, it is just this role of "Faculty Consultant," suggested by Knefelkamp, Widick and Parker (1980), that is recommended as an important role for student affairs.

This study concerns the use of developmental characteristics of college students to develop a teaching intervention in a freshman colloquium class and a comparison of the developmental and other results of this intervention compared to other freshman colloquia not using developmental characteristics in their design. This research seeks to incorporate elements of the ATI model as
modified by Rhetts (1972) in order to address the "inadequacy of conceptualization" issue noted earlier (Widick).

The three components of the ATI are:

1. task analysis
2. identification of relevant dimensions of individual differences, and
3. development of alternative instructional treatments.

Task analysis suggests that both the learning that is to take place and the instruction that is to be implemented are intentionally linked. In this study the learning that is sought is awareness and understanding of the issues in the transition from high school to college, personal development issues of young adults, and those personal skills which assist both processes. The instruction is linked to these intended learnings by using the first 3 vectors of Chickering's psychosocial theory as a means of focusing instruction, and by using Kohlberg's recommended technique of positing moral dilemmas followed by discussion intended to challenge the adequacy of students' moral reasoning. Nelson and Low's (1979) Personal Skills Map (hereafter PSM) will be used to measure changes in personal skills development and Rest's (1979b) P score on the DIT will be used to measure change in moral reasoning.

By incorporating the knowledge base of the "more adequate" concepts of the individual represented by Chickering and Kohlberg, the age-cohort specific developmental differences of traditional college freshman can be addressed--e.g., work on the
first 3 vectors of Chickering’s schema and Stage 3 and 4 moral development in Kohlberg’s schema. What is needed next, therefore, is an examination of the "more adequate" concepts of instruction using Chickering and Kohlberg. This examination will then lead to alternative instructional treatment based upon these concepts of the individual.

Chickering and Nelson and Low’s Theories

Chickering’s theory is a psychosocial theory, which emphasizes the developmental tasks of stage development called "Identity." Stages are time-periods where qualitatively different psychological issues such as exploration and commitment to a career, ideology, or interpersonal relationships preoccupy persons and need to be resolved. Different issues or tasks need to be resolved during each stage of an adult’s life, and the extent to which these tasks are accomplished adequately affects the person’s ability to resolve the next set of tasks in the life course. Traditional-age college students are in the psychosocial stage called "Identity" (Erikson, 1968). From age 15 until approximately the age of 22, young adults confront issues relating to identity. Young adults experiment with roles and lifestyles, make choices and experience the consequences of such choices, seek to understand their talents and abilities, seek achievements in different areas, and seek to find a sense of meaning in their lives (Rodgers, 1989). Arthur Chickering’s theory of student
development describes the developmental tasks of traditionally aged (17-24) college students. His research indicates that freshmen developmentally are attempting to resolve vectors, or tasks he calls developing competence, managing emotions and developing autonomy. By the senior year, students are dealing with the vectors of establishing identity, freeing interpersonal relationships, developing purpose, and establishing integrity. Chickering views these seven vectors as the tasks typically preoccupying students during their college years. Each vector has its own subset of tasks, each one of which also needs to be resolved during the college years (Rodgers, 1989). For example, developing competence involves resolving issues of intellectual, physical, manual, and social interpersonal competence, as well as the sense of confidence a student develops in his/her ability to cope both with what occurs and what he/she plans on accomplishing.

As indicated the first 3 vectors--Developing Competence, Managing Emotions, and Developing Autonomy--appear to be "where most freshmen students are" developmentally. In order to design instruction to meet their needs, the curriculum should focus its content on or relate its content to these 3 vectors for freshmen, including the skills needed to resolve these tasks.

Nelson and Low (1979) have designed the Personal Skills Map (PSM) to assess the personal skill strengths associated with developmental tasks or vectors, as well as those skill areas in
which change may be needed. Hence, The PSM gives the user feedback on skills needed to resolve vectors. The PSM has three dimensions of personal effectiveness: (I) Intrapersonal effectiveness, (II) Interpersonal effectiveness, and (III) Career-Life Management effectiveness and 14 specific skill scales. The scales are grouped within their respective dimensions and correlated to their relevant vectors (Chickering) as follows:

**Personal Skills Map (PSM) Chickering**

**Intrapersonal Skill**

1. Self-esteem  
   1st Vector, Sense of Competence  
   2nd Vector, Managing Emotions  
   4th Vector, Sense of Identity

**Interpersonal Skills**

2. Interpersonal Assertion  
   1st Vector, Social Interpersonal Competence

3. Interpersonal Comfort  
   1st Vector, Social Interpersonal Competence

4. Empathy  
   1st Vector, Social Interpersonal Competence

**Career/Life Skills**

5. Drive Strength  
   3rd Vector, Developing Autonomy  
   4th Vector, Sense of Identity

6. Decision-Making  
   3rd Vector, Developing Autonomy  
   4th Vector, Sense of Identity

7. Time Management  
   1st Vector, Intellectual Competence
8. Sales Orientation 1st Vector, Social Interpersonal Competence 
3rd Vector, Developing Autonomy 

9. Commitment Ethic 3rd Vector, Developing Autonomy 
4th Vector, Sense of Identity 
6th Vector, Sense of Purpose 

10. Stress Management 2nd Vector, Managing Emotions 
4th Vector, Sense of Identity 

11. Physical Wellness 1st Vector, Physical Competence 

12. Interpersonal Aggression Inadequate 1st Vector, Interpersonal Competence 
Inadequate 2nd Vector, Managing Emotions 

13. Interpersonal Deference Inadequate 1st Vector, Interpersonal Competence 
Inadequate 2nd Vector, Managing Emotions 

Personal Change Orientation 

14. Change Orientation None 

Three of the 14 skills scales--change orientation, aggression, and deference--reflect problematic behaviors; thus, a high number of positive responses on the 300-item PSM relating to these 3 skill scales might suggest the need to change behavior; whereas, for the 11 remaining skill scales used, a high number of positive responses relating to any one of the 11 scales will yield a skill "strength" score. Conversely, a low number of positive responses will yield a score where "changes" may be needed.
Kohlberg's Theory

Cognitive-structural theory uses the construct of "stage" also. The meaning of the term is different, however, from psychosocial theory. Cognitive-structural "stages" refer to different sets of cognitive assumptions that affect how persons make meaning of their experience; they are not about the content or preoccupation of experiences. Again, change occurs differently for both kinds of theory. Cognitive-structural theory tends to perceive developmental change occurring as the result of cognitive conflict. "Cognitive conflict" refers to the challenging of a person's present state of perceiving, or "making meaning" with reasoning one stage above the person's highest current stage of reasoning. When this challenge occurs, a person is often thrown into a state of confusion, or "disequilibrium." The theory postulates that the resulting state of cognitive confusion will be resolved in one of two ways: by assimilation, in which the person "force fits" his/her sense of confusion and disequilibrium into his/her current way of thinking, or by accommodation, in which the person changes his/her current way of thinking to "accommodate" the confusion and disequilibrium that have occurred in his/her life. By accommodating, or coping with this new state of confusion and disequilibrium, a person grows and changes developmentally to a more complex way of making meaning. This is more likely to happen if the individual (1) cares about the issue, (2) has an opportunity to reflect on the challenge with a supportive, trained facilitator, and (3) both the above
situations occur repeatedly (Rodgers, 1980). Psychosocial change, on the other hand, is perceived as being triggered by what Erikson (1968) termed the **epigenetic principle**. The epigenetic principle suggests that there is an underlying structure that affects development throughout a person’s lifespan. Thus, development is viewed as unfolding in a series of stages that are both sequential and predictable. Each stage has its own "time of special ascendancy" and is initiated by both internal changes--biological and psychological--as well as external changes, which include environmental roles and other culture-related expectations. While childhood, youth and old-age are dominated by internal changes--specifically, biological changes; in mid-life, "psychological and environmental factors are more prominent" (Rodgers, p. 26). Change occurs by a series of differentiations and integrations that are associated with the 7 vectors postulated by Chickering. Again, by challenging persons with appropriate content and supporting persons as they engage in tasks that relate to these vectors, change is facilitated. These challenges and supports must be "on target" in that they must be directly targeted at the student’s current developmental level.

Lawrence Kohlberg’s (1984) theory focuses on moral reasoning and falls within the cognitive-structural family of theory; therefore, his theory is concerned with assumptions that affect how we make meaning of moral situations where persons have competing claims and we must decide what should be done. Change for Kohlberg,
therefore, is generated through cognitive conflict and is introduced by intentionally and repeatedly confronting students with moral dilemmas inherent in subject matter, their lives, or hypothetically constructed situations. By structuring discussion of these dilemmas in such a way that students are challenged to think differently, Kohlberg seeks to raise the level of students’ moral reasoning. He believes that students should be challenged "+1"--that is, that they should be challenged to think in terms of the next highest state above their current level of moral reasoning. Kohlberg developed a scheme that includes 6 stages of moral reasoning. These 6 stages will be reviewed in detail in Chapter 2, and are discussed in detail in Appendix A:

**Stage 1**  Naive Moral Realism "Do what you’re told"

**Stage 2**  Morality of Concrete Individual Needs "Let’s Make a Deal"

**Stage 3**  Morality of Interpersonally Shared Norms "Be considerate, nice, and kind, and you'll get along with people"

**Stage 4**  Morality of the Codes and Procedures of a System "Everyone in society is obligated and protected by the law"

**Stage 5**  Morality of Human Rights and Social Welfare "You are obligated by whatever arrangements are agreed to by due process procedures"

**Stage 6**  Morality of Universalizable, Reversible/General Ethical Principles "How rational and impartial people would organize cooperation is moral"
Stage 1 represents the lowest and least complex level of moral reasoning, while Stage 6 represents the highest and most complex stage. College students typically score at Stage 3 on entrance and Stage 4 upon graduation (Rest, 1973a). Kohlberg not only devised a schema to gauge moral justice reasoning, he also sought to intentionally develop educational programs that would enhance moral development. He used two strategies to implement the cognitive-structural general concepts of change. That is, in order to introduce cognitive conflict and enhance accommodation, he used (1) moral dilemma discussions and/or (2) "just community" concepts. The use of moral dilemmas deals with making choices in situations that have "right or wrong" implications for the persons involved. Kohlberg sought to elicit the reason, or motivation, for a person on what should be done in such situations. For example, Kohlberg’s most well-known dilemma is the so-called "Heinz dilemma," which is as follows:

In Europe, a woman was near death from a very bad disease, a special kind of cancer. There was one drug that the doctors thought might save her. It was a form of radium that a druggist in the town had recently discovered. The drug was expensive to make, but the druggist was charging ten times what the drug cost him to make. He paid $200 for the radium and charged $2,000 for a small dose of the drug. The sick woman's husband, Heinz, went to everyone he knew to borrow the money; but he could get together only about $1,000, which was half of what it cost. He told the druggist that his wife was dying and asked him to sell it cheaper or let him pay later. But the druggist said, "No, I discovered the drug and I'm going to make money from it." Heinz got desperate and broke into the man's store to steal the drug for his wife (p. 12).
Having posited the dilemma, Kohlberg then raises the following questions: "Should the husband have done that? Was it right or wrong? Is your decision that it is right (or wrong) objectively right, is it morally universal, or is it your personal opinion? What is the basis for your opinion or judgment?"

In Kohlberg's dilemma technique, once such a dilemma has been presented, discussion can take place with or without a trained facilitator. If a facilitator is not available, the natural differences of opinion among group members is used to provide the challenge, or, if a facilitator is present, the facilitator focuses the discussion on the lowest stage of reasoning presented and slowly works up the stages in sequential order. In this way, Kohlberg seeks intentionally to create cognitive conflict by positing dilemmas such as the Heinz Dilemma and then "leading" students to accommodation by presenting progressively higher ways of challenging meaning.

Kohlberg's "just community" concept involves working with a particular intact group of people who have an on-going shared social life together--e.g., a particular floor of a residence hall or alternative high school group. The aim is to introduce a participatory democracy in which such a group uses both meetings of the whole and of subgroups to develop a sense of community, shared goals, shared expectations, and mutually agreed upon standards and rules, as well as to deal with grievances (Kohlberg, 1984). This type of intervention was not used in this research;
therefore, this study will focus on moral dilemma discussions led by a trained facilitator.

Astin’s Theory and Pace’s Proximate Instrument

Alexander W. Astin, in *Achieving Educational Excellence*, has noted that "Students learn by becoming involved" (Astin, 1985, p. 133 and following). Astin suggests that involvement refers to both the amount of physical and psychological energy that students invest in their own education. In formulating this theory, Astin observed that it has antecedents in the Freudian concept of "cathexis," as well as being similar to the concepts of "vigilence" and "time on task" that learning theorists have identified. The author then cites five "postulates" of the involvement theory:

(1) Involvement refers to the investment of physical and psychological energy in various "objects." The objects may be highly generalized (the student experience) or highly specific (preparing for a chemistry examination).

(2) Regardless of its object, involvement occurs along a continuum. Different students manifest different degrees of involvement in a given object, and the same student manifests different degrees of involvement in different objects at different times.

(3) Involvement has both quantitative and qualitative features. The extent of a student’s involvement in, say, academic work can be measured quantitatively (how many hours the student spends studying) and qualitatively (does the student review and comprehend reading assignments, or does the student simply stare at the textbook and daydream?).

(4) The amount of student learning and personal development associated with any educational program is directly proportional to the quality and quantity of student involvement in that program.
The effectiveness of any educational policy or practice is directly related to the capacity of that policy or practice to increase student involvement. (pp. 135-6)

After citing these five postulates, Astin notes that his theory evolved from a longitudinal study of college dropouts (Astin, 1973), which sought to identify those factors that affect students' persistence in college. Astin noted that every positive factor could be linked to aspects that increased student involvement; whereas, every negative factor was likely to reduce student involvement. In analyzing environmental factors related to student involvement, Astin observed that the students' place of residence was the most important. Specifically, living in a campus residence had a positive correlation to retention; thus, Astin speculated that residential students had more opportunity for involvement in college. Similarly, students who joined social fraternities or sororities, or who participated in intercollegiate sports, or enrolled in honors programs, tended to persist in college as well. In short, the "bonding" that would seem to result from such affiliations seems to enrich students' experience with college or, as Astin states, "... nearly all forms of student involvement are associated with greater-than-average changes in the characteristics of entering freshmen" (p. 147).

In noting the need to evaluate different forms of involvement, Astin cites C. Robert Pace's "quality of effort" measures (p. 154). Indeed, Pace's College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ) includes "quality of effort" scales. Accordingly, this Researcher
called Astin to verify whether Pace’s instrument was the most effective means of making a proximate assessment of involvement (telephone call, Fall, 1987), and Astin concurred. The decision was thus made to use Pace’s instrument to evaluate "involvement" (see Chapter Two for a discussion of Pace’s CSEQ).

To sum up, this study seeks to use Kohlberg’s moral dilemmas discussion technique so as to challenge the adequacy of students’ present moral reasoning, including doing so repeatedly. In addition, this study focuses on the need to foster psychosocial development--particularly those developmental tasks applicable to 18-19 year-old freshmen. Specifically, this study is concerned with the following questions:

1. Will developmentally designed freshman colloquia result in enhanced psychosocial skills for participants, compared to students in the other freshman colloquia?

2. Will developmentally designed freshman colloquia result in higher grade point average (g.p.a.) for participants compared to the g.p.a. of students in the other freshman colloquia?

3. Will developmentally designed freshman colloquia result in higher moral development scores (i.e. Rest’s "P" score measuring principled thinking), for participants compared to students in the other freshman colloquia?

4. Will developmentally designed freshman colloquia result in greater campus involvement (as measured by Pace’s CSEQ) for participants, compared to students in the other freshman colloquia?

5. Will developmentally designed freshman colloquia result in a higher degree of satisfaction for participants, compared to students in other freshman colloquia?
Why This Study is Important

The past 16 years have witnessed a dramatic shift in the values of entering college freshman; whereas, in 1969, 76% of entering freshmen wanted to "Get along with people," by 1985 only 56%--or a reduction of 20%--of freshmen espoused this goal. Similarly, while 71% of freshmen in 1969 thought it important to "Formulate goals and values for life," 59%--or a reduction of 12%--thought this important in 1985. Instead, a preoccupation with personal career goals and earning power has usurped the more social value-laden goals of students entering college in the 1960s (Levine, 1989). Educators in colleges and universities have witnessed a decline in the importance of standards and values, yet we know from the work of Rest and Whitely that the college years can be a period of significant growth in moral development and that formal education is closely linked to such growth (Whitely, 1982; Pearson, 1989). Certainly, a freshman seminar model that intentionally seeks to promote moral development and succeeds in doing so is worthy of recognition.

Likewise, if we know that development is not a one-dimensional affair, that it necessarily involves emotional, spiritual, occupational, physical and social growth, then we need to act on this awareness and develop seminars and colloquia that fully acknowledge and explicitly incorporate these domains of personal growth so as to more fully realize students' potential for development.
"Involvement"--i.e., the amount of physical and psychological energy that the student devotes to the collegiate experience (Astin, 1985, p. 134) has been shown to correlate with retention and reduced attrition; hence, in addition to enhancing moral reasoning and personality, if a developmentally designed freshman colloquium also results in higher involvement, then it can assist with this problem also. Finally, the proposed intervention is another example of student affairs professionals using their developmental perspective to serve effectively as an educational model to faculty.

Significance in the Research Context

As Rest (1986) has noted, there is a need for more studies in the domain of moral education programs so as to pursue more specific questions, such as for whom do specific programs work best and under what conditions? (p. 86). In addition, certain skills need to be developed as students resolve psychosocial personality issues. Nelson and Low's Personal Skills Map (PSM) is a potentially valuable instrument for measuring skill development associated with vector development. This study will serve to further determine the validity and appropriateness of this instrument.

Finally, Astin's construct of "involvement" can be measured by Pace's College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ). If involvement aids retention and development, then designed courses that intentionally seek to enhance involvement as
measured by the CSEQ would seem to be a way to maximize the potential of such courses for enhancing personal growth.
CHAPTER II
THE NEED TO LINK "ADEQUATE THEORY" TO INSTRUCTION

It has been noted that the literature of ATI research is limited and that what research has been done has tended to look at student ability level, generally to the exclusion of instructional improvement (Widick, 1975). Most of the research suffers from what Widick has termed "conceptual inadequacy" (p. 22). By finding theory that is conceptually adequate and linking that theory by change concepts to achievement tasks and instruction (Widick, p. 26), this inadequacy is reduced.

Cognitive-structural and the psychosocial developmental theories are incorporated in the deliberately designed intervention used in this study because they appear to offer the conceptual adequacy needed. Lawrence Kohlberg, in developing and then elaborating upon a theory of moral development, built his theory on the earlier cognitive-structural work of Piaget, who had "left off" in his work tracing the development of children's moral judgment at the beginning of adolescence (Gilligan, 1981, and hereafter). By studying adolescents, Kohlberg sought to describe how people reason when confronted with moral dilemmas about what they should do in such dilemmas when there are competing claims by the persons involved in those dilemmas. Kohlberg was concerned
with those structures of meaning which define what a person should do, rather than the actual content of his/her structure of meaning. In studying 84 boys aged 10 to 16, Kohlberg constructed moral dilemmas that intentionally placed socially accepted values in conflict--e.g., the value of life versus the value of property, or respect for the individual versus concern for the welfare of the group. By drawing upon his observation of the adolescents whom he studied, Kohlberg was able to identify 6 different stages of justice which were derived from the boys’ conception of life, law, property, authority, punishment, and conscience. These 6 identifiable stages appeared to be invariant in their sequence, with each successive stage representing a hierarchical reorganization of the moral concepts of the stage immediately preceding it. Each stage showed a progressively expanded perspective, enabling the individual to better take the point of view of the other and hence come to a fairer resolution of moral dilemmas. By conceiving of justice as "fairness" and an "equilibration of natural rights," Kohlberg perceived moral development as being signified by an expansion in the social unit to which the individual feels accountable--e.g., the social unit begins with the individual as its smallest component, grows to friends of the individual, then to the individual’s peer group, and so on.

The 6 stages that the theorist identified centered on the concept of conventional morality--i.e., "justice" is defined in terms of maintaining existing social systems by respecting their norms and
values. Thus, the 6 stages are subdivided into 3 general levels reflecting the degree to which conventional morality is reflected, hence preconventional, conventional, and postconventional levels are identified. Preconventional judgment is concerned with the perspective of the individual only, which the conventional judgment level expands to include a societal perspective, while postconventional judgment broadens beyond a societal view to include a universal perspective.

Kohlberg's 6 stages are derived from the two distinct stages of moral judgment that the researcher was able to observe within each of the three levels of moral judgment. At the preconventional level, in Stage 1, Kohlberg observed the continuation of Piaget's "heteronomous morality of constraint," in which the individual feels vulnerable to some kind of retribution from dimly-perceived and powerful authorities, should he/she get into trouble. By preconventional level Stage 2, the individual is not so threatened by a sense of powerful authorities and is able to begin to operate with some sense of autonomy and to engage in reciprocal relationships with others.

At the conventional level of moral judgment, Stage 3, the individual, while operating with stereotypic and limited notions of goodness, is able to move from egocentric moral judgment to judgments involving a sense that the needs of others--specifically, a primary peer group--take precedence over his/her needs. At Stage 4 this group perspective is extended to include society as a
whole and as a social order that is to be preserved. At this stage the individual understands his/her individual welfare to be inextricably tied to that of the society.

With the development of postconventional moral judgment, even the limits of society are transcended, or expanded, to include broad ethical principles. At Stage 5 the individual adopts concepts of equality and reciprocity that define themselves in an understanding of social contract and individual conscience. At Stage 6 these concepts expand to a universal concept of justice wherein justice exists as an ideal that is to be impartially applied and acted upon. (See Appendix A for further illustration of Kohlberg's 6 stages.)

Having developed his theory of moral judgment, Kohlberg subsequently deliberately designed educational programs that sought to enhance moral development. By using the cognitive-structural concept of "cognitive conflict," in which a person's current way of thinking is challenged by presenting a structurally more advanced way of thinking, Kohlberg was able to introduce his moral dilemmas and to lead his students, by Socratic dialogue, to the discovery of "higher" ways of moral thinking. Kohlberg drew upon Rest’s (1973) research that indicated people preferred the highest stage of moral judgment that they could understand, which was usually one stage above their current way of thinking. Turiel (1966) had also demonstrated that exposing people to a stage of thinking above their own tended to facilitate their development to
that stage; thus, by using his 6 stages of moral judgment, Kohlberg could present a moral dilemma; identify the stage of reasoning being employed by his students; and through Socratic dialogue, challenge his students’ thinking by presenting the next highest--or more structurally advanced--stage of moral reasoning, thereby inducing change and development.

Numerous instruments have been developed to measure Kohlberg’s stages. Kohlberg’s own Moral Judgment Interview (MJI), Rest’s Defining Issues Test (DIT), Gibbs’ Social Reflection Questionnaire (SRQ) and Page and Bode’s Ethical Reasoning Inventory (ERI) are the most notable measures developed so far. Although Kohlberg’s instrument was the initial means of measuring his 6 stages, the development of subsequent instruments has been in response to problems that others have perceived in the use of the MJI. Page and Bode (1980) have catalogued these concerns: the time-consuming nature of the MJI in that it must be administered on a one-to-one basis; and problems in scoring protocols, including extensive training for scorers and the potential for both interviewer and scorer bias, as well as the need for complex interpretations in scoring. The point should not be lost, however, that virtually all of these subsequent instruments build upon Kohlberg’s foundation work in developing the MJI.

Kohlberg’s recommendations for teaching moral development have been employed in a number of studies and have met more with emulation than with the revision and modification his
MJI has encountered. Blatt and Kohlberg (1975) were successful in increasing the level of moral reasoning by using moral discussions in junior high and high school classrooms. Straub and Rodgers (1978) employed dilemma discussions, as well as the psychosocial task of identity, in designing a literature course focusing on the development of women. James Rest and others (1978), in developing the Defining Issues Test (DIT), which purports to measure similarities to Kohlberg's stages on a recognition, rather than a production basis, found that DIT scores can be significantly increased by moral education interventions based on Kohlberg's moral discussion techniques. Rest and Thoma (1985), in evaluating 55 studies, 19 of which used college students as subjects, found that moral education programs emphasizing dilemma discussion and those programs emphasizing personality development both produced modest but definite effects. At the college level, Whitely and Loxley (1986), in using an Empathy and Perspective Taking Module in their Sierra Project found that, while they did not succeed in raising Kohlbergian stage levels as hypothesized (from 4 to 4 1/2 or from 4 1/2 to 5), they were able to increase levels from Stage 3 to Stage 4. Although not as dilemma discussion oriented as Kohlberg's technique, this module is based on Kohlberg's theory in that it focuses on perspective-taking so that students can broaden their egocentric perspectives and include others. Both Rest's DIT and Kohlberg's Moral Judgment Interview
(MJI) were used in assessing moral judgment stage levels in this study.

Thus, whether using moral dilemma discussion methods, personal psychological development, or social perspective taking, Kohlberg's theory of moral development can be focused on classroom interventions that have demonstrated some success in facilitating students' moral development. This study seeks to use moral dilemmas, as well as an emphasis on empathy (in the sense of role-taking), and personal psychological growth as means of enhancing freshman college students' moral development.

Chickering's (1969) theory of psychosocial development and associated concepts of change were described in Chapter I; hence, this chapter will summarize the use of Chickering and Nelson and Low in deliberately designing the intervention in this study and will review their related literature.

The intervention in this study uses the psychosocial change concepts of challenging the person with content relevant to current developmental tasks and supporting the person as he/she processes these experiences. This study seeks to facilitate psychosocial change by focusing on the developmental issues that come into focus during the first year of college. These issues, as identified by Chickering's theory, include the first three vectors in particular: (1) Developing Competence, (2) Managing Emotions, and (3) Developing Autonomy. Since these issues of development tend to be appropriate for first-year college students, they become
content for instructional design. Similarly, Nelson and Low’s skill scales describe the skills associated with Chickering’s vectors and provide feedback on levels of skill attainment. The skills provide teachable content and the PSM provides a means of evaluation that is understandable for both teacher and student alike. Thus, while Nelson and Low intended the PSM as a means of measuring psychosocial skills, the very development of that instrument provides a means of applying such ATI elements as task analysis and the identification of relevant dimensions of individual differences.

Although Chickering has not actually designed instructional interventions to facilitate development along the lines of his theory, as Kohlberg has done, Chickering (1969) has acknowledged the importance of the curriculum, teaching, and evaluation for facilitating psychosocial development. Other researchers, notably Widick and Simpson (1975), have noted that the classroom can contribute to students’ psychosocial development; however, they advocate combining identity formation as a theme for academic content with a cognitive developmental theory as a means of defining structural processes where classroom interventions are planned (Widick, Knefelkamp & Parker, 1975; Widick & Simpson, 1975). Straub and Rodgers (1978), for example, used Kohlberg’s dilemma discussions and identity issues in designing a literature class focusing on the development of women.
Hurst (1978) has attempted to use Chickering's theory more specifically by actually relating developmental vectors to specific skills; thus, in teaching a Life-Planning Workshop, he has sought to facilitate development along vectors of competence and autonomy (1st and 3rd vectors) by teaching the skills needed by students to plan and make independent decisions. Again, in a program called Education Through Student Interaction (ETSI), Hurst (1974) sought to enhance students' interpersonal competence (1st vector) by teaching group skills. It is just this kind of vector-specific intervention, in which particular vectors of development and their attendant skills are identified and incorporated into instructional design, that this study also uses.

Such synergistic instructional interventions are promising but relatively scarce, particularly within the domain of psychosocial theory. The proposed study seeks to draw upon the knowledge of development theory pertaining to college freshmen, Chickering's three initial developmental tasks, and Kohlberg's theory of moral reasoning as measured by Rest's proximate instrument, the DIT, so as to incorporate both cognitive-structural and psychosocial theories of development. By using the 14 personal skills measured by Nelson and Low's PSM, which can be integrated into Chickering's vectors of development, the instructional intervention of this study seeks to be "grounded" in psychosocial development and to report the usefulness of an instrument, the PSM, that has had little use in the context of college instruction.
While the instructional approaches employed in this study employ relatively recent theory and instructional concepts, certainly there have been attempts to use the classroom and curriculum as a means of addressing psychosocial, as well as intellectual, development since early in the history of American higher education. The next section will survey the instructional efforts that have been undertaken to date.

History of the Freshman Seminar

One of the earliest forerunners of the freshman seminar was a freshman orientation course established at Boston University in 1888. In 1900 the mechanical engineering department at the University of Michigan required all freshmen to attend a series of orientation lectures. At about the same time Oberlin required its freshmen to take a non-credit career information course. These first courses grew out of a uniquely American concern for the special needs of freshmen that was acknowledged as early as 1877 at Johns Hopkins, with the creation of a system of faculty advisors (Gordon, 1989).

Later, in 1911, the first orientation course for credit was established at Reed College. This course, "The College Life Course," was intended to assist freshmen in adjusting to college life. At about this time the Carnegie Foundation was recommending that universities take steps to help freshmen "find themselves" (p. 185), and by the end of World War I there was a
proliferation of such orientation courses, the creation of which in many ways paralleled the development of student personnel services. By 1928, Fitts and Swift (1928) had developed a typology of these courses, with a first type reflecting an organizational and content approach that purported to assist students in their adjustment to college. A second type was more of a "How to study and think critically" course, while the third type concerned itself with students' social and intellectual orientation. In fact, Gordon (1989), in chronicling the history of freshman orientation courses, notes that "the orientation courses today are surprisingly similar to the earlier ones in content and format" (p. 187).

However, the growth of such courses was not unchecked, for in the 1930's faculty began to object to credit being offered for "life adjustment" courses. By the mid 1960's orientation courses under such faculty scrutiny became scarce indeed. It was not until the emergence of the "new student" in the 1970's--i.e. the older adult, first-generation college students, and less academically prepared students--that the orientation courses experienced a period of resurgence as educators sought ways to better integrate these "new students" into the academic mainstream (Gordon, pp. 188-189). One of the more fortunate byproducts of this renewal has been the acknowledgement that faculty need special preparation to meet the differing needs of freshmen.

While today orientation courses are often termed freshman seminars, they, too, have evolved into three distinct types. One
type of course tends to emphasize personal adjustment; a second
type focuses on a more intellectual, academic approach to the
meaning of a liberal education; and the third type is more
synergistic, incorporating both adjustment and intellectual issues
(Gordon, pp. 190-191).

The content in which the proposed study occurs is very
distinctly that of the liberal education seminar, the second type of
orientation course that is presently discernible. As Gordon notes,
the freshman seminar "is more concerned with the academic
adjustment and development of the student and is more
intellectually based. It is often taught by faculty who might be the
student's academic advisor. The freshman seminar content may
be incorporated into an already existing course or may be initiated
as an interdisciplinary offering" (p. 191). This is descriptive of the
proposed research context to an almost uncanny degree, for Hiram
College's freshman colloquia (seminar) and the Freshman Institute
that precedes it are intentionally academic. For example, the
Freshman Institute is a one-week, academic orientation to the
liberal arts which is intended to help students prepare for the rigors
of a liberal education. Similarly, the colloquium, one of three
graded, five-hour classes taken by freshmen, is selected primarily
on the basis of announced academic content (see Appendix D for
Colloquia Descriptions). Again, the colloquium instructor serves as
the academic advisor throughout the colloquium students’
freshman year. Finally, the colloquium content is distributed to
general elective courses as the instructor deems; thus, the three colloquia serving as the intervention in this study are each divided into three components: two credits for composition, two for psychology, and one credit for literature (see Appendix D for "Distribution of Colloquium Credit")--according nicely with Gordon's interdisciplinary criterion.

Although these freshman seminars, in one form or another, have been in existence since 1888, the nature of the institutions which they serve has changed considerably. American universities have expanded and become much more differentiated in the last forty years. As Sanford has observed, the modern university has "succeeded" more in becoming a disparate entity, rather than a holistic one (Whitely, 1982). Sanford has noted, too, that liberal arts colleges--particularly the elitist ones--have followed the universities' example by focusing more on department-specific and research-related aspects of their curriculum, rather than retaining their sense of community and unity of spirit. Our society has likewise, become increasingly fragmented. And our students, reflective of both our society and the institutions of higher education that serve them, have similarly manifested a lack of a sense of community, confusion about values, a lack of intimate friends, a tenuous sense of self, and a noticeable lack of commitment to a defined belief system (p. xiv). While University 101 courses, such as those initiated by the University of South Carolina, have been developed to ease the transition of freshmen
to large universities, there is a category of colleges, the small, traditional, liberal arts colleges, such as Hiram, that are perhaps best suited to recapture that sense of something lost that Sanford decries when he says, in surveying the landscape of higher education, "Where in the curriculum, then, were students to find anything to nurture the spirit? How were they to attain broad understanding, to find out what it means to be human, to experience wonder, to acquire a sense of values?" (p. vii). It is noteworthy that Sanford cites his own undergraduate experience at the University of Richmond and his teaching experience at Vassar as being emblematic of the sense of community and "homonymy" (Whitely) that has been lost in today's collegiate experience.

John Whitely, in his on-going work with the Sierra Project at the University of California-Irvine has sought, in many ways, to restore the role of value formation to the arena of the collegiate experience. Whitely's initial rationale for his work was to create a curriculum intentionally designed to inculcate in students a greater capacity for ethical awareness and to develop in them a "higher standard of fairness" (p. 2). By implementing a residential learning program (Sierra is one of the residence hall complexes at U.C.-Irvine), Whitely has moved, quite consciously, towards an integrated sense of a learning community--very much in the spirit of Sanford's remembered undergraduate experience. It would seem that, by designing a residential learning experience, Whitely has provided us all with a replicable model; for large universities can,
by redefining the domain of the residence hall, implement an intentional "community of scholars," while small institutions--particularly liberal arts colleges--can seek intentionally to recreate across their entire campuses that once-possessed pervasive sense of academic community.

James Rest, whom Whitely has drawn upon in designing his interventions and evaluating the results, has noted that moral judgment is not an isolated acquisition but, rather, occurs in concert with general social development. Rest has noted the traits of those who show a propensity to develop in moral judgment: their love of learning; their interest in new challenges; their enjoyment of intellectually stimulating environments; their tendency to make plans and set goals, and to take risks; and their ability to see themselves in the larger social context of history, as well as their ability to take responsibility for themselves (Rest, 1986). Rest has also noted that moral education programs emphasizing the discussion of dilemmas and personality development tend to produce modest but definite effects (p. 85).

The University 101 movement has brought student affairs professionals and their faculty colleagues back to a more integrated, holistic sense of student development in which educators are encouraged not only to attend to cognitive, but to psychosocial, moral and physical development as well. Whitely's work, his careful research and participation in the freshman year experience, coupled with the on-going work of Rest and his
(3) knowledge and utilization of student services, (4) personality development, (5) success of freshman sub-populations, and (6) degree of satisfaction expressed about freshman seminars (Fidler & Hunter, 1989).

This study focuses on an outcome variable where there is not much research evidence, specifically, the question of whether or not freshman seminars influence personality development. Research at Clarion University using the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis suggests that participants in a freshman seminar may have achieved a lowering in feelings of apprehension, increased social involvement, and greater self-discipline (Fidler & Hunter, p. 226).

Researchers at Columbus College used Rotter’s Internal-External Locus of Control Scale and the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory but did not find significant differences between participants and non-participants. Fidler and Hunter conclude that "Additional research is needed before conclusions can be made on the effect of freshman seminars on personality variables" (p. 316). This study uses Nelson and Low’s Personal Skills Map (PSM) to determine if a freshman seminar can positively affect participants’ personality growth.

Finally, numerous studies have been done evaluating students’ satisfaction with freshman seminars and, as might be expected, the University of South Carolina, with its 13-year history of the University 101 course, has well-documented data that show
students do expect benefits, such as easing the transition from high school to college, and that they do report positive gains, ranging from a better understanding of self to better relationships with faculty and peers (Fidler & Hunter, pp. 230-231). This study uses a uniform "Colloquium Evaluation" (see Appendix D) form, as well as the two questions relating satisfaction with college on the "Opinions about College" part of the CSEQ (see Appendix C), to assess the degree of students' satisfaction with the intervention colloquium, as compared to other colloquia.

Of course one of the results of increased measurement and research will be increased credibility for those student affairs professionals who venture into the classroom domain of the faculty in order to teach freshman seminars. As noted earlier, the typology of current freshman seminars reflects three broad trends: the orientation courses--those courses primarily concerned with adjustment to college; freshman seminars, whose focus is intellectual and academic; and a third kind of course that attends to both areas of adjustment and intellectual development. It has also been noted that faculty scrutiny, beginning in the 1930's and extending through the mid 1960's, all but obliterated the freshman seminar on college campuses. Obviously, then, student affairs professionals need to heed the hard-learned lessons of the past, lest they contribute, however inadvertently, to the demise of the freshman seminar.
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Just how student affairs professionals might bring their knowledge of developmental psychology to bear on classroom instruction has been suggested by Norman Sprinthall (1980), who has observed that "we will need to systematically connect principles of psychology to classroom practice" (p. 335). Elsewhere, in addressing issues raised by James Rest, Sprinthall echoes Rest's concern that we differentiate the learning potential that is inherent in given experiences so as to acknowledge the different stages at which students may be operating--the notion of the differentiated curriculum (pp. 140-143).

Some of the theory base used by student affairs professionals is also applicable to traditional academic interests and has, to some extent, already been adopted. For example, Perry's scheme, which describes intellectual development in nine sequential stages, is attractive to faculty. Much research has been done on Perry-based classroom interventions (Stephenson & Hunt, 1975; Stephenson, 1982; Widick, 1975; Widick & Simpson, 1978) and adequate measures of Perry levels exist. Knefelkamp and Widick's Sentence Stem and Essay Test (1974) was developed to measure cognitive development on Perry's stages; and was subsequently shortened to the essays only as the Measure of Intellectual Development (MID) (1978), while Taylor (1983) built on both of these instruments in devising the Measure of Epistemological Reflection (M.E.R.). There are literally hundreds of classroom and student affairs studies on Perry's scheme using
these three measures. Thus, student affairs professionals and the faculty both can base their interventions on the same theories.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

In Chapter III the design and methodological detail of the study are described. The chapter is divided into the following sections:

a) hypotheses and operational definitions
b) subjects
c) instrumentation and scoring procedures
d) design and methodology, and
e) methods of data analysis

Hypotheses and Operational Definitions

The questions examined in this study, as indicated previously, are:

(1) Will developmentally designed freshmen colloquia result in enhanced psychosocial skills for participants, compared to students in the other colloquia?

(2) Will developmentally designed freshmen colloquia result in higher grade point average (g.p.a.) for participants compared to the g.p.a. of students in the other freshmen colloquia?

(3) Will developmentally designed freshmen colloquia result in higher moral development scores (i.e., Rest's "P" score measuring principled thinking) for participants, compared to students in the other freshmen colloquia?
(4) Will developmentally designed freshmen colloquia result in greater campus involvement (as measured by Pace's CSEQ) for participants, compared to students in the other freshmen colloquia?

(5) Will developmentally designed freshmen colloquia result in a higher degree of satisfaction for participants, compared to students in other freshmen colloquia?

The projected research hypotheses for these questions are as follows:

HY1: There will be significant differences in the psychosocial skills of students enrolled in the deliberately designed colloquia, compared to students enrolled in the other freshmen colloquia.

HY2: There will be significantly higher grade point averages (g.p.a.) during the first term of the freshman year for students enrolled in the deliberately designed colloquia, compared to students enrolled in the other freshmen colloquia.

HY3: There will be significantly greater change in P scores, reflective of moral reasoning, for students enrolled in the deliberately designed colloquia, compared to students enrolled in the other freshmen colloquia.

HY4: There will be greater involvement (as measured by Pace's CSEQ), for students enrolled in the deliberately designed colloquia, compared to students enrolled in the other freshmen colloquia.

HY5: There will be a higher degree of satisfaction for students enrolled in the deliberately designed colloquia, compared to students enrolled in the other freshmen colloquia.
Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined according to their use in this study:

**Psychosocial skills**, will be defined by scores on the scales of Nelson and Low’s Personal Skills Map (PSM), (see next section for description of the instruments).

**Deliberately designed colloquia**, refers to two sections of freshmen colloquia in 1988-89 and one section in 1989-90 that are deliberately designed using Chickering’s vectors of competence, managing emotions, autonomy, and identity; Nelson and Low’s personal skills scales as content, and Kohlberg’s moral dilemma discussions as an educational strategy (see Appendix D for syllabus) in order to try to teach content, enhance psychosocial skill development, enhance moral reasoning complexity, and increase satisfaction with the classroom experience.

**Students in deliberately designed colloquia**, refers to 25 freshman students in sections 20 and 21 of 1988-89 intervention and 17 freshman students in section 21 of 1989-90 intervention who participated in the same deliberately designed colloquia as defined above.

**Students enrolled in other freshman colloquia**, refers to 40 freshman students enrolled in forty-one freshmen colloquia in both 1988-89 and 1989-90 which were not deliberately designed using personal skills or moral reasoning.
Grade point average (g.p.a.), refers to the grades earned for the freshman colloquia and other courses taken in the first term of college. Grades range from A--4.00 to F--no credit or points and include (+)--.67 and --.33 gradations--e.g., a B+ equals 3.33 while a B- equals 2.67.

P score, the P score refers to the Principled Thinking Score derived from Rest's Defining Issues Test (D.I.T.) (see section on instruments for further discussion of the P score and a review of the D.I.T.).

Moral reasoning, refers to Lawrence Kohlberg's scheme of moral reasoning stages as measured by the P score on Rest's DIT.

Involvement, refers to Alexander Astin's construct of involvement--i.e., the quality and quantity of the physical and psychological energy that students invest in their college experience as measured by the scales on Pace's CSEQ (see Appendix C).

Pace's College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ), refers to the instrument designed by C. Robert Pace that assesses the construct of "quality of effort"--i.e., the amount, scope, and quality of effort that students expend on their own experience. This construct is considered to be proximate to that of Astin's "involvement," hence the use of the CSEQ as a means of measuring involvement (see Appendix C).

Degree of satisfaction, refers both to the CSEQ's "Opinions about College" and the Colloquium Evaluation items; 1.D.
"Independent of how much you liked the Colloquium, how much do you feel you learned?" and 1.E. "In summary, how do you rate your satisfaction with this Colloquium as a whole?" (see Appendix C).

Subjects

The subject sample for the study was comprised of freshmen undergraduates from Hiram College, all of whom were required to take a freshman colloquium during their first term of enrollment (Fall Quarter). Freshmen rank order their top 4 preferences from a colloquium prospectus (see Appendix D) that is sent to them in July prior to their matriculation to the College. The colloquium used for this study was entitled: "Young Adulthood: The College Years," and was taught for two successive years: 1988-89 and 1989-90. Two separate and independent sections of the course were taught in 1988-89 and one section was taught in 1989-90, with the sections meeting on Mondays and Thursdays (periods 6, 7-1:20-4:20 p.m.) and Tuesdays and Fridays (periods 6, 7-1:20-4:20 p.m.) in 1988-89 and Tuesdays and Fridays (periods 6, 7-1:10-3:20 p.m.) in 1989-90. Subjects for the two experimental colloquia in 1988-89 and the one experimental colloquium in 1989-90 self-selected the deliberately designed colloquia or, in the case of several late-registering and "at risk" students, were steered towards the experimental colloquia. Although this self-selection lacks randomness, it is the only way in which entering freshmen can select a colloquium at the college in this study and is, in fact,
similar to the selection process for many colleges offering a freshman seminar or class. This method of selection, therefore, allows for generalization for similar kinds of freshmen initial-entry courses. Subjects for both the 1988-89 and 1989-90 Comparison Groups were drawn randomly from a table of random numbers using an alphabetical listing of all freshmen from the remaining colloquia. All subjects, both Experimental and Comparison group members, were asked permission with regard to their participation in the research. The Comparison Group students for both the 1988-89 and 1989-90 groups were contacted by letter (see Appendix C). Those who agreed to participate in 1988-89 were sent a second letter (see Appendix C); whereas, the 1989-90 Comparison Group was sent just one letter (see Appendix C), and invited to a group meeting for further explanation and initial administration of the pre test instruments (PSM and DIT). Post tests of the PSM and DIT and instructions were delivered by campus mail (see Appendix C). Experimental Group subjects were informed of the research in class and were asked permission to participate in the research (see Appendix C). The Experimental subjects received group administration in class of the pre tests of the PSM and DIT. The post tests of the PSM and the completion of Colloquium Evaluations were done during the final examination period for Fall Quarter, 1988, while the post test of the DIT was handed out in class to be returned. The post test only of the CSEQ
was delivered by campus mail to both Experimental and Comparison group participants (see Appendix C).

Original enrollments for the experimental colloquia for the 1988-89 year were 16 for section 20 and 11 for section 21. All 27 students completed the course, although 1 student in section 20 withdrew from the College after Winter Quarter; thus, 26 of the original 27 students completed the freshman year. Initial enrollment for the 1989-90 experimental group was 19 for section 21 but two students declined to participate; thus, 17 students completed their participation in the study.

Combined SAT scores were obtained for all but 1 student (a GED recipient) in the 1988-89 group. The combined 1988-89 Experimental Group’s combined SAT scores averaged 948, substantively lower than the Combined Comparison Group average of 1067 (a difference of 119 points). Significant differences in class rank occurred for the 1988-89 Experimental Group as well, with its mean rank being 28.3%; whereas, the Comparison Group had a mean rank of 18.8% (nearly 10% higher). Based on these indices, there are systematic differences between Experimental Group ('88-89 SAT mean equals 948 and mean class rank equals 28.3%), and Comparison Group ('88-89 SAT mean equals 1067 and mean class rank equals 18.8%). Accordingly, statistical procedures will need to be used to derive meaningful comparisons and control for systematic differences.
Instrumentation

Three instruments were used: the Personal Skills Map (PSM) the Defining Issues Test (DIT) and the College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ) (see Appendix C).

Personal Skills Map (PSM)

The Personal Skills Map is an instrument that was developed by Darwin B. Nelson and Gary R. Low in order to create a positive assessment instrument which would enable individuals to identify areas of personal strengths and areas in which change is needed in order for individuals to achieve personal growth. The PSM is a self-reported instrument and provides its participants with a computerized map that reflects the individuals’ self-assessment in intrapersonal, interpersonal, and career/life management dimensions. Fourteen scales in three major dimensions of personal effectiveness are employed: I Intrapersonal Dimension; (1) Self-Esteem; II Interpersonal Dimension; (2) Assertion, (3) Interpersonal Comfort, (4) Empathy; III Career/Life Skills; (5) Drive Strength, (6) Decision-Making, (7) Time Management, (8) Sales Orientation, (9) Commitment Ethic; IV Personal Wellness; (10) Stress Management, (11) Physical Wellness; V Communication Style; Interpersonal Assertion (see #2); (12) Interpersonal Aggression, (13) Interpersonal Deference; VI Personal Change
Orientation; (14) Personal Change Orientation. These scales are defined as follows:

**Self-Esteem:** How satisfied you are with your current thoughts, beliefs, attitudes, general behavior; how much you currently value yourself.

**Assertion:** How satisfied you are with your current ability to communicate in positive, direct, straightforward, and comfortable ways under stress.

**Interpersonal Comfort:** How you see your own ability to judge appropriate social and physical distance in verbal and nonverbal interactions and how comfortable and relaxed you are with others.

**Empathy:** How accurately you think you understand another person’s thoughts, feelings, and behaviors and how able you are to accept them.

**Drive Strength:** How you effectively direct your own energy and motivation to accomplish personal and career goals.

**Decision Making:** How able you find yourself to be in planning, initiating, and implementing effective problem solving procedures.

**Time Management:** How effective you see yourself to be in organizing and using time to accomplish personal and career goals.

**Sales Orientation:** How skillful you see yourself being at positively impacting, persuading, influencing others, and in general, making a difference.

**Commitment Ethic:** How skillful you see yourself to be in completing projects and job assignments in a dependable manner, even under difficult circumstances.

**Stress Management:** How skillful you are in your own perception in positively managing stress, anxiety, and tension on a daily basis.
Physical Wellness: The extent to which you observe healthy attitudes and disciplined living patterns important in physical health and well being.

Interpersonal Assertion: Same as Assertion above.

Interpersonal Aggression: How inclined you are to getting into a pattern with someone else under stress in which you would tend to overpower, dominate, or discredit the other person's rights, thoughts, feelings, and behaviors.

Interpersonal Deference: How inclined you are to getting into a pattern with someone else under stress in which you would tend to be indirect, self-inhibiting, self-denying, avoiding, withdrawing, and would tend to store up unexpressed feelings.

Change Orientation: Your level of satisfaction with current skills and behaviors, your personal need to make skill changes now, and your level of readiness to change (Low, 1986, p. 11).

The PSM is a self-administered, untimed instrument with 300 items that usually requires 45 to 75 minutes to complete. Participants are encouraged to answer as they really are, rather than as they would like to be. The PSM has both an adult version (ninth-tenth grade reading level) and an adolescent version (PSM-A), with fifth-sixth grade reading levels.

In establishing the validity of the PSM, the authors sought to determine whether or not the PSM could differentiate between individuals functioning at (1) healthy, (2) normal, or (3) below average skill levels by conducting research with skilled professional helpers, normal adults, and persons voluntarily seeking counseling and psychotherapy services from out-patient treatment facilities. The results showed that professional helpers were significantly
higher in assertion; whereas, persons in therapy achieved significantly higher scores in interpersonal aggression, deference and change orientation. Again, the PSM significantly correlates with a number of scales on other instruments--(1) Personal Orientation Inventory (Shostrom, 1962): (2) Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (Edwards, 1953); (3) Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (Gattell, 1956); and (4) Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (Hathaway and McKinley, 1943)--thus establishing initial concurrent validity.

Reliability coefficients for the PSM scales ranged from .64 (Empathy) to .94 (Sales Orientation) and are, therefore, well within acceptable limits for behavioral science research. Again, while the so-called "Hawthorne Effect" is possible--i.e., students can project a "better self"--it can be controlled by establishing the right "set" for participants.

**College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ)**

The College Student Experiences Questionnaire was first published in 1979, and revised in 1983, by C. Robert Pace of the Higher Education Research Institute at U.C.L.A. The instrument was developed in order to assess the quality of undergraduate student education and to examine the sources of student progress toward the attainment of important goals of college education (Pace, 1983, p. 4). Pace’s concern was that education tends typically to be viewed, and measured, as a product rather than a
process. In his own words, the author notes, "It seemed to me that the quality of the educational experience or process should somehow be taken into account. We need ways to measure the quality of the process as well as the quality of the product" (p. 5). Later, in discussing accountability and after acknowledging the fact that colleges are responsible for resources and facilities, programs and procedures, and the stimuli and standards that they provide for student learning and development, Pace asserts, "But surely the students are also accountable for the amount, scope, and quality of effort they invest in their own learning and development, and specifically in using the facilities and opportunities that are available in the college setting. Accountability for achievement and related student outcomes must consider both what the institution offers and what the students do with those offerings" (pp. 6-7). This course of thought led Pace to develop "quality of effort" measures, that would be judged by the frequency with which students engaged in activities. Specifically, scales were developed with numerical values, ranging from "very often" (4) to "often" (3) to "occasionally" (2) to "never" (1).

The CSEQ is comprised of fourteen scales—the scales consisting of lists of activities which reflect increasing levels of effort and potential value. Seven of the scales relate to students' use of major campus facilities, and seven relate to other opportunities for experience in the college environment. In all there are 142 activities in fourteen quality of effort scales as follows:
I-Students' use of major campus facilities—(1) Classroom (Course Learning scale) (10 activities); (2) Library (10 activities); (3) Facilities related to the Arts (12 activities); (4) Facilities related to Science/Technology (12 activities); (5) Student Union (10 activities); (6) Athletic and Recreational Facilities (10 activities); (7) Dormitory, Fraternity/Sorority (10 activities); II-Students' Opportunities for Experiences in the College Environment—(8) Experiences with Faculty (10 activities); (9) Clubs and Organizations (10 activities); (10) Experiences in Writing (10 activities); (11) Personal Experiences (10 activities); (12) Student Acquaintances (10 activities); (13) Topics of Conversation (12 activities); (14) Information in Conversations (6 activities). These fourteen scales reflect increasing levels of effort and potential value. Thus, use of the Student Union would go from a relatively "low" quality of effort—"casual and informal use—had snacks, met friends, etc."—to a higher quality of effort use—"programmatic use—attended events, held meetings, etc."

These fourteen scales comprise one-half of the instrument.

The initial part of the CSEQ consists of items pertaining to background information. These items are included so as to determine the relationship between quality of effort and important personal characteristics and various conditions in college, such as major field, residence, and grades.

Additionally, two questions relating to the extent of reading and writing that students have done during the current school year
are included. There are also two questions relating to students' satisfaction with college and, finally, students are asked to respond to a question regarding the need for students to exert initiative in order to receive maximum benefits from their college experience.

The next section of the CSEQ contains five items dealing with characteristics of the college environment. These five items reflect five major dimensions that Pace has identified as differentiating college environments: scholarship, awareness, community, propriety, and practicality. These dimensions are measured by asking students to rate how much emphasis they feel is placed on the following aspects of student development at their colleges:

1. development of academic, scholarly, and intellectual qualities;
2. development of aesthetic, expressive, and creative qualities,
3. concern for being critical, evaluative, and analytical;
4. development of vocational and occupational competence, and
5. concern for personal relevance and practical values in the courses.

The final section of the instrument deals with "Estimates of Gains." This consists of twenty-one goal statements of important objectives, such as whether students have "acquired background and specialization for further education in some professional, scientific or scholarly field"--"very much," "quite a bit," or "very little."

In discussing the validity of his instrument, Pace suggests that quality of effort scales dealing with academic and intellectual activities, such as use of the library, contact with faculty members,
course learning, writing, and science laboratory, should correlate in such a way that seniors would presumably demonstrate greater intellectual efforts than freshmen, as evidenced by higher grades. Pace's Table 3, "College Status Characteristics Related to Academic Effort," does in fact show a positive and significant correlation with students' year in college, grades, aspirations for advanced degrees, and hours spent on school-related activities (p. 34). The author observes that his findings are fully supportive of the construct validity of his quality of effort scales.

Pace also examines the issue of credibility on self-reported data. He notes that questions have been clearly formulated and have been developed with a concern for their relevancy and the ability of students to answer questions knowledgeably. Again, Pace observes that the activities cited in his instrument are specific and that recall is limited to what students have done "during the current year" (p. 35). With regard to the clarity of responses, the choices "never," "occasionally," "often," and "very often" are formulated so as to avoid any ambiguity.

In discussing the issue of instrument reliability, Pace suggests that his quality of effort scales can be compared to achievement tests (p. 23). The author points out that the reliability of his test and measurement items can be estimated statistically following classical test construction theory, but he also states that his goal is not only to achieve test reliability but "confidence" as well. By "confidence" Pace means the ability to demonstrate that results on
his measures are congruent with what is known from prior research and theory. Item intercorrelations for the CSEQ are all positive, although some items are somewhat low, while others are somewhat high. Within each scale every item does make a significant and positive contribution to the scale score.

Noting that Guttman had suggested that a coefficient of 85% would be a good criterion to use when considering the reproducibility of scales, the author notes his instrument ranges from a low of 78% to a high of 91%. Finally, in noting the distribution of scores on each of the quality of effort scales, Pace reports that nearly 10,000 students from 40 colleges participated in initial studies during the years 1979-81 and that later studies showed that no percentage at any point in the distributions was changed by more than two points, while nearly two-thirds of the new per cents were identical with the earlier, larger pool of data.

Defining Issues Test (DIT)

The Defining Issues Test was conceived as an easier method of assessing Kohlberg’s stages of moral development than Kohlberg’s Moral Judgment Interview (MJI). The assessment procedure is based on subjects’ rating and their ranking of stage-prototypical statements, rather than being interviewed as subjects, which Kohlberg’s Moral Judgment Interview requires. Again, the DIT relies on recognition, rather than production of response, as required by Kohlberg’s assessment. Whereas Kohlberg stage
types his subjects on his instrument, the DIT's P and D indices locate subjects in terms of a continuous number representing the developmental continuum. Given these differences, users of the DIT can only speak in terms of similarities to Kohlberg's stages, and DIT scores should not be used to predict stage scores on Kohlberg's instrument. The DIT uses 6 moral dilemmas, 3 of which were taken from Kohlberg's original instrument, the Moral Judgment Interview (1958), and 3 from Lockwood's dissertation (1970). After a subject reads a dilemma, 12 issue statements are listed and the subject is asked to rate all 12 statements and then to rank the 4 most important issues from the set of 12.

The P score, which is the sum of the weighted ranks given to stage 5 and 6 items (5a, 5b and 6 on Rest's Scoring Form), is the most widely used index from the DIT and is interpreted as "the relative importance a subject gives to principled moral considerations in making a decision about moral dilemmas" (Rest, 1979). The P index purports, then, to assess if subjects are moving towards Kohlberg's various levels of principled thinking. Rest's subdivisions correspond to Kohlberg's "morality of social contract," "morality of intuitive humanism," and "morality of principles of ideal social cooperation."

The D score is an overall index of moral judgment development which draws on information from all stages, rather than just stage 5a, 5b, and 6 items. The D score was developed with the intent to replace the P score, but it has not proven to be
markedly superior. Another score, the A score, is intended to
gauge an "anti-establishment orientation" in subjects.

There are two checks built into the DIT for ascertaining
reliability. One check is the M score, which consists of lofty-
sounding items which are intentionally nonsensical. This check is
to represent subjects who choose items simply because they
"sound" pretentious but actually have no meaning. Thus, if
subjects consistently rate and rank M items high, then their
protocols may be discarded.

There is also a Consistency Check built into the DIT, so that a
subject’s ratings can be compared with the subject’s rankings. For
example, if a subject ranks an item first, then ratings for that item
ought not to be any higher. In general, if a subject has more than
two inconsistencies on the six stories in the instrument, then that
subject’s protocol ought to be discarded as well.

For purposes of the proposed study, the P index is used,
with no reference made to the D index. Numerous M scores and
more than two inconsistencies on a single instrument will serve to
invalidate subjects’ protocols.

As Rest points out, since moral judgment development is a
psychological construct, with many theoretical implications, no one
study can establish the DIT’s validity in attempting to operationalize
that construct (Rest, 1988, p. 6.1). In order to achieve good face
validity, the DIT both asks subjects what course of action they
would favor in a given dilemma, and attempts to discern the reasons behind that choice of a particular course of action.

The test-retest reliabilities for the major P and D indices of the DIT are generally in the high .70's or .80's, while Cronbach's alpha index of internal consistency is generally in the high .70's. Stage scores—i.e., Stage 2, 3, 4, 5a, 5b, and 6 are generally lower, in the .50's and .60's, which serves to underline Rest's caution that the DIT does not purport to accurately measure specific stages of Kohlberg's scheme. Again, there is a 3-story version of the DIT, which is not being used in the proposed study. Its reliability is predictably lower. Since the DIT is an objectively scored instrument, there is no problem with either interjudge reliability or with differing interviewing styles.

**College Student Data**

Hiram College is a private, church-related (Disciples of Christ), residential, liberal arts college that, in many ways, reflects the stereotype of a "traditional" liberal arts college. During the 1988-89 academic year the College had an enrollment of 876 traditional students, 92.5% of whom lived on campus, while during the 1989-90 academic year the College has an enrollment of 924 traditional students, 92.5% of whom live on campus. The college is moderately selective in its admissions, with the 1988-89 freshman class having a mean SAT of 1060 (510 verbal; 550 quantitative) and a median class rank of 85%, while the 1989-90 freshman class also
has a mean SAT of 1070 (520 verbal; 560 quantitative) and a median class rank of 87%. Three-fourths of the freshman class come from within the state of Ohio and 55% come from the northeast quadrant of Ohio. Although costs are fairly expensive ($9,249 tuition; $3,256 room, board, and fees), 90% of the students receive financial aid, with an average award being $7,000. Again, quite unlike whatever liberal arts elitist stereotype one might imagine, 60% of the incoming freshmen are typically "first-generation" college students. Hiram itself is located in a village of approximately 500 people and was settled in what was originally the Western Reserve area of Connecticut; consequently, the Village and the College appear to be more "New England" than Midwest. The College is somewhat isolated; Cleveland is 40 miles to the northwest; Akron 35 miles to the southeast; and Youngstown some 45 miles due east.

The subjects of the study were entering freshmen who self-selected for the 1988-89 Experimental Group (consisting of two colloquia--#20 and #21), or 27 students; (13 in #20 and 14 in #21), and for the 1989-90 Experimental Group (consisting of one colloquium), or 19 (17 of whom agreed to participate in the study) students, while the subjects for the Comparison Groups for both years were randomly selected from the other forty-one colloquia. In order to control for attrition, 40 comparison group subjects in 1988-89 and 35 subjects in 1989-90 were invited to participate on a voluntary basis, with the hope being that attrition would not go
below the number of students in the Experimental Group. The 27 subjects in the Experimental Group accounted for approximately 9% of the 1988-89 freshman class while the 17 subjects in the 1989-90 group accounted for approximately 7% of the 1989-90 freshman class. Since virtually all entering freshmen self-selected their colloquia, there was no opportunity to collect a larger "N" for the intervention. In fact, being permitted to teach two such colloquia in 1988-89 broke with the faculty convention that no one instructor ought to be allowed to teach more than one colloquium (see letter from Dean Moser in Appendix B).

Design and Methodology

A non-randomized control group pre test-post test design was employed, since the Experimental, or treatment group, was self-selected and could not be drawn randomly. The design used was a nonrandomized control-group pre test-post test design (Isaac and Michael, 1982). Given the constraints of the Freshmen Colloquia at the college studied wherein all freshmen were permitted to rank order their first four preferences from the 22 colloquia descriptions offered, there was the inherent limitation of having to work with a non-randomized experimental group. However, since the deliberately designed intervention was not being administered to the comparison group, it was possible to select randomly comparison group non-participants.
The inherent threat to internal validity is the self-selection aspect of the Experimental Group, yet that is the method for selecting all freshmen colloquia at the college studied. Another concern is that late registering students--often those most undecided or less certain about college goals--and known "at risk" students, were steered to the Experimental Colloquia, thus reducing chances for matched samples of "equal" ability. The 1989-90 Colloquium was offered late, only after a faculty member had to withdraw from teaching his scheduled colloquium; thus, this Facilitator was permitted to offer his colloquium, which then became available to late enrolling students, some of whom were actually assigned to the Experimental Colloquium (See Appendix E).

Since all subjects are in self-selected colloquia, there should be little difference of within group history. Instrumentation administration was similar for both Comparison and Experimental groups, since both pre tests (PSM and DIT) were administered in large groups. The Comparison Groups were convened for a special administration, while the Experimental Group had the instruments administered in each of the respective colloquia. Again, given the relative homogeneity of the College's freshmen, maturation and pretesting effects should be similar for both groups.

With regard to external validity, there is potential for a reactive effect to the experimental procedures, but both groups (1988-89 and 1989-90) have been treated virtually alike with regard to instrumentation and follow-up procedures. Because the
comparison group was randomly selected from all other colloquia, there may actually be enhanced external validity.

Dependent Variables

Academic Performance

Academic performance was operationalized as:
1) performance grades for the course on weekly reading quizzes
2) performance grades for the course on 2 oral presentations
3) performance grades for the course on 4 written papers
4) performance grade for the course on response journal

Student Satisfaction

Student satisfaction was operationalized as responses on an evaluation form designed for all freshmen colloquia (see Appendix D) and on the "Opinions About College" section of the CSEQ.

Psychosocial Development

Psychosocial development was operationalized as a weekly focus on one or more skill scales of Nelson and Low's PSM (see Syllabus, Appendix E). Development was measured by using self-report data on a pre test-post test administration of the PSM.

Cognitive/Moral Development

Cognitive/Moral development was operationalized as a
weekly focus on moral dilemmas, as reflected in both literary readings and video tapes. Development was measured by a pre test-post test administration of Rest’s DIT.

Independent Variables

Instructional Treatment:
The primary independent variable manipulated in this study was instructional approach. Instructional approaches were designed by analyzing both the achievement tasks and developmental status characteristics of the students. The instructional treatment was designed to "match" two developmental statuses of the students; that is, students and environment were matched on Chickering’s vectors, Nelson and Low’s skills, and Kohlberg’s levels of moral reasoning. It was assumed that most of the students were reasoning in Kohlberg’s Stage 3, but that whatever stage emerged the facilitator would start at the lowest level and work up in challenge and design.

It was further assumed that these students would be preoccupied with Erikson’s issues of identity and would be primarily engaged in the first three vectors of psychosocial development (Chickering, 1969). Based upon theoretical assumptions and empirical studies, it was assumed that these students would benefit from an instructional approach that incorporated these developmental concepts into the
instructional content of the course. Finally, it was assumed that a focus on the personal skills associated with the vectors also would become content foci for the instructional design.

Hence, three instructional approaches were used: one to focus on and foster development of specific psychosocial vectors, one on personal skills associated with these vectors, and one on Kohlberg’s processes for discussing moral dilemmas.

The Curriculum

The Content

The course was interdisciplinary, using three basic areas: psychology; literature; and language and composition (see Appendix D, "Distribution of Credit for Freshman Colloquia") to illustrate the theme of transition from late adolescence to young adulthood. The psychology content was drawn from Corey’s developmental psychology text, I Never Knew I Had a Choice, and supplemented by Gardner and Jewler’s freshman year experience text, College is Only the Beginning and used literary articles and excerpts from novels (see Appendix E), which cover the psychosocial vectors of Chickering as young adults ‘come of age.’ The psychosocial theory of Chickering and the vector-specific skill scales of Nelson and Low were employed to select literature and to structure the course, with each unit’s readings being directed
toward the amplification of the skill(s) and corresponding vector(s) that are featured in that unit's topic.

The areas of psychology and literature were selected in the belief that traditional age college freshman would be preoccupied with issues of competence, managing emotions, autonomy, and identity and would be interested in gaining knowledge and insight in these areas. Using characters in literature who are engaged in similar tasks was thought to be a non-threatening way in which to help students recognize developmental tasks and work on their own development. The additional emphasis on "survival skills" acknowledged the importance of Chickering's first vector of Developing Competence for success in college and sought to provide freshmen with transitional skills that they would need immediately upon entering college. The emphasis on language and composition reflects an institution-wide expectation that all freshmen colloquia, regardless of overall course content, will provide a component that includes 4 writing assignments and 2 oral presentations.

Following is an outline of the course content.

Unit I. Introduction to Chickering's theory of 7 Developmental Vectors

Skill scales/vectors: all 7 vectors of Chickering's theory; administration of PSM

Psychological content: Corey, Chapter 2: "Reviewing Your Childhood and Adolescence;" Chapter 3: "Adulthood and Autonomy"
Unit II. Transition from high school to college

Skills scales/vectors: interpersonal comfort (1st vector, Developing Competence)

Skill content: Gardner and Jewler, Chapter 1: "Making the Transition;" Chapter 3: "Decoding Your Professors"

Literary content: Trilling, "Of This Time, Of That Place"

Unit III. Social Perspective-Taking

Skill scales/vectors: empathy (1st vector, Social Interpersonal Competence)

Literary content: King, "Letter From Birmingham Jail"

Video: A Day to Remember

Unit IV. Survival Skills

Skill scales/vectors: time management (1st vector, Developing Intellectual Competence)

Skill Content: Gardner and Jewler, Chapter 5: "Study Skills: Planning and Preparing"

Unit V. Communication Style

Skill scales/vectors: interpersonal comfort, aggression, deference, and assertion (1st vector, Social Interpersonal Competence; lack of 1st vector, inadequate Social Interpersonal Competence; lack of 2nd vector, inadequate Managing Emotions)

Skill content: Gardner and Jewler, Chapter 12: "Standing Up For Yourself Without Stepping on Others"

Literary content: Muro, "Cecilia Rosas"

Unit VI. Human Sexuality

Skill scales/vectors: interpersonal comfort (1st vector, Social Interpersonal Competence)
Psychological content: Corey, Chapter 18: "Intimate Relationships"

Literary content: Keegan, "Dangerous Parties"

Unit VII. Stress and Anxiety

Skill scales/vectors: stress management (2nd vector, Managing Emotions; 4th vector, Establishing Identity)

Psychological content: Corey, Chapter 4: "Your Body and Stress"

Skill content: Gardner and Jewler: Chapter 13: "Anxiety Management"

Literary content: Oates, "In the Region of Ice"

Unit VIII. Wellness and Substance Abuse

Skill scales/vectors: personal wellness (1st vector, Physical Competence)

Psychological content: Same as Unit VII

Skill content: Gardner and Jewler, Chapter 14: "Developing a Healthy Lifestyle"

Literary content: Cunningham, "White Angel"

Unit IX. Decision-Making

Skill scales/vectors: decision-making (3rd vector, Developing Autonomy; 4th vector, Establishing Identity)

Psychological content: Corey, Chapter 10: "Work"

Skill content: Gardner and Jewler, Chapter 7: "Choosing a Major"

Literary content: Styron, "Chapter One" (from Sophie's Choice)
Unit X. Empathy and Social Perspective-Taking

Skill/scales/vectors: empathy (1st vector, Social Interpersonal Competence)

Psychological content: Corey, Chapter 5: "Sex Roles"

Skill content: Gardner and Jewler, Chapter 19: "The Minority Student on Campus;" Chapter 20: "The Disabled Student on Campus"

Literary content: Mead, "College: DePauw"

Video: Children of a Lesser God

Unit XI. Making Commitments

Skill scales/vectors: commitment ethic (3rd vector, Developing Autonomy; 4th vector, Establishing Identity; 6th vector; Clarifying Purpose)

Psychological content: Corey, Chapter 6: "Sexuality;" Chapter 7: "Love"

Skill content: Gardner and Jewler, Chapter 11: "Establishing Rewarding Human Relationships in College"

Literary content: Naylor, "December 21st" (from Linden Hills)

Unit XII. Developing Leadership Skills

Skill scales/vectors: sales orientation, drive strength (3rd vector, Developing Autonomy; 4th vector, Establishing Identity)

Skill content: Gardner and Jewler, Chapter 17: "On Becoming a Leader"

Literary content: Golding, "Castle Rock" (from Lord of the Flies)

Video: Lord of the Flies
Unit XIII. Forming an Adult Identity

Skill scales/vectors: self-esteem (1st vector, Developing Competence; 2nd vector, Managing Emotions; 4th vector; Establishing Identity)

Psychological content: Corey, Chapter 12: "Meaning and Values: Putting Life in Perspective"

Skill content: Gardner and Jewler, Chapter 10: "How to Integrate Your Living/Learning Environments"

Literary content: Knowles, "Phineas"

Video: A Separate Peace

General Objectives and Instructional Rationale

The course was designed to assist the student in meeting the following objectives:

(1) to promote self-awareness and develop values clarification skills

(2) to develop skills in interpersonal communication

(3) to promote a sense of empathy and understanding of others

(4) to develop a sense of comfort and acceptance in the transition to college life

(5) to encourage involvement with all dimensions of the college experience

(6) to develop "coping skills" so as to facilitate the adjustment to college

Given the nature of this course--i.e., a first-term, freshman colloquium in which the instructor is expected to serve as students' initial mentor and given what is generally known about traditional age college freshmen (their psychosocial resolution of
developmental vectors culminating in a new sense of adult identity; and their tendency to reason morally at a Kohlberg Stage 3 level), this design sought to incorporate developmental concepts of challenge and support as defined by each theory. For Kohlberg, challenge occurs as a result of moral dilemmas being posited and discussed in each unit--e.g., "If Dr. King were alive today, would he be pleased by the state of racial relations he would observe?"

Again, cognitive challenge was introduced through a variety of learning activities, ranging from a semi-formal dinner in the facilitator’s home to a "high ropes" adventure to participants undergoing a wellness assessment. Again, the facilitator sought to present a variety of viewpoints in classroom discussions and used role plays in class--e.g., having a male student ask a member of the opposite sex for a date and then reversing roles, with the woman asking the man. Support was provided by the highly personal atmosphere of the class; in fact, the actual class met in a very informal seminar room in a colonial building. The syllabus was very structured, with assignments, due dates, grade point system, and thematic introductory material included (see Syllabus, Appendix E). Participants were required to keep response journals and to reflect on both the readings and discussions of the class. Class participation was informal and exchanges between and among students encouraged. Specific skills were taught, whenever possible, in an experiential way. For example, the skill of "interpersonal comfort" was intentionally the first skill taught and
focused on the here-and-now task of students making the transition from high school to college. "Time management" was taught prior to midterms, with upperclass students giving first-person accounts to the freshman participants of their own experiences coping as freshmen and making adjustments to accommodate the demands of college. Realistic in-context situations were role played: a student challenging a grade from a professor, and two students confronting each other in an imagined roommate conflict. In another instance, when discussing "stress management" students were given a self-assessment questionnaire before the guest lecturer discussed stress and ways to reduce stress.

While specific skills were focused upon each week, they were taught in the context of their relevant vectors; thus, "time management" was first introduced as a skill--as Nelson and Low define it, "How effective you are in organizing and using time to accomplish personal goals" (1979)--and then related to its appropriate vector, the 1st vector of Developing Intellectual Competence. The skill was taught as being a component of the larger vector of development.

Instructional Staff

The instructional staff consisted of one administrator, the dean of students, who is also a graduate student in a Ph.D program in student affairs. In addition to a number of administrative positions, the instructor has taught at both the high school and college level in the areas of literature, language and
composition. The instructor's undergraduate and master's degrees are in English literature. The instructor has a knowledge of college freshmen and has taught "college adjustment" courses at previous institutions.

The instructor taught two sections of freshman colloquia in 1988-89 and one section in 1989-90. Due to the freedom that all colloquia instructors are accorded in choosing their course content, it is difficult to make meaningful comparisons with other colloquia, although comparison group data was collected for both years.

Chronology of Research

In May of 1988 and 1989 designated colloquia instructors were asked to submit one-page descriptions of their proposed colloquia for Fall Quarter, 1988, and Fall Quarter, 1989 respectively (see Appendix D, "Young Adulthood: The College Experience"). There were 22 of these colloquia in 1988-89 and 21 in 1989-90, the descriptions of which were included in a booklet sent to all incoming freshmen for Fall 1988 and Fall 1989 (see Appendix D). From these booklets of 22 and 21 colloquia descriptions, each freshman was asked to rank order his/her top four preferences; thus, there was a self-selection factor for all freshmen, particularly since most students received their first or second choice (see Appendix D, "Colloquium Selection Sheet"). The colloquia for 1988-89 were limited to a maximum enrollment of 14; the two colloquia comprising the experimental group were finalized at
enrollments of 13 (for #20) and 14 (for #21), for a total of 27 participants, or nearly 9% of the freshman class, while the 1989-90 colloquium was intentionally permitted to swell to 19, with 17 students giving permission to be included in the research, or nearly 7% of the freshman class. The comparison group was obtained by drawing 40 names for 1988-89 and 35 names for 1989-90 from an alphabetized freshman roster, with all alphabetized names being assigned a number in sequence, last names beginning with the letter "A" being the lowest numbers (e.g., Abra=1; Allman=2 and so on), and the last letters of the alphabet being the highest numbers (e.g., Thoma=38 Wepner=39 and so on). A random table of numbers was used. In September of 1988 and 1989 respectively, Comparison Group students thus selected were contacted in writing (see Appendix C); those students completing the consent form at the bottom of the letter were then contacted by a second letter (see Appendix C) and asked to come to a question and answer session and to take the two pre test instruments—the PSM and the DIT; whereas, in 1989-90 only one letter with a consent form was sent, with positive respondents being asked to come to a question and answer session and to take the pre test instruments (see Appendix C).

Initial administration of the pre test instruments for the Experimental Groups occurred during the first week of classes. They, too, were informed in writing of the voluntary nature of their participation in the research project (see Appendix C).
Post tests for the PSM occurred somewhat differently for the two groups. Since the Experimental Groups had a scheduled final exam date for the Fall Quarter, they received their post tests of the PSM at that time, as well as completing a "Colloquium Evaluation." The Comparison Group had its post test of the PSM delivered by campus mail (it was assumed that the Comparison Group was "test wise" since they had taken the pre test of the same instrument); a follow-up letter was sent a week later, and then individuals failing to respond were called and asked to complete the instrument before the end of the Quarter (see Appendix C).

The post test of the DIT was delivered by campus mail to both Experimental and Comparison Groups for '88, '89 and was followed up by letters and then telephone calls (see Appendix C) about midway through the Winter Quarter (January 27, 1989); whereas, both Experimental and Comparison Groups for '89, '90 were given the post test of the DIT at the end of the Fall Quarter.

Similarly, the post test only of the CSEQ was delivered by campus mail to both experimental and Comparison Groups at the beginning of Spring Quarter (March, 1989) and at the end of Winter Quarter (March, 1990) in accordance with Pace's recommendation that the instrument be administered two-thirds to three-fourths of the way through the college year, and was followed up by letters, then telephone calls, and finally, by personal contact when possible and when appropriate (see Appendix C).
By the end of the data collection for 1988-89, the Comparison Group had been reduced to 27 participants, from an initial number of 40; while the Experimental Group had been reduced to 25--one student transferred at the end of Winter Quarter and one student withdrew for financial reasons midway through Spring Quarter. By the end of the data collection for 1989-90, the Comparison Group had been reduced to 14 participants, from an initial number of 35; while the Experimental Group had been reduced to 16, since one student transferred at the end of Fall Quarter. Thus, participants in the post test only of the CSEQ were reduced accordingly.

Methods of Data Analysis

A four-way analysis of variance will be run to assess the main effects of the instructional approach and developmental status, as well as the interaction effect on the dependent measures of academic achievement. Each of the four groups (Experimental 1988-89; Comparison 1988-89; Experimental 1989-90; Comparison 1989-90) will be examined separately for permutations and combinations, and then both Comparison Groups (1988-89 and 1989-90) will be combined, as will both Experimental Groups (1988-89 and 1989-90); thus, combined Comparison Group data will be compared to combined Experimental Group data.

The "involvement" variable will be assessed by a multivariate analysis of the 14 CSEQ scales and an analysis of covariance will be conducted. In addition, the 14 PSM scales will be assessed by
multivariate analysis and by an analysis of covariance. Analysis of variance will be used to analyze P scores on the DIT, and the relevant 2 "satisfaction" responses on the "Freshman Colloquium Evaluation." An ANOVA will also be used to analyze first-term g.p.a. Reliability coefficients will be conducted on the Pace (CSEQ) and Rest (DIT) instruments. Finally, male and female scores will be compared to determine if gender differences occur. Schematically, the proposed analysis will be as follows:
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter summarizes the results of the study. The frequencies and percentages of subjects by gender, race and experimental or comparison group are presented in Tables 1-5 (see Appendix F). The percentages of men and women were comparable as analyzed by chi square statistics; however, the frequency of minority students (race) was too small to analyze (i.e., 66% of all cells had expected counts of less than 5). The fact that the two comparison groups--C '88 and C '89-- had no minorities is not surprising in that Comparison Group subjects were randomly drawn and the College's minority enrollment is very small (a total of 29 students, 28 of whom are African American), in a student body of 924 students. The fact that the Experimental groups had a total of 5 African Americans and 1 Hispanic, a disproportionately high number of minorities given the College's total enrollment, is accounted for in that "at risk" students and late registering students were "steered" to the Experimental colloquia in both years.

With regard to gender differences, the overall participation rate for women, as opposed to men, is slightly higher than the College's demographic profile--62.2% to approximately 55% for the
College—but this may be accounted for by the fact that participation by the Comparison Group was voluntary and women tended to respond favorably more frequently than men. In the Experimental Group two African-American males declined to participate in the research for E '89; had they done so, the combined Experimental Groups would have had 22 females and 22 males. As it is the 22 females (52%) to 20 males is a slightly lower percentage of females than the College as a whole (56.44%). The Comparison Group's profile of 29 (72.5%) females to just 11 males reflects a greater percentage of women than the Experimental Groups or the College as a whole.

The means and standard deviations, where appropriate, for student pre and post test scores on the PSM, DIT, CSEQ, first-term g.p.a., high school class rank percentile, colloquia evaluations, and CSEQ "Opinions about College" items are included in Tables 6-9 for the four groups (E '88; C '88; E '89; C '89); and Tables 10 and 11 for the combined two groups (E '88 & E '89 and C '88 & C '89). These will be briefly described by instrument or measure.

Results by Instruments

Personal Skills Map (PSM)

Scores on the PSM can be described and then compared relative to norms developed on adults in this culture. Mean pre and post test scores for the four groups and two combined
Experimental and Comparison groups are presented in Tables 6-11. Generally for the combined 2-groups the means fall in the median range of the norm group, with only three means in the low, or "changes" area, and five means in the high, or "strengths" area. The areas of low scores were decision-making for the pre-test on E '88, '89 and pre and post tests for C '88, '89. The area of strengths was reduced aggression for the post test C '88, '89 only; and approached reduced aggression on the Experimental group post test. Stress management and physical fitness for the Comparison Group only, C '88, '89 and empathy for E '88, '89 on the post tests only moved towards "strengths." (see Figures 1 and 2 in Appendix H).

Defining Issues Test (DIT)

The mean and standard deviation results on the DIT for the 4-groups and 2 groups are presented in Tables 6-11 (See Appendix F). The 4-group analysis of the pre and post tests of the DIT showed pre and post test means of 32.40 and 36.09 for E '88; 37.00 and 41.27 for C '88; 35.14 and 41.37 for E '89; and 41.02 and 42.56 for C '89. The 2-group analysis showed pre and post test means of 33.51 and 38.23 for E '88, '89 and 38.31 and 41.69 for C '88, '89. The means and standard deviations for all women and all men in the study are presented in Tables 12 and 13 (see Appendix F). Women's pre test mean was more than 9 percentage points above men and both groups changed about 4 points.
Grade Point Average (g.p.a.)

Grade point average (g.p.a.) for the 4 groups indicated a first-term g.p.a. of 2.77 for E '88; 2.93 for C '88; 2.84 for E '89; and 3.11 for C '89. For the 2-group means, E '88, '89 had a 2.80 while C '88, '89 had a 2.99 g.p.a.

College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ)

Generally involvement on this campus was similar in pattern for both the E '88, E '89 and C '88, C '89 groups. When compared to Pace's norms for Liberal Arts II colleges (the category of liberal arts colleges in which Hiram is classified), both the Experimental and Comparison groups often scored differently than the norms. The patterns of similarity between the Hiram group and the national norms will be described, and the occasional areas of difference will be highlighted. The means and standard deviations for each sub-scale are in Tables 6-11 (see Appendix F).

Freshman Colloquia Evaluations (Items "D" and "E")

Two items from the "Freshman Colloquium Evaluation" are used by the institution to assess "satisfaction." These items are: I.D. "Independent of how much you liked the Colloquium, how much do you feel you learned?" and I.E. "In summary rate your satisfaction with the Colloquium as a whole." These two items are ranked on a 5-point scale, from a low rank of 1--"little"--to a high rank of 5--"much."
While the E '88 and C '88 groups did not have significant differences on either item (E mean of 4.16 versus C mean of 4.05 on item "D" and Experimental group mean of 4.08 versus Comparison group mean of 4.00 on item "E"); item "D" on the '89 evaluations did differ significantly, with the E '89 mean being 3.18, compared to the C '89 mean of 3.86, indicating that E '89 felt they had learned less in the Colloquia than the Comparison group. A 2-tailed t-test was run, showing significance at the .01 level. E '89 had a group mean of 3.76 on Item 1, E, compared to 3.88 for C '89, which was not significant.

College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ) "Opinions about College"

The CSEQ has three questions in its "Opinions about College" section, and two of them can be used to assess "satisfaction" as well. Question #1, "How well do you like college?" and Question #2, "If you could start over again, would you go to the same college you are now attending?" Pace suggests that these two questions and their weighted "degree of satisfaction" responses can be combined; thus, given a weighting of from 4 to 1 points per question, 4 being "I am enthusiastic" and "Yes, definitely" respectively; while 1 is "I don't like it" and "No, definitely" respectively. Three categories of satisfaction can thus be derived. A combined score of 7-8 points indicates "very satisfied," 6 points
indicates "satisfied" and 5 points or less indicates "neutral to not satisfied."

Using this procedure, the combined Experimental groups were noticeably less satisfied, with 72.5% of the students being "satisfied" to "very satisfied," while the combined Comparison groups were generally more satisfied, with 86.1% expressing opinions of "satisfied" to "very satisfied" (see Table 14 in Appendix F).

Gender Differences (Men versus Women)
With regard to gender differences on the PSM, women began with higher deference (mean of 19.47 to 17.35) than men, but lowered their deference scores more (a decrease of -2.61 to -1.93 for men); thus, women came closer to the score of men by the end of the term--16.86 as opposed to 15.42 for men.

Concerning self-esteem, while men began slightly lower (57.19 to 58.88 for women), they were higher in post test measures, 65.03 as opposed to 64.65 for women, for an overall gain of 7.84 points versus 5.77 points for women.

As might be anticipated, women began higher in empathy--19.20 versus 16.58 for men; however, men gained 2.77 points (to 19.35) while women gained 1.17 points; thus, by the post test men were much closer to women--19.35 to 20.37.

In decision-making, men, while beginning nearly identical to women--11.58 to 11.20 respectively--gained 2.65 points to 1.45
points for women, moving out of the PS.M. "changes" area into the "median" area; whereas, the women's score was not high enough to move out of the "changes" area.

In time management men started out in the "changes" area (12.94) and gained 2.35 points to move out of the "changes" area and approach the scores of women. Women's gains were negligible on time management (0.19). Both pre and post test scores were in the "median" area for women.

In stress management men started slightly ahead within the "median" area--32.71 to 31.92 for women--but gained more as well--2.90 to 0.90 for women--and increased to 35.61 while women's gain was to 32.88.

With regard to the Principled Thinking, or P score, of the Defining Issues Test (DIT), men showed a slightly greater increase--4.34 to 3.90 for women--although men started considerably lower--30.14 to 39.32 for women. Finally, first-term g.p.a. for women was 0.20 higher--2.97 versus 2.77 for men.

Race Differences (Caucasian, African American, Hispanic)

Due to the small cell sizes for minority students (less than 5), meaningful generalizations relating to racial differences cannot be made.

Group Differences (Experimental versus Comparison Groups; 1988, 1989)

Concerning group differences on the PSM scales, the Experimental Group (both E '88 and E '89; n=42) reduced its
deference score by -3.07; whereas, the Comparison Group (both C '88 and C '89; n=40) reduced its deference score by -1.60. The Experimental Group reduced its score to 14.88, compared to the Comparison Group's reduction to 17.83. With regard to empathy, the Experimental Group began at 17.81, lower than the 18.63 of the Comparison Group, but improved by 2.57 points (as opposed to 0.95 points for the Comparison Group); thus, it finished at a higher post test score—20.38 compared to 19.58 for the Comparison Group. Interpersonal comfort represented a higher starting point for E '88, '89—14.64 versus 13.93 for C '88, '89; even so, E '88, '89 improved more—3.62 points versus 2.22 points for C '88, '89—to end at 18.26 versus 16.15. In decision-making both groups began in the norm group "changes" area of the PSM (11.52 for E '88, '89; 11.15 for C '88, '89); but E '88, '89 improved to 13.86, placing it in the "median" area, while C '88, '89 experienced less growth—1.45 to E's 2.34—keeping it within the "changes" area. Interestingly, in both stress management and physical fitness, the Comparison Groups both started higher and improved more—32.00 to 34.73 (2.73 points) for C '88 and 26.80 to 28.43 (1.63 points) for C '89 respectively, compared to the Experimental Groups—31.26 to 31.98 (0.72) for E '88 and 26.71 to 26.83 (0.12 points) for E '89. Finally, in commitment ethic, E '88, '89 started lower—17.33 to 18.73 for C '88, '89—but increased enough (1.48 to -0.08 for C '88, '89) to end ahead of the Comparison Group—18.81 to 18.65.
On the Defining Issues Test (DIT), the Experimental Group improved more in principled moral reasoning--4.72 points to 3.38 for the Comparison Group, but began at a lower pre test score--33.51 as opposed to 38.31 for the Comparison Group.

Results by Hypotheses
The research hypotheses and end results are as follows:
HY 1: There will be significant differences in the psychosocial skills of students enrolled in the deliberately designed colloquia, compared to students enrolled in the other freshman colloquia on pre test, post test and within group changes.

A 1-between, 1-within MANOVA treatment was used, with the between-groups being the Experimental and Comparison groups (E '88, C '88, E '89, C '89 and combined E '88, '89 and C '88, '89); and the within-group measure being the time elapsed between pre and post tests for the groups. The dependent variables are the 14 PSM skill scales. (See Tables 15, 16 in Appendix G).

Group and time effect prove not to be significant $F(14, 67) = 1.57, p<0.1107$. Also, the group effect by itself is not significant $F(14,67)=1.88, p<0.1187$. The time effect is significant, indicating significant change perhaps due to the intervention, a test-wise factor, or both.

With respect to the MANOVA interaction group effect, no overall interaction effect was found. (Wilk's criterion $F(14.67)=1.57, p<F=0.1107$) There is, therefore, no need to go to
the overall main effect, in fact, the overall main effect was found not to be significant. (Wilk's criterion $F_{(14, 67)} = 1.85, p<0.1187$).

In order to examine the question of whether the deliberately designed instructional method had an impact upon specific skill scales--e.g., empathy with the curriculum's emphasis on perspective-taking--a univariate analysis was conducted to examine both the interactive and the main effect on the 14 PSM skill scales. In examining the univariate interaction effect, the skill scale of empathy was found to be close to significant ($p<F=0.061$); while commitment ethic was significant ($p<F=0.031$). No other individual skill scales approached significance ($<.05$).

Concerning the univariate main effect, the skill scales of sales orientation, which is essentially a leadership skill, ($p<F=0.040$); and time management ($p<F=0.034$) were both significant; while several other skill scales were significant at ($<.10$): assertion ($p<F=0.096$); aggression ($p<F=0.099$); and interpersonal comfort ($p<F=0.081$); while the skill scale of deference ($p<F=0.104$) was just over $.10$.

**Other Findings**

Concerning gender differences, while women and men lowered their aggression scores by nearly the same margin (-2.13 for women; -2.03 for men), because women began with lower aggression, they were able to move from the "median" area to the "strengths" area (6.20 to 7.26 for men) by post test; whereas, men
lowered their aggression, but remained in the "median" area. In self-esteem men began with slightly lower scores (57.19 to 58.88 for women) but increased more (7.84 to 5.77) to move ahead of women by post test, with mean scores of (65.03 to 64.65 for women)--both means falling within the "median" area of the PSM norms. Similarly, in empathy, men began with lower pre test scores (16.58 to 19.20 for women) but gained more by post test (2.77 to 1.17 for women) to come much closer to women (19.35 to 20.37 for women). In decision-making men gained more by post test (2.65 to 1.45 for women), enabling them to move out of the "changes" area into the "median" area, while women remained within the "changes" area. Again, men were able to increase enough in time management (2.35 to 0.96 for women) to move from the "changes" area to the "median" area while women, who began in the "median" area, remained there with little appreciable gain. Finally, men were able to improve their stress management scores more than women (2.90 to 0.96); thus, they began higher (32.71 to 30.96 for women), gained more, and ended higher (35.61 to 31.92 for women). (See Figures 3 & 4 in Appendix H).

The means and standard deviations for all subjects reported by gender are in Tables 12 and 13 (see Appendix F). Such differences do suggest a possible gender effect. Consequently, a 1-between, 1-within MANOVA design was run and determined that a gender effect is significant with respect to the overall effect of the 14 PSM skill scales, while there is no interactive effect. A summary
of the MANOVA design on post test PSM scores by gender is included in Table 15 in Appendix G).

HY 2: There will be significantly higher grade point averages (g.p.a.) during the first term of the freshman year for students enrolled in the deliberately designed colloquia, compared to students enrolled in the other freshmen colloquia.

A combined 2-group only design was used, with subjects’ SAT scores and class rank percentile used as pre test measures, and the subjects’ first-term grade point average (g.p.a.) used as the post test measure. SAT scores were used because, while both SAT and ACT scores are accepted by the College in this study, more students submit SAT scores. Additionally, the College admissions office has historically used a factor of 44 to convert ACT scores to SAT scores. It was decided, then, to use SATs as the standard score indicator for the pre test. In fact, the derived Comparison Group SAT mean (C '88, '89), which group was randomly drawn, of 1067.44 compares favorably with the College’s all-campus mean of 1070.

A linear regression to assess g.p.a. (treated as the dependent variable) using class rank percentile, mean SAT and group (Comparison and Experimental) as predictor variables, was run. Results are shown in Table 17. According to Table 17, the model is significant, with F (3,71) =7.716, p<.0002. The R2 is equal to 24.5%, meaning that the three predictor variables explain about
25% of the g.p.a. variance. According to the t-tests of the parameter estimate, only the co-efficient of the SAT variable is significantly different from 0.0, with t=3.857, p<.0003 (see Table 18 in Appendix G). As a result, both group and class rank does not help in predicting g.p.a. In relation to HY 2, knowing whether the subject is in E '88, '89 or C '88, ’89 does not help in predicting the first-term g.p.a. In the above regression analysis diagnostic measures have been taken to determine if there are outliers in the data. No such outliers have been detected as a result. The regression equation based on the sample can be simplified as GPA = 1.5752 + 0.0014xSAT.

In terms of post test results, the difference in first-term g.p.a. is not significant (2.7706 for the Experimental Group; 2.9995 for the Comparison Group); however, the noticeable difference in SAT mean scores (948.05 for E and 1067.44 for C) will be discussed in Chapter V, given the significance of the SAT variable that was found in the linear regression analysis.

HY 3: There will be significantly greater change in P scores, reflective of moral reasoning, for students enrolled in the deliberately designed colloquia, compared to students enrolled in the other freshman colloquia at pre test, post test and within group changes.

Similar to HY 1, a 1-Between, 1-Within ANOVA was set up to assess the post test P score of the DIT. (See Table 19 in Appendix G). As before, the group variable served as the between
variable and the time variable (referring to the pre and post condition) serves as the within variable. However, in this study the approach is univariate, rather than multivariate.

The group-time interaction turns out not to be significant, with $F(1,80) = 0.37$, $p < .5459$ (see Table 21 in Appendix G). Also, the group effect by itself is not significant, so it cannot be stated that the greater change in P scores occurred for the Experimental Group as a result of the planned intervention. The time effect is, again, significant, indicating that students do gain in their use of principled reasoning over the time period of the first term in both groups.

Other Findings

No interaction effect was found; however, since the literature indicates a possible gender bias against women in using Kohlberg's stages of moral justice (Gilligan, 1980), sex differences were examined, even though the sample size is small ($N=82$). Whereas, women may score lower than men due to gender bias in the theory and/or its measures, this was not the case in this study. Instead, women began considerably higher (39.32 to 30.14 for men) and increased by nearly the same margin by post test (3.90 to 4.34); thus, women ended higher as well (43.22 to 34.48 for men). This finding also will be discussed further in Chapter V.

HY 4: There will be greater involvement in the college environment (as measured by Pace's CSEQ), for
students enrolled in the deliberately designed
colloquia, compared to students enrolled in the other
freshman colloquia.

The overall effect of the 14 CSEQ scales indicates that there
was not a significant difference for the students in the Experimental
Group in terms of involvement. (df. 14, $F=1.26; p<0.25$) with
significance at <.05.

The Experimental Group scored noticeably higher than the
Comparison Group in five of the 14 scales: experiences with faculty
(20.5 to 18.8), library usage (21.9 to 20.5) personal experiences
(24.3 to 23.4), topics in conversation (29.1 to 28.1), and clubs and
organizations (21.0 to 19.4); however, the Comparison group also
scored higher in five of the fourteen scales: writing (26.5 to 25.0),
art, music and theater (21.6 to 20.1), dormitory living (27.0 to 26.0),
course learning (29.0 to 28.2), and science/technology (23.4 to
22.7). (see Table 15 in Appendix F). The remaining four scales
had variances of 0.3 or less. While Pace notes that differences of
>1 on the "quality of effort" scales are significant, with differences
of >3 being highly significant, he is speaking in terms of his own
normative studies, which have a very large "N." Thus, the
differences between Experimental and Comparison groups are
probably not large enough to be significant, given the limited
nature of this study. What may, therefore, be of more interest is
how the two groups scored when compared to the Liberal Arts II
norms that Pace has established.
Both the Experimental and Comparison groups scored above the Liberal Arts II norms in science (E '88, '89--22.7; C '88, '89--23.4) >1 and >2 points respectively above the Liberal Arts II norm of 21.4. Likewise, both groups scored higher in student union usage (E '88, '89--23.7; C '88, '89--23.7) >1 above the Liberal Arts II norm of 22.6. Topics in conversation means (E '88, '89--29.1; C '88, '89--28.1) were >3 and >2 points respectively above the 25.4 norm for Liberal Arts II colleges, and athletics means (E '88, '89--22.9; C '88, '89--22.2) were >4 and >3 points respectively above the 18.8 norm for Liberal Arts II colleges. Finally, both groups scored higher in personal experiences (E '88, '89--24.3; C '88, '89--23.4), making them >1 and +0.8 respectively above the Liberal Arts II norm of 22.6.

When the Experimental and Comparison Groups were compared separately to the LA II norms, the Experimental Group scored >1 above the LA II norms on four scales (library usage, student union usage, personal experiences, and science/technology), and >3 on two scales (athletics/recreation and topics in conversation), while scoring 1 lower on only two scales (faculty and course learning). The Comparison Group scored 1 or >1 higher than the LA II norms on six scales (student union usage; art, music and theater; writing; science/technology; dormitory usage; and topics in conversation) and >3 on one scale (athletics/recreation), while scoring >1 lower on two scales (faculty and clubs and organizations).
HY 5: There will be a higher degree of satisfaction with their
colloquia experience for students enrolled in the
deliberately designed colloquia, compared to students
enrolled in the other freshman colloquia.

On the basis of Freshman Colloquia Evaluations—items "D"
and "E"—there were no significant differences between E ’88 and all
freshmen; however, in comparing E ’89 and C ’89, item "D"
("Independent of how much you liked the Colloquium, how much
do you feel you learned?"); all freshmen indicated a higher degree
of satisfaction (3.86) than did E ’89 (3.18). In doing a 2-tailed t-test,
a critical value of + 2.576 (with significance at .01) and degrees of
freedom = 17 + 266 -2 were found. Item "E" was not found to be
significant at the .05 level for E ’89.

In examining the three "Opinions About College" items of the
CSEQ, item #1, "How well do you like college?" was found, in
doing a 2-tailed t-test, not to be significant (T1 = 1.749), (critical
value at <.05 = 1.99; critical value at 0.01 = 2.370). Item #2,
however, "Would you go again to the same college?" did yield a
significant difference (C ’88, ’89 mean of 3.40 versus E ’89, ’89
mean of 2.88). Again a 2-tailed t-test was run, with T1 = 4.421;
critical value of <.05 = 1.99; critical value of <0.01 = 2.64; critical
value of 0.001 = 3.40. Item #3, "Do you agree that students have to
take the initiative?" was found not to be significant (T1 = 1.91; critical
value of .05 = 1.99).
In sum, HY 5 was not sustained; in fact, the Comparison Group expressed a greater degree of satisfaction on two of the five items, while the other three items did not differ significantly.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

This chapter presents the results and implications of the study. Those findings that proved significant are presented, along with the conclusions that have been drawn. Those hypotheses which were posed, but did not prove statistically significant, are discussed, as well as the limitations of the study. Some implications for student affairs that may suggest areas of further research are also presented.

The Study

Widick has noted the need to focus on instructional improvement, both by finding theory that is conceptually "adequate," and by linking such theory through the use of change concepts that relate to achievement tasks and instruction. In order to operationalize this recommendation, the study has sought to draw from the domains of both cognitive-structural and psychosocial theory--notably Kohlberg’s cognitive-structural "moral philosophy" constructs and Chickering’s "vectors" of development. This "more adequate" theory and the change concepts that attend it--e.g., the concept of "cognitive conflict" that facilitates cognitive
development and the "epigenetic principle" believed to trigger psychosocial change--were linked to a deliberately designed instructional intervention. This intervention sought to incorporate psychosocial skill development; specifically, the 14 personal skills scales measured by Nelson and Low's Personal Skills Map, by using these skill scales as content for the instructional intervention. These 14 skill scales are seen as encompassing the first three vectors, or developmental tasks, postulated by Chickering: (1) developing competence, (2) managing emotions, and (3) developing autonomy. These tasks are considered to be where traditional college-aged students are in terms of their psychosocial development. Thus, by facilitating skill development in these age-appropriate tasks, the design sought to use the "epigenetic principle" as a means of inducing change. Additionally, by intentionally positing moral dilemmas and challenging students' current ways of thinking, the deliberately designed intervention sought to create "cognitive conflict" so that students would be challenged to think at a higher level of moral development than their present states. In this way the study sought to implement the elements of the ATI model that Widick suggests as a model for linking "adequate" theory to instructional tasks.

This study was conducted with three sections of a freshman seminar, the Hiram Colloquium, over a two-year period. The intent of the study was to determine whether such an intentional psychosocial instructional intervention could produce statistically
significant gains in psychosocial skill development, moral
t judgment, academic performance, "involvement," and the
expressed degree of satisfaction with both college and the
deliberately designed colloquia. These achievement tasks were
formulated into the following research hypotheses:

HY 1: There will be significant differences in the psychosocial
skills of students enrolled in the deliberately designed
colloquia, compared to students enrolled in the other
freshmen colloquia.

HY 2: There will be significantly higher grade point averages
(g.p.a.) during the first term of the freshman year for
students enrolled in the deliberately designed colloquia,
compared to students enrolled in the other freshmen
colloquia.

HY 3: There will be significantly greater change in P scores,
reflective of moral reasoning, for students enrolled in
the deliberately designed colloquia, compared to
students enrolled in the other freshmen colloquia.

HY 4: There will be greater involvement (as measured by
Pace's CSEQ), for students enrolled in the deliberately
designed colloquia, compared to students enrolled in
the other freshmen colloquia.

HY 5: There will be a higher degree of satisfaction for students
enrolled in the deliberately designed colloquia,
compared to students enrolled in the other freshmen colloquia.

Discussion of the Results

Although only one PSM skill scale proved significant, and a second skill scale was close to significance (> .06) for E '88, '89, more to the point is the fact that all subjects--both E '88, '89 and C '88, '89--improved on the PSM overall, indicating that the Colloquia, with their small size and close interaction with faculty mentors, may create a potent environment for psychosocial development. More importantly, the fact that so many "at risk" students and the overall Experimental Group (median class rank percentile 10% below Comparison Group; median SAT 119 points below Comparison Group), were able to achieve a first-term g.p.a. of 2.80 (compared to 2.99 for the Comparison Group) which was not significantly lower than the Comparison Group, would seem to indicate that the "compensatory effect," first observed by researchers at the University of South Carolina "University 101" course, may have occurred as a result of the deliberately designed colloquia. It should be noted that the University of South Carolina’s "compensatory effect" was achieved by creating a voluntary intervention for the experimental group, as opposed to no intervention for the comparison group; whereas, in this study the Comparison Group was comprised of students in similar colloquia. The difference was the deliberate design of the intervention--all
colloquia (both Experimental and Comparison) were "like" in that:
(1) the majority of students self-selected their colloquia; (2) all are of similar size (ranging from 11 to 19 students, with the largest colloquium being one of the Experimental colloquia--19 students for E '89); (3) the colloquia used senior faculty mentors for the most part; and (4) all colloquia had the same basic curricular opportunities and constraints--e.g., 4 written paper assignments, 2 oral presentations, and various required workshops, such as word processing on the College's VAX computer. Unlike the South Carolina model, there were no freshmen who were not in any intervention. What this study suggests, then, is that a deliberately designed intervention in the context of a liberal arts seminar may have particular value for "at risk" or lower-than-average entering college students--both in terms of such students' psychosocial adjustment to college and their level of academic achievement during their initial term at college.

With regard to moral development, significant growth occurred for both groups. What may be of both theoretical and institutional interest is that women began and ended with significantly higher P scores than men. Given the fact that these findings do not support Gilligan's critique of Kohlberg's moral development scheme and/or its measurement, it may be important to understand why males at this institution are entering with significantly lower P scores (2nd quartile versus 3rd quartile for women). There may be a need for more intentional programming
for males regarding issues of moral development and perspective taking.

Quality of effort did not prove markedly different for the Experimental and Comparison groups; however, when both groups were compared to national norms for Liberal Arts II category colleges, both Experimental and Comparison group students were observed to have scored significantly higher in science and student union usage, and even higher in topics in conversation and athletics. This may in part be explained by the peculiar aspects of the College at which this study took place. For example, Hiram College is ranked among the top 33 biological science programs in the country, according to the College's admissions publications. Biology is very prominent in the curriculum and most students would agree that it is the strongest department in the College. Again, all students are required to take at least one laboratory science course as part of their general education requirement. Similarly, Hiram is unusual in that it is more isolated than most other, comparable liberal arts colleges. It is situated in a village of 500 people and is three miles away from the nearest grocery store, gasoline station, theater, or shopping area. Thus the Kennedy Center, the College's student center, is perhaps more important than it might be on a campus situated nearer an urban area. Meeting rooms, a snack bar, bookstore, large screen television, 24-hour computer center, information center, public restaurant, and virtually all significant club and organization rooms are housed in
this building. Also, virtually all dances and entertainment are held in the Kennedy Center. It is not surprising, therefore, that student usage of this facility is greater than at other LA II colleges. That students in the study conversed more often about various topics is, again, very possibly attributable to the nature of the College, specifically, to its housing. Well over 90% of the College's students live on campus and the campus itself is quite compact. Students are permitted to "homestead" in the same room or on the same floor year by year and, indeed, many students live in the same room or on the same floor for three or all four years of college. In fact, Hiram seems to retain much of the spirit of "the collegiate way," with the College's emphasis on residential living, its rural, undisturbed setting, its dormitories, its two, communal dining halls and the paternalistic mentoring that characterize not only the colloquia, but the curriculum in general. The effect is to create a sense of place that goes far beyond what one might expect on most college campuses.

Finally, that the students in this study should well exceed other LA II colleges in their rate of athletic participation may be understandable as well. Hiram's athletic department boasts that 45% of all students participate in intercollegiate athletics, and that may well be the case. Thus, there are seventeen men's and women's intercollegiate sports, as well as club sports in rugby, and women's soccer. There is also a very active intramural sports program.
The effect of all this may be to help the College feel better about itself. The College has been in prolonged financial doldrums and has not had a robust self concept. It may be beneficial for the College to develop a more informed sense of its position with regard to other, similar institutions and, in so doing, it may come to a stronger sense of self affirmation.

To summarize, the general college environment promotes a high degree of involvement as measured by "quality of effort" scales of the CSEQ, and the deliberately designed colloquia added no measurable increase in this area.

The "degree of satisfaction" indices, both on the "Freshman Colloquium Evaluation" and the CSEQ "Opinions about College" section, generally indicate high rates of satisfaction for both groups. The Experimental Group’s significantly lower score on degree of satisfaction with its colloquium may reflect the fact that many of the participants were late in registering or were steered to the colloquium because they were perceived to be "at risk."

Examples of this would be the E '89 colloquium, which was not initially offered and only became available after a senior faculty member left the college, thereby creating the need for a "filler" colloquium. Obviously this colloquium was available only to late registering students; indeed, several were actually assigned to the colloquium, thus eliminating the "self selection" factor that is at the heart of the colloquium model at Hiram (see Table 14 in Appendix F). Given these constraints, it may be more remarkable that the
colloquium was rated more than minimally "satisfactory" by its participants (3.18 of a possible 5.00).

The fact that Experimental group students did not express as high a degree of satisfaction with their Hiram college experience may be reflective of the fact that late-deciding students are often less resolved about their college choice.

Discussion of the Hypotheses

HY 1 did not prove significant in that there was no overall group difference between the Experimental and the Comparison groups. As Figure 1 indicates, both groups improved in their psychosocial skills, as measured by the PSM. As noted previously, the mentoring and interaction model that is reflected in the colloquia is apparently powerful and can be expected to lead to psychosocial skill development. In fact, Johnson (1989), in reviewing the benefits of mentoring, cites Browning’s (1973) qualities of a healthy mentoring relationship (p. 120). These qualities include basic trust, the capacity for autonomy and initiative, and a sense of purpose. If one recalls Chickering’s vectors of psychosocial development, specific vectors involving achieving competence (1st vector); becoming autonomous (3rd vector); and clarifying purposes (6th vector) accord nicely with Browning’s criteria. The potency of the colloquium model in a small, personalized, residential liberal arts college also needs to be acknowledged. For example, both groups achieved a reduced, or
"strengthened" score in deference, both groups improved in assertion and interpersonal comfort, and both improved in decision-making. The fact that gains occurred on individual skill scales for the Experimental Group as well suggests that certain aspects of the colloquium model might be expanded or improved so as to yield gains in these skill scales. For example, since Experimental Group subjects improved noticeably on the skill scales of commitment ethic and empathy, colloquia faculty might want to examine the syllabus developed for the Experimental Colloquium. These two scales are defined as follows:

commitment ethic--How skillful you see yourself to be in completing projects and job assignments in a dependable manner, even under difficult circumstances.

empathy--How accurately you think you understand another person's thoughts, feelings, and behaviors and how able you are to accept them.

The significant growth in commitment ethic (P > .03) may be a cumulative effect of the deliberately designed colloquium's emphasis on personal growth and development. Again, the Experimental Colloquium's emphasis on the transition to college--e.g., the use of the College is Only the Beginning text; selected readings, such as Trilling's short story "Of This Time, Of That Place;" and the highly structured nature of the colloquium "Syllabus" (Perry, 1970; Widick, Knefelkamp, and Parker, 1975)
may have helped students to perceive themselves as coping and completing assignments successfully.

That empathy came close to statistical significance (P > .06) is also understandable in that the course was designed to stress empathy, particularly to facilitate growth in moral judgment, as measured by the DIT. The units on social perspective-taking, with the emphasis on racial understanding in Unit III and again in Unit X that focused on sex roles, individuals with disabilities, and discrimination, accounted for one-fifth of the term's syllabus. Additionally, each week moral dilemmas were intentionally posited; either in the Readings selection or in the presentational materials--e.g., the video, *A Day to Remember*, about Martin Luther King; coupled with "Letter From Birmingham Jail;" Oates' short story about a nun's dilemma in dealing with a troubled student in "In the Region of Ice;" Sophie's dilemma in choosing which one of her children was to live in *Sophie's Choice*; Margaret Mead's autobiographical account of being discriminated against during sorority rush in "College: DePauw," the difficult world of the hearing impaired dramatized in the video, *Children of a Lesser God*; the dilemma of leadership posed in "Castle Rock" from *Lord of the Flies*, etc.

With regard to HY 2, while the Experimental group did not achieve a significantly higher first-term g.p.a. as hypothesized, the fact that a noticeably lower-ability group of students were able to achieve comparable academic gains in the first-term may have
implications for designing other freshman seminar courses to help lower-than-average and "at risk" students compensate for their differential academic preparation—as indicated by entering class rank percentile and standardized test scores. What may be more to the point is not the fact Experimental group subjects did not achieve higher first-term g.p.a.’s, but that they did not score lower. Given the increasingly diverse nature of college students and the need for small liberal arts colleges to diversify their student populations more, a psychosocial intervention such as the one studied in this research may have potential value to colleges for assisting such students in compensating for deficiencies in their academic preparation.

Since significant change occurred for both groups regarding HY 3, the hypothesis was not sustained but may have value for the institution in terms of the gender differences that were observed. This information may be of value in alerting the institution to the fact that males were observed to have significantly lower levels of moral judgment than females. How this phenomenon "plays out" may be reflected in the fact that there is a noticeable incidence of anti-social behavior by males reported in campus judicial write-ups. For example, there have been a high number of sexual assaults for a small college, a high number of verbally and physically aggressive behavioral incidents; and a tendency for such problematic behaviors to become "embedded"—e.g., after the freshman year, male students seem less able to perceive or understand "higher"
levels of ethical conduct. The fact that males did gain slightly more on the post test measures of the DIT--4.34 to 3.90--is not particularly encouraging in light of the fact that they began and ended more than a standard deviation below women (SD = 7.5); pre test DIT mean of 30.14 for men, compared to 39.32 for women; and post test mean of 34.48 for men, compared to 43.22 for women. In terms of James Rest's recommended cut-off points on the P score index, it is interesting to note that men began, and stayed within the second quartile (range of 23 to 34), while women began and ended in the third quartile (range of 35 to 46).

The superior scores of women and the rate of difference from men (SD = 7.5) quite clearly do not support Carol Gilligan's stated concerns about the inherent bias of Kohlberg-based instruments. Specifically, Gilligan has cited the Freudian criticism of women's sense of justice, which is perceived as "compromised" in its refusal to be absolutely impartial, and which "reappears not only the work of Piaget but also in that of Kohlberg" (Gilligan, p. 18).

Interestingly, Whitely, in using the DIT score in his Sierra research, did find in one of the three years reported (1982) that women outperformed men (41.83 to 34.95 at pre test; 43.21 to 39.30 at post test), although there was not a full standard deviation's difference.

Greater involvement, (HY 4) did not occur for the Experimental Group over the Comparison Group; indeed, the two groups were very similar. In looking at individual "quality of effort" scales, the
Experimental Group scored higher on five of the 14 scales; similarly, the Comparison Group scored higher on five of the 14 scales. The remaining four scales differed by 0.3 or less. Again, given the small size of the sample (N = 82), Pace's generalizations about +1 differences being significant and +3 differences being highly significant may not apply (Pace, 1984, p. 65). As indicated, what may prove of value to the institution studied is the fact that both groups scored above Pace's well-established norms for Liberal Arts II colleges, the category of liberal arts colleges in which Hiram College is included. Both groups scored above Liberal Arts II norms in science, student union usage, topics in conversation, athletics, and personal experiences. In some ways, then, Hiram's toughest competition may be itself. When compared to national, standardized norms, the Experimental Group fared considerably better than when compared to the Comparison Group. In fact, when compared to national Liberal Arts II norms, the Experimental Group scored equal to the norms on one scale (Writing: 25.0); above norms on nine scales (Library: 21.9 to 20.2; Student Union: 23.7 to 22.6; Art, Music and Theater: 20.1 to 19.8; Athletics: 22.9 to 18.8; Student Acquaintances: 26.1 to 25.3; Science: 22.7 to 21.4; Dorms: 26.0 to 25.6; Topics in Conversation: 29.1 to 25.4 and personal experiences: 24.3 to 22.6); and below norms on four scales (Faculty: 20.7 to 21.5; Course Learning: 28.2 to 29.2; Clubs and organizations: 21.0 to 21.5; and Information in Conversations: 14.4 to 14.6). The Comparison Group was similar in that it scored
above LA II norms of 10 scales and below on four scales--these four scales being the very same scales on which the Experimental group scored lower.

The effect of this is that the College studied may deserve a better "report card" than it tends to give itself. In looking at the below norm scales, two in particular may be worthy of considering for the College studied. Being below Liberal Arts II norms in faculty interaction, an aspect of its character that the College takes great pride in, may cause Hiram to re-evaluate its patterns of faculty-student interaction. Similarly, being below norms in course learning may again cause the College to reconsider. It is well known on campus, for example, that students are not using the College’s library in great numbers. It should be noted, too, that these latter two scales were below norms for both the Experimental and Comparison groups.

The fifth hypothesis concerning rates of student satisfaction did not prove significant for the Experimental Group; however, it is important to note that the freshman colloquia in general receive high "satisfaction" ratings. It may be noteworthy, too, that the psychosocial nature of the deliberately designed colloquia held up well by comparison with the more intentionally cognitively-oriented Colloquia of the Comparison Group. For example, the College "sells" the fact that entering freshmen will be taught by senior faculty in academic areas for which freshmen can self-select. Thus, entering biology majors, for instance, have the chance to sign up
for freshmen colloquia taught by senior biology faculty on topics that are of inherent interest to biology majors. The fact that the intentionally designed colloquia are psychosocial by design--e.g., they deal with personal growth and development themes--makes them quite different in intent. That academic credit is split among three different academic disciplines: Composition, Literature, and Psychology (see "Distribution of Credit for Freshman Colloquium" in Appendix D), suggests the cognitively diffuse nature of these colloquia.

Also, as indicated previously, the significantly lower degree of satisfaction with item "D" for E '89 may be explained by the fact that the Colloquium Experimental 1989 was not initially advertised or available; it was a late substitution for a faculty member who left the College for another position; thus, the majority of students did not have the deliberately designed colloquium as an option. Instead, late-registering students (often the least decided and least committed) were steered, or even assigned to the colloquium. (see Table 16 in Appendix F). Since these students were, by default, denied the range of choices that earlier registering freshmen had, it is perhaps understandable that their degree of satisfaction would be less from the outset. For similar reasons, the CSEQ question #2, regarding students’ willingness to return to the same college if they had the chance, may reflect the undecided and noncommittal nature of late-entering College freshmen.
Summary

Overall, this study does provide some support for Widick's contention that theory can and should be linked to formal instruction. The fact that the Researcher, who is not a senior member of the faculty, was able to teach a colloquium that was intentionally psychosocial by design, and that this colloquium was rated highly by its student participants, suggests that Student Affairs professionals can work side-by-side with their faculty colleagues. The word-of-mouth reputation that has accrued to the deliberately designed colloquia has raised the consciousness of faculty. The Associate Dean of the College has acknowledged that such a colloquium model is "on target" for entering freshmen students--particularly "at risk" and lower-than-average students. Indeed, the fact that such a group of students with significantly lower SAT scores was able to achieve comparable first-term g.p.a.'s seems to be important. The experiential nature of the colloquia has been acknowledged by such student comments as, "This is the only class where I get to talk and discuss." and "The high ropes course really changed my mind about my feelings about myself and some of my classmates." Likewise, faculty have made observations such as, "Your kids seem to be fired up about your colloquium." As suggested by Widick, Knefelkamp and Parker, this kind of response has put the Researcher in a position to be an informal "faculty consultant."
The fact that "at risk" and lower-than-average students are seen to have achieved at an academic level commensurate with students more representative of the entering class profile suggests that Widick’s charge that we account more intentionally for learner differences can be accommodated by the deliberately designed colloquia.

An immediate result of the Experimental colloquium has been that a fellow Student Affairs professional, the Associate Dean/Director of Counseling, has taught a quite similar colloquium, modeled intentionally upon the deliberately designed colloquia. This colloquium, too, has received similar, positive, informal evaluative comments.

Initially this Researcher set out to determine if psychosocial development, along the lines of Chickering’s first three vectors of development: developing competence, managing emotions, and developing autonomy, which culminate in the fourth vector, establishing identity, could be enhanced by teaching the skills measured by Nelson and Low’s Personal Skills Map (PSM). While the potency of Hiram’s colloquium/mentor model has been seen as contributing positively to students’ psychosocial growth; the deliberately designed colloquia were, likewise, observed to have contributed to such growth. It was further observed that the deliberately designed colloquia may contribute significant gains in particular skill scales; notably, commitment ethic, sales orientation, and time management.
The Researcher also sought to determine if such a psychosocial intervention could positively impact students' first-term g.p.a. to the extent that significant gains could be measured. While this did not happen, given the considerably lower academic profile of the Experimental Group (more than 10% lower class rank and SATs that were 119 points lower on average), the fact that the Experimental group achieved a 2.80 first-term g.p.a., compared to 2.99 g.p.a. of the Comparison Group, seems reflective of the "compensatory effect" that has been identified by the University of South Carolina.

Although significantly larger P scores did not occur for the Experimental group, the fact that both groups made good progress in improving P scores (33.51 to 38.23 for a gain of 4.72 for E '88, '89; 38.31 to 41.37 for a gain of 3.38 for C '88, '89) is encouraging. Perhaps more significant is the fact that the Experimental Group was able to move from the second quartile into the third quartile by intervention's end. Of greatest interest were the gender differences, and the fact that men began and ended a full standard deviation below women. The fact that the Experimental Group moved ahead by more than a point, although not of statistical significance, should not be overlooked. Again, the fact that the psychosocial skill scale of empathy on the PSM approached significance in gains (> .06) may also support the fact that intentional interventions similar to this one may yield appreciable growth in this area. Given the low moral judgment scores for men,
planning interventions to enhance moral and ethical development might be a goal that the institution studied may wish to make explicit.

While involvement, as measured by Pace's "quality of effort" scales did not increase significantly for the Experimental Group, the fact that both groups did so well when compared to national Liberal Arts II norms, indicates that the personalized, residential nature of the small liberal arts college studied is a potent developmental environment for college students. The institution studied may want to consider becoming more intentional about enhancing an already rich college life.

Finally, the generally high "degree of satisfaction" scores while, again, not yielding significance for the Experimental Group, would seem to indicate that most students are having a positive experience with the colloquia at the institution studied. Of concern may be the fact that students who are late registering for freshman colloquia may have already ambivalent feelings about college in general and Hiram in particular exacerbated by a perceived lack of choice. The institution studied may well want to examine the relative value of "late admits," or may seek a broader array of colloquium options for such students--e.g., locking in 3 "late" slots per colloquium so that late registering students may still have a good array of choices.
Gender Effects

Psychosocial development for men and women occurred somewhat differently as measured on the PSM skill scales. Women reduced deference more by post test, thereby approximating men's deference. In like fashion, men were able to increase empathy scores more, enabling them to end much closer to women in empathy. In decision-making, while men began by being nearly identical to women, they improved enough to move out of the "changes" area. These changes are indicative of the fact that the college experience impacts men and women somewhat differently in skill development, yet does so in ways that make sense--e.g., that women would need to lower deference in a society which acculturates them to be deferential is understandable. Similarly, that men would grow more in empathy in a society that often downplays compassion in male stereotypes also makes sense. Men's greater gain in decision-making may be reflective of men responding to cultural cues that establish expectations that men "should" be decisive.

As noted previously, the most noticeable gender-related difference occurred on the P score of the DIT, wherein women began more than a standard deviation ahead of men and, even though men gained slightly more by post test, remained more than a standard deviation ahead at post test. It has also been noted that men began and ended in the second quartile of moral judgment norms, while women began and ended in the third quartile. These
patterns are noteworthy because of the reported bias inherent in both the moral judgment theory of Kohlberg and/or in instruments, such as Rest's DIT, which are derived from Kohlberg's theory.

With regard to the CSEQ "Quality of Effort" scales, while men scored above women on eight of the 14 scales, three scores were +1 to >1 to >5 points higher and would seem gender related. In student union usage (+1), the fact that Hiram's student union has pool tables and video games--both of which are used much more by men--may partially account for men's higher score. Again, that men would be >1 point above women in science (24.2 to 22.3) may well be explained by Hiram's national reputation in the sciences and the well-documented propensity of men to enter the "hard sciences" in much larger numbers than women. Finally, that men should score >5 points above women on athletics/recreation was somewhat surprising since there were an unusually high number of women athletes in the Experimental colloquia; however, the items for this particular scale on the CSEQ are oriented more to gym usage and intramurals, both of which are areas where men typically participate more. Women scored higher than men on six of the 14 CSEQ scales. The two scales in which women scored noticeably higher were writing (+1) and dorm usage (>1). While gender differences are not as apparent here, women's greater social maturity upon entrance to college may be reflected in more discipline in a subject area such as writing, and in better initial interpersonal skills in terms of interacting in the residence halls.
Conclusions

There are two conclusions that can perhaps be drawn from this study. One conclusion is that, while there was no overall group change in personal skills development, several individual skill scales did yield significance for the Experimental group when analyzed by univariate analysis. A second conclusion was not hypothesized but appears worthy of further examination; that is, that women at the institution studied begin and end with significantly higher principled moral reasoning scores than men. The study failed to demonstrate that significant group differences occurred in psychosocial development or in group moral judgment gains, as measured by the P score of the DIT. A third tentative conclusion that might be drawn is that the deliberately planned colloquia may be of particular benefit to "at risk" and lower-than-average entering freshmen students. Thus, while the Experimental group did not demonstrate significant gains in first-term g.p.a., the fact that a lower ability group could do comparable academic work is certainly intriguing. Again, the study failed to demonstrate that the Experimental Group demonstrated a higher degree of involvement, as measured by Pace's "quality of effort." An interesting aspect of this hypothesis is that both groups generally scored above Liberal Arts II college norms; this does not relate directly to the hypothesis but may be of interest to the institution studied. Finally, the study failed to demonstrate a higher "degree of satisfaction" for the Experimental Group; in fact, the Experimental
Group was significantly below the Comparison Group in evaluating its sense of satisfaction with both the Experimental Colloquia and with the College itself. Inasmuch as many of the Experimental group participants had limited or no choice in choosing what are ostensibly "self-selected" colloquia, this finding may have importance for the institution studied in its treatment of late-registering students. Due to the small minority enrollment at the college studied, the cell sizes were too small for statistical analysis.

Limitations of the Study

The major limitations of the study were the lack of random selection for the Experimental group and the limited size of the sample (N = 82). The fact that randomness could not be achieved for the Experimental group led to several complications. A major difficulty was that E '88, '89 was a less-than-representative group in that minorities and "at risk" students occurred much more frequently than would be represented by a random sample. Again, due to the fact that the Researcher was not a senior faculty member, late registering students comprised a disproportionate part of the colloquia, further skewing the randomness of the Experimental Group. Yet another complication was that the Experimental Colloquium for 1989 was permitted to swell well beyond the Comparison Colloquia--e.g., the E '89 colloquium had 19 students, 17 of whom agreed to participate in the study, in contrast to an average colloquium size of 14. The sample size was
limited both by what the Researcher could himself teach and by the faculty convention that only one colloquium ought to be taught per year by the same instructor. As it was, an exception was granted to this convention for 1988.

With regard to the Comparison Group, sampling bias also occurred in that only volunteers were solicited and, because there were no inducements, attrition tended to be high. Another possible contributing factor to the Comparison Group attrition might be the fact that the Researcher was the dean of students, an authority figure charged with the oversight of the discipline function at the college studied.

Finally, because the Researcher was also the intervener and grade-giver for the Experimental Colloquia, which courses accounted for one-third of the subjects' first-term g.p.a., there was a potential for bias--even though a comparison of Experimental and Comparison Group colloquia grades would not seem to reflect experimental group "grade inflation" (E '88 g.p.a. of 3.13 compared to C '88 g.p.a. of 3.21; E '89 g.p.a. of 2.94 compared to C '89 g.p.a. of 3.26; combined E '88, '89 g.p.a. of 3.06 compared to combined C '88, '89 g.p.a. of 3.23). Ideally, the design would have been better if the intervener and grader-giver was not the Researcher.

Implications for Student Affairs

Perhaps this study's greatest contribution is to demonstrate in a somewhat different way how student development theory can be
linked to formal instruction. Just as this Researcher found Widick
(1975); Widick, Knefelkamp and Parker (1975); Widick and
Simpson (1975); Rodgers and Straub (1978); and Hurst (1978)
im instructive in demonstrating ways to link theory with instruction; so,
too, others may find this study helpful. Of particular use may be the
adapting of Nelson and Low's Personal Skills Map (PSM) for use as
a virtual syllabus for a psychosocial intervention. This Researcher
is not aware of anyone else having intentionally matched
Chickering's vectors of development to the personal skills
assessed by Nelson and Low's instrument. Such matching was
readily accomplished and provides both instructor and student with
a very usable means of both assessing initial personal skills status
and measuring subsequent growth in personal skills development.

The apparent success of this deliberately designed
intervention in aiding "at risk" and lower-than-average students' academic performance would seem hopeful, both in responding to
Widick's challenge to more intentionally account for the individual differences of students and in meeting the needs of an increasingly diverse college student population. Student Affairs professionals may find the linking of cognitively complex material with psychosocial skills and tasks that occurred in the syllabus design for this intervention to be helpful in meeting and overcoming faculty skepticism about the perceived "softness" of personal development courses.
Although not a primary focus of this study, the observation of women's superior performance on a measure of moral judgment should prove provocative to Student Affairs professionals and certainly should stimulate further validation work with the newer measures of moral judgment that emphasize a production response to ethical questions.

Implications for Research

Given the limited number of studies using the PSM in four-year colleges and the relative ease with which the PSM skill scales can be related to Chickering's vectors of development, it would seem that further studies would be helpful, both for helping students to develop an awareness of their present state of personal development and possible areas of growth, and in making this useful instrument more known and accessible to colleges and universities. With regard to gender issues and moral judgment theory, while the lines of opposition are fairly well established, validation studies with the newer instruments--e.g., Bode and Page's ERI and Gibbs' revised SRQ--would seem to offer a wide range of opportunities and insights.

Finally, if colleges and universities are to acknowledge adequately the increasing diversity of their student populations and, further, to acknowledge the special needs and differing academic backgrounds of such diverse students, then instructional interventions that intentionally use developmental theory applied to
formal instruction in such a way as to acknowledge these differences, represent an area of curriculum development in which much work remains to be done.
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Sincerely,

Stuart Tennant  
Dean of Students

cc: Bob Rodgers

March 6, 1990

Permission is granted for dissertation use only of the above referenced material provided that full bibliographic credit is given.

Alice S. Morrow  
Permissions Editor
May 26, 1989

Robert Rodgers, Ph.D.
Dissertation Advisor
and Dissertation Committee Member

Dear Dr. Rodgers:

This is to certify that Stuart Tennant, a Hiram College staff member, has sought and received permission from me in my role as Associate Dean of the College to conduct human subjects research pursuant to his goal of doctoral dissertation research. Stuart sought permission from me to contact students randomly selected for his research central control group. Again, Stuart has solicited only voluntary participation from his two Colloquia (his experimental group) and from his random control group. I believe he has acted ethically and has sought to operate within the constraints of what Hiram requires when its faculty conduct human subjects research.

Stuart has informed me that this may be a concern that he did not teach a larger "N" for his experimental group; however, I need to inform you that I have already strained Hiram's expectation that faculty should teach only one Freshman Colloquium by permitting Stuart to teach two such Colloquia. I doubt that I could grant him such permission again.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any additional concern.

Sincerely,

Craig L. Moser
Associate Academic Dean

CLM/sjb
APPENDIX C

LETTERS TO STUDENTS AND

PACKET OF INSTRUMENTS
Dear

I am conducting research regarding students' personal development during their initial year of college. Specifically, I have designed the Colloquium I am teaching with the intent to enhance students' personal growth. That is the intent; whether or not this occurs will be determined from my research.

In order to determine the effectiveness of the course I have designed, it is necessary to measure the students who are not taking the course so as to have a control group. In order to do this measurement I am administering three instruments: the Personal Skills Map, the Defining Issues Test, and the College Student Experiences Questionnaire. The Personal Skills Map and the Defining Issues Test need to be administered on a pre-test, post-test basis, while the College Student Experiences Questionnaire is administered once. The Personal Skills Map measures key personal life skills; the Defining Issues Test, moral maturity, and the College Student Experiences Questionnaire, the quality of effort expended in the college experience.

I am requesting your permission to administer these instruments and to use the results in my research. The results will be used only in an aggregate form—that is, all the scores of the participants in the control group will be averaged. All information will be treated in the strictest confidence. Your participation in this research is voluntary and you may choose not to participate. I will be happy to share my research results with you and discuss any individual results that you would like explained.

You have been selected at random to participate in this research. If you are willing to participate, please indicate by completing the bottom portion of this letter and return it in the enclosed envelope to your floor RA.

Thank you for taking the time to read this.

Sincerely,

Stuart Tennant
Dean of Students

___ Yes I have read your letter and agree to participate in your research.

___ No I do not wish to participate in this research project.

______________________________ Name (please print)

______________________________ Signature
September 1988

Dear <sal>:

I am conducting research regarding students' personal development during their initial year of college. Specifically, I have designed our colloquium with the intent to facilitate students' personal growth. That is the intent; whether or not this occurs will be determined from my research.

In order to determine the effectiveness of the course I have designed, it is necessary to measure the students who are taking the course. This is one reason why I have administered the Personal Skills Map (PSM). The Personal Skills Map is an instrument that measures key personal life skills, such as time management, decision-making and assertiveness. It is my hope that you will personally find the results of your PSM both interesting and useful as well.

I am requesting your permission to administer the PSM and to use the results in my research, both at the beginning of the colloquium, and again at the end of the term. The results will be used only in an aggregate form—i.e., all the PSMs will be averaged for scores—and all information will be treated in the strictest confidence. Your participation in this research is voluntary and you may choose not to participate. I will be happy to share my research results with you and to discuss your individual PSM results.

Thank you for taking the time to read this information.

Sincerely,

Stuart Tennant
Dean of Students

ST/mmd
September 1988

Dear <sal>:

Thank you for your willingness to participate in the control group for research purposes. I think you will be pleasantly surprised to learn that there should not be more than 5 hours of your time required for the entire year. A schedule of the times and dates that I will need your participation is as follows:

--- Wednesday, September 21 at 12:00 noon in Drury Hall (2nd floor of Bates)--pizza and administration of Personal Skills Map and Defining Issues Test (no more than 2 hours)
--- Week of November 15--retest of Personal Skills Map (1 hour)
--- March 1989--administrating College Student Experiences Questionnaire (1 hour)
--- May 1989--retest of Defining Issues Test (1 hour)

The meeting next Wednesday is crucial and I will provide a pizza and pop lunch. This will be a time to answer any questions that you might have and to begin the administration of two of the research instruments. Again, thank you for your participation; I look forward to seeing you next Wednesday in Drury Hall.

Sincerely,

Stuart Tennant
Dean of Students

ST/mmd
September 1989

Dear <sal>:

I am conducting research regarding students' personal development during their initial year of college. Specifically, I have designed the Colloquium I am teaching with the intent to enhance students' personal growth. That is the intent; whether or not this occurs will be determined from my research.

In order to determine the effectiveness of the course I have designed, it is necessary to measure the students who are not taking the course so as to have a control group. In order to do this measurement I am administering three instruments: the Personal Skills Map, the Defining Issues Test, and the College Student Experiences Questionnaire. The Personal Skills Map and the Defining Issues Test need to be administered on a pre-test, post-test basis, while the College Student Experiences Questionnaire is administered once. The Personal Skills Map measures key personal life skills; the Defining Issues Test, moral maturity, and the College Student Experiences Questionnaire, the quality of effort expended in the college experience.

I am requesting your permission to administer these instruments and to use the results in my research. The results will be used only in an aggregate form—that is, all the scores of the participants in the control group will be averaged. All information will be treated in the strictest confidence. Your participation in this research is voluntary and you may choose not to participate. I will be happy to share my research with you and discuss any individual results that you would like explained.

You have been selected at random to participate in this research. If you are willing to participate, please bring the completed bottom portion of this letter with you next Wednesday. We will meet next Wednesday, September 13th, at 12 noon in the Kennedy Center Ballroom for pizza and pop and the administering of the first 2 instruments--the Personal Skills Map and the Defining Issues Test. Thank you for taking the time to read this information.

Sincerely,

Stuart Tennant
Dean of Students

Yes I have read your letter and agree to participate in your research.

No I do not wish to participate in this research project.

________________________________________ Name (please print)

________________________________________ Signature
September 27, 1989

Dear Research Participant:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in the freshman year research that I am conducting. At this time, I need to have you return your completed Personal Skills Map (PSM) and Defining Issues Test (DIT). If for some reason, you have misplaced your original questionnaires, please feel free to come in to 1st Floor Bates Hall and get another copy(ies). Again, in order for your feedback to be timely, you need to turn your completed PSM and DIT within the next day or two--certainly by Friday at the latest. One of my staff will be calling to follow up, if necessary. Again, thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Stuart Tennant
Dean of Students

ST/mmd
MEMORANDUM

To: Students serving as Control Group for Personal Skills Map (PSM)

From: Stuart Tennant

Re: Post-Test of PSM

Well, here we are nearly at the end of the Quarter. As I indicated to you in September, I need you to retake the Personal Skills Map. Remember, the PSM is "time bound," meaning that it reflects your thoughts on a given day—not as though they are "frozen in time."

In order to accommodate what are, I am sure, your very busy schedules, I am distributing this to you individually so that you can complete these instruments within the next week, by Friday, November 4th. Please simply return them to the Student Affairs office on the 1st Floor of Bates Hall once you have completed your PSMs. You may slide them under the door if the office is closed when you are returning them.

Remember the following details:

1. Try to use a single context—or frame of reference throughout when answering questions—e.g. your friends and experiences in high school or your family.

2. When answering items 1 through 54, remember to answer 3 questions for each situation.

3. It's okay to use the same answer—e.g. 3/1 "sometimes descriptive" for all three questions if that's the most accurate response.


Again, thank you for your help and cooperation on this project.

SBT/mmd
MEMORANDUM

To: Students serving as Control Group for Personal Skills Map (PSM)

From: Stuart Tennant

Re: Post-Test of PSM

I realize that you are busy and hope that distributing the PSMs has given you the flexibility to find time to complete your individual PSM. As yet we have not received your completed score sheet. May I ask again that you bring your completed PSM to the Student Affairs Office on the 1st floor of Bates. You may slide them under the door if the office is closed when you are returning them.

Remember the following details:

1. Try to use a single context—or frame of reference throughout when answering questions—e.g. your friends and experiences in high school or your family.

2. When answering items 1 through 54, remember to answer 3 questions for each situation.

3. It's okay to use the same answer—e.g. 3/1 "sometimes descriptive" for all three questions if that's the most accurate response.


Again, thank you for your help and cooperation on this project.

SBT/mmd
MEMORANDUM

To: Colloquium Students
From: Stuart Tennant
Re: Post-Test of PSM and Course Evaluations

A. PSM Post-Test
   Remember the following details:
   1. Try to use a single context—or frame of reference throughout when answering questions—e.g. your friends and experiences in high school or your family.
   2. When answering items 1 through 54, remember to answer 3 questions for each situation.
   3. It's okay to use the same answer—e.g. 3/1 "sometimes descriptive" for all 3 questions if that's the most accurate response.
   4. On the "score sheet," you simply transpose the numerical values of the answers you have circled on a one-for-one basis—e.g. #1 M/2 = #1 X; #2 S/1 = #2 O; #3 L/O = #3 O; and then add up the columns for your total scores.

B. Course Evaluations
   1. Do not write your name on your evaluation.
   2. Once you have completed the 1-page evaluation, return it to Craig Moser, 3rd Floor Hinsdale.
   3. Once you have completed the 2-page evaluation, return it to Mary Donnelly, 1st Floor, Bates Hall.
MEMORANDUM

To: Students participating in Student Development Research Project

From: Stuart Tennant

Re: Instructions for taking Post-Test of Defining Issues Test (DIT)

November 17, 1989

Please remember that the DIT, like the Personal Skills Map, is not "time-bound" --that is, it is quite acceptable for you to have a different opinion now than you did last Fall about the six stories cited in the DIT. The important thing is to remember the following:

1. I am interested in your own opinions about controversial social issues. Remember, too, that different people have different opinions.
2. Try to set aside an hour or so to complete the questionnaire--give yourself ample time to consider every item carefully.
3. Every story has 12 issues. The first task after reading each story is to read each item by itself and to rate it in importance. After rating each item individually, then you should consider the set of 12 items and rank the four most important items. A sample story (Frank Jones deciding about buying a car) is used to illustrate the task of rating and ranking issues in terms of their importance in making a decision.
4. Note that the sample case illustrates items which may not be comprehended (item 4) or which sound like gibberish (item 6). You should rate such items as "no importance." You will find such meaningless nonsense items throughout the test and should, when you find such items, rate them low.
5. If, while you are completing the questionnaire, you do not understand a word in a story, you may ask for a dictionary definition of the word. If you do not understand a word in an item, you should make your best judgment about the word. If you have no idea what the word means, then rate the item low.
6. The items should be rated and ranked in terms of how important that issue is in making a moral decision--(e.g. what is the crucial question that you should focus on in making a decision?). Some items will raise very important issues for you, but you should then ask yourself, should the decision rest on this issue?

Remember, there are five places to put a check.

Great Importance -- Check here if the question concerns something that makes a big, crucial difference one way or the other in making a decision about the problem.

Much Importance -- Check here if the question concerns something that a person should clearly be aware of in making a decision, and one way or the other, it would make a difference in your decision, but not a big, crucial difference.
Some importance -- Check here if the question concerns something you generally care about, but something that is not of crucial importance in deciding about this problem.

Little importance -- Check here if the question concerns something that is not sufficiently important to consider in this case.

No importance -- Check here if the question is about something that has no importance in making a decision, and that you'd be wasting your time in thinking about this when trying to make a difficult decision. Some of the questions are apt to seem foolish or make no sense -- Check here on those questions.

Again, thank you for taking the time to help--I hope you find this instrument interesting and that it raises stimulating issues for you.

Once you have completed your DIT Post-Test, please return it to Mary Donnelly, 1st Floor, Bates Hall.

Again, a reminder, In April I will ask you to take the College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ). Thanks for your help!
MEMORANDUM

To: Colloquium Students (#20 & #21)
From: Stuart Tennant
Re: Post-Test of PSM and Course Evaluations

A. PSM Post-Test
   Remember the following details:
   
   1. Try to use a single context—or frame of reference throughout when answering questions—e.g. your friends and experiences in high school or your family.
   
   2. When answering Items 1 through 54, remember to answer 2 questions for each situation.
   
   3. It's okay to use the same answer—e.g. 3/1 "sometimes descriptive" for all three questions if that's the most accurate response.
   
   4. On the "score sheet," you simply transpose the numerical values of the answers you have circled on a one-for-one basis—e.g. #1 M/2 = #1 □ ; #2 S/1 = #2 □ ; #3 L/0 = #3 O ; and then add up the columns for your total scores.
   

B. Course Evaluations
   
   1. Do not write your name on your evaluation.
   
   2. Once you have completed the 1-page evaluation, return it to Craig Moser, 3rd Floor Hinsdale.
   
   3. Once you have completed the 2-page evaluation, return it to Mary Donnelly, 1st Floor, Bates Hall.
MEMORANDUM

To: Colloquium Students (#20 & #21)

From: Stuart Tennant

Re: Post-Test of PSM and Course Evaluations

A. PSM Post-Test
   Remember the following details:
   1. Try to use a single context—or frame of reference throughout when answering questions—e.g. your friends and experiences in high school or your family.
   2. When answering items 1 through 54, remember to answer 3 questions for each situation.
   3. It's okay to use the same answer—e.g. 3/1 "sometimes descriptive" for all three questions if that's the most accurate response.
   4. On the "score sheet," you simply transpose the numerical values of the answers you have circled on a one-for-one basis—e.g. #1 M/2 = 2 #1 ; #2 S/1 = 2 #2 ; #3 L/0 = 0 #3 ; and then add up the columns for your total scores.

B. Course Evaluations
   1. Do not write your name on your evaluation.
   2. Once you have completed the 1-page evaluation, return it to Craig Moser, 3rd Floor Hinsdale.
   3. Once you have completed the 2-page evaluation, return it to Mary Donnelly, 1st Floor, Bates Hall.
To: Students participating in Student Development Research Project
From: Stuart Tennant
Re: Instructions for taking Post-Test of Defining Issues Test (DIT)

Here we are again! You may "remember" taking this instrument back in September. Please remember that the DIT, like the Personal Skills Map, is not "time-bound" -- that is, it is quite acceptable for you to have a different opinion now than you did last Fall about the six stories cited in the DIT. The important thing is to remember the following:

1. I am interested in your own opinions about controversial social issues. Remember, too, that different people have different opinions.

2. Try to set aside an hour or so to complete the questionnaire--give yourself ample time to consider every item carefully.

3. Every story has 12 issues. The first task after reading each story is to read each item by itself and to rate it in importance. After rating each item individually, then you should consider the set of 12 items and rank the four most important items. A sample story (Frank Jones deciding about buying a car) is used to illustrate the task of rating and ranking issues in terms of their importance in making a decision.

4. Note that the sample case illustrates items which may not be comprehended (item 4) or which sound like gibberish (item 6). You should rate such items as "no importance." You will find such meaningless nonsense items throughout the test and should, when you find such items, rate them low.

5. If, while you are completing the questionnaire, you do not understand a word in a story, you may ask for a dictionary definition of the word. If you do not understand a word in an item, you should make your best judgment about the word. If you have no idea what the word means, then rate the item low.

6. The items should be rated and ranked in terms of how important that issue is in making a moral decision--(e.g. what is the crucial question that you should focus on in making a decision?). Some items will raise very important issues for you, but you should then ask yourself, should the decision rest on this issue?

Remember, there are five places to put a check.

**Great** importance -- Check here if the question concerns something that makes a big, crucial difference one way or the other in making a decision about the problem.

**Much** importance -- Check here if the question concerns something that a person should clearly be aware of in making a decision, and one way or the other, it would make a difference in your decision, but not a big, crucial difference.
Some importance -- Check here if the question concerns something you generally care about, but something that is not of crucial importance in deciding about this problem.

Little importance -- Check here if the question concerns something that is not sufficiently important to consider in this case.

No importance -- Check here if the question is about something that has no importance in making a decision, and that you'd be wasting your time in thinking about this when trying to make a difficult decision. Some of the questions are apt to seem foolish or make no sense -- Check here on those questions.

Again, thank you for taking the time to help--I hope you find this instrument interesting and that it raises stimulating issues for you.

Once you have completed your DIT Post-Test, please return it to Mary Donnelly, 1st Floor, Bates Hall, by Friday, February 3rd.

Again, a reminder, in April I will ask you to take the College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ), and in early May, a "delayed Post-Test" of the DIT. Thanks for your help!
March 6, 1990

Dear Research Participant:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in the freshman year research that I am conducting. At this time, I need to have you return your completed College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ). If for some reason, you have misplaced your original questionnaire, please feel free to come in to 1st Floor Bates Hall and get another copy. Again, in order for your feedback to be timely, you need to turn in your completed CSEQ within the next day or two--certainly by Friday at the latest. One of my staff will be calling to follow up, if necessary. Again, thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

.  

Stuart Tennant  
Dean of Students

ST/mmd
March 1, 1990

Dear

Thank you for your cooperation on the research instruments--by now you are a "veteran" of the Personal Skills Map (PSM) and the Defining Issues Test (DIT). While you have taken each of these instruments twice (as Pre- and Post-tests), the attached instrument, the College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ) is a "post-test only" instrument; therefore, you will see it only this once.

Please read the instructions within the brown box on the cover of the CSEQ. As you will note, the questionnaire is divided into eight parts: Background Information, College Activities, Conversations, Reading/Writing, Opinions About College, The College Environment, Estimate of Gains, and "Additional Questions" (see attached sheet).

Again, please try to use a soft, black lead pencil in completing the instrument. Remember, too, that the "College Student Experience" being reported is your own. As in all the instruments, confidentiality is assured and results will be used only in an aggregate fashion.

Thank you for completing all these instruments and participating. Please return the completed CSEQs to the ground floor Student Life office in Bates Hall by the end of the term.

Sincerely,

Stuart Tennant
Dean of Students

ST/tmt
Attachment
April 3, 1989

Dear <sal>:

Thank you for your cooperation on the research instruments—by now you are "veterans" of the Personal Skills Map (PSM) and the Defining Issues Test (DIT). While you have taken each of these instruments twice (as Pre-and Post-Tests), the attached instrument, the College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ) is a "post-test only" instrument; therefore, you will see it only this once.

Please read the instructions within the brown box on the cover of the CSEQ. As you will note, the questionnaire is divided into eight parts: Background Information, College Activities, Conversations, Reading/Writing, Opinions About College, The College Environment, Estimate of Gains, and "Additional Questions" (see attached sheet).

Again, please be sure to use the attached soft, black lead pencil in completing the instrument. Remember, too, that the "College Student Experience" being reported is your own. As in all the instruments, confidentiality is assured and results will be used only in an aggregate fashion.

Thank you for completing all these instruments and participating. Please return the completed CSEQs to the ground floor Student Life office in Bates Hall.

Sincerely,

Stuart Tennant
Dean of Students

ST/mmd
Attachment
The student evaluations of their Freshman Colloquia for 1989-90 provide following results to two questions.

Independent of how much you liked the Colloquium how much do you feel you learned?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>An Average Amount</th>
<th>Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary rate your satisfaction with the Colloquium as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>An average Amount</th>
<th>Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Personal Skills Map

Life Management Success System
PLEASE NOTE:

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

These consist of pages:
161–185
APPENDIX D

COLLOQUIA MATERIALS
Psychologist Arthur Chickering has suggested that, as our society approaches something akin to universal higher education, the new conditions of our increasingly technological society have created another developmental period tucked in between adolescence and adulthood. This developmental period, spanning from seventeen to the middle or late twenties, Chickering has identified as "young adulthood." Chickering's thesis suggests that there are seven major areas of student development ("vectors" in his terminology) that young adults are engaged in and that these "vectors" can be considered in relation to six major aspects of college. This course will use Chickering's thesis as a "jumping off place." We will examine Chickering's theory and then view the college experience, both in terms of personal development theory and in terms of literature about the college experience.

Students will begin the course by taking a human potential instrument, the Personal Skills Map (PSM), which is a self-assessment of intrapersonal, interpersonal, and career/life management skills. The course will then utilize two books, College Is Only the Beginning: A Student Guide to Higher Education, and I Never Knew I Had a Choice, as well as a packet of readings from literature, as basic texts for the course. The intent of the course is to focus on personal skills development by first, learning about the actual skill—e.g. assertiveness, time management, decision-making; and second, by reading about "young adulthood" characters in fiction who are also dealing with issues of personal growth. Examples of such reading are "Of This Time, Of That Place" by Lionel Trilling; "In The Region of Ice" by Joyce Carol Oates; and a selection from Blackbird Winter, by Margaret Head.

A response journal will be kept throughout the colloquium and students will be expected to make weekly entries in response to guest speakers, small group discussion, and assigned readings. Students will write four brief papers and will be expected to make two oral presentations in class.

Stuart Tennant, Dean of Students. Academic Background: B.A.; M.A. (English) Ohio State University; A.B.D. (Student Personnel) Ohio State University. Academic Interests: English and American literature, developmental psychology, English composition, Teaching of English as a Second Language (TESOL), student personnel. Personal Interests: tennis, jogging, adult coed soccer, participatory parenting, noon-time "killer" basketball, and reading fiction about the college experience.
Please indicate the four Colloquia which you would most like to take by putting the numbers 1, 2, 3 or 4 next to your selections according to the order of your preference. If you have a particular first choice because of your background and/or intended major, you may indicate that choice and write a short note indicating the reasons. We will try to honor special requests, but cannot guarantee a first choice.

Please return this selection sheet in the enclosed envelope NO LATER THAN AUGUST 15, 1988. Final Colloquium assignments will be made shortly thereafter. You will learn about your Colloquium assignment on September 4.

Thank you for your cooperation.

__________ FRC 101-01 ____________ FRC 101-09 ____________ FRC 101-16
__________ FRC 101-02 ____________ FRC 101-10 ____________ FRC 101-17
__________ FRC 101-03 ____________ FRC 101-11 ____________ FRC 101-18
__________ FRC 101-04 ____________ FRC 101-12 ____________ FRC 101-19
__________ FRC 101-05 ____________ FRC 101-13 ____________ FRC 101-20
__________ FRC 101-06 ____________ FRC 101-14 ____________ FRC 101-21
__________ FRC 101-07 ____________ FRC 101-15 ____________ FRC 101-22
__________ FRC 101-08

(Please print or type)

NAME_____________________________________________________________________________________

HOME ADDRESS______________________________________________________________________________

CITY/STATE/ZIP______________________________________________________________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLOQUIUM</th>
<th>COURSE TITLE</th>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>ROOM</th>
<th>INSTRUCTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRC 101-01</td>
<td>TURKEY: A CULTURAL EXPERIENCE</td>
<td>6/4/7MTh</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ugur Aker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRC 101-02</td>
<td>THE FRENCH AND LAUGHTER</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Liliane Akers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRC 101-03</td>
<td>WAR AND REVOLUTION IN THE 20TH CENTURY</td>
<td>6/6/7MTh</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nosar Alsalmolki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRC 101-04</td>
<td>IN THE HEART OF THE HEART OF THE COUNTRY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>David Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRC 101-05</td>
<td>LIBERAL EDUCATION AND THE CLASSICS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gary Craig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRC 101-06</td>
<td>MEDICINE AND LITERATURE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Carol Donley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRC 101-07</td>
<td>THE GREAT LAKES</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gorman Duffett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRC 101-08</td>
<td>STUDIES IN SELF-IDENTITY</td>
<td>6/6/7MTh</td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Emerson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRC 101-09</td>
<td>CHILDREN PLAY; ADULTS WORK: REAL OR IMAGINED DIFFERENCES?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gwen Fischer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRC 101-10</td>
<td>THE UNITED STATES AND ITS COLONIES</td>
<td>6/6/7MTh</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nathan Godfried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRC 101-11</td>
<td>PARADOX AND THE LIMITATIONS OF RATIONALITY</td>
<td>6/6/7MTh</td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Grajek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRC 101-12</td>
<td>MUSIC IN THE THEATRE: OPERA, OPERETTA, MUSICAL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Justin Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRC 101-13</td>
<td>THE REALITIES OF RUSSIA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roland Layton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRC 101-14</td>
<td>SOCIETY AND THE ARTS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Hoeller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRC 101-15</td>
<td>THINKING THE UNTHINKABLE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Miccolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRC 101-16</td>
<td>LOVING RELATIONSHIPS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Linda Pierce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRC 101-17</td>
<td>HOLOCAUST AND CONTEMPORARY RESPONSE</td>
<td>6/6/7MTh</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dixon Slingerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRC 101-18</td>
<td>THINKING MACHINES? OR CLEVER PROGRAMMERS?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oberta Slotterbeck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRC 101-19</td>
<td>CHALLENGES, CHOICES, AND CHANCES: THE COLLEGE EXPERIENCE</td>
<td>6/6/7MTh</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lynn Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRC 101-20</td>
<td>YOUNG ADULTHOOD: THE COLLEGE EXPERIENCE</td>
<td>6/6/7MTh</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stuart Tennant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRC 101-21</td>
<td>YOUNG ADULTHOOD: THE COLLEGE EXPERIENCE</td>
<td>6/6/7F</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stuart Tennant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRC 101-22</td>
<td>COSMOSPHERE, COSMOGONY, COSMOLOGY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gordon Wepfer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Turkish society has been living a schizophrenic existence between western and eastern values for more than two hundred years. Many syntheses have emerged during this time but the society keeps on defining and redefining its place, its aspirations, its environment within the continuous dialectic of East and West, eastern and western, traditional and modern.

The object of this colloquium is to teach each other one aspect of the culture. Since cultures are rarely monolithic, each participant will concentrate on one tiny aspect and will enlighten the rest of the group on one's own findings.

Some may pick sociological questions, some economic structure, some foreign policy problems. Others may concentrate on music, literature, architecture, or history. Still others may use the geographical setting as a stepping stone to investigate Hittites, ancient Greeks, apostles, etc.

Everyone will give progress reports every week. The progress reports will include (1) some interesting information to be told to the class from your readings; (2) two to five pages of narrative that summarizes your weekly work; (3) updating of the detailed outline for your final paper that will be the combination of the weekly reports organized in a cohesive fashion. All the writing will be done on personal computers available in the lab for easy editing.

I promise to provide varied experiences every week when we don't have progress reports. They will include award winning Turkish movies, travel slides, music, dance, outside lecturers. I plan to visit a rug dealer in the area who sells Turkish rugs as an introduction to Turkish folk art. Cleveland Art Museum has collections that will be relevant to us and we will visit the Museum.

Last year Hiram College library received a grant from "The Institute of Turkish Studies" in Washington, D.C. to update its books related to Turkey. Even though our holdings are not exhaustive by any means, we do have enough variety to support this course. I will have these books and my own books put in reserve in the library for your use. Some of these are:

- K. Atıllı. Turkish Art
- U. Bates. Women as Patrons of Architecture in Turkey
- Turkish Studies Association Bulletin (various issues)
- Middle East Technical University, Studies in Development (various issues)
- Yasah Kamal. Iron Earth, Copper Sky, Hemed, My Hawk, Seagull
- Is. Fahri. An Anthology of Modern Turkish Short Stories
- Halman, Talaat (ed). Contemporary Turkish Literature: Fiction and Poetry
- Bianchi, Robert. Interest Groups and Political Development in Turkey
- Halicka, Hanetta and Ahmet Evin (eds). Modern Turkish Architecture
- Halman, Talaat (ed). Modern Turkish Drama: An Anthology of Plays in Translation
- Kagıtçibası, Çigdem and Diane Sumar (eds) Sex Roles, Family and Community in Turkey

Dr. Ugur Aker, B.A. (Econ) Robert College, Istanbul, Turkey; B.A. and Ph.D. Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan. I teach economics and finance courses. A recent paper I presented was entitled "Imaginary Transactions in Turkish Foreign Trade." I have a few interests, convictions, prejudices; I'd rather you find out about them than me reveal them.
THE FRENCH AND LAUGHTER

The French are often thought to be light-hearted. They never seem to take anything or anyone seriously. Their zest for living is mitigated by an occasional urge to be critical. Indeed they love argumentation and accept comfortably their own paradoxes. They like to poke fun at their own government, institutions, at anyone and anything, and best of all at themselves. Is there anything they feel seriously about? Of course! It is precisely behind their comic mask that we discover truth about the French and about every man.

This colloquium will examine what prompts laughter, what laughter helps us discover about the French and about ourselves. It will be primarily a French literature course in translation covering selected readings borrowed from representative works from the medieval farce to contemporary French comedy. These readings will encompass a variety of genres: prose, poetry, theatre, cabaret songs and perhaps some cartoons.

The readings will be taken from the following works:

- Gargantua and Pantagruel, selections, Rabelais
- Persian Letters, Montesquieu
- The Would be Gentleman and The School for Wives, Moliere
- Selected fables, Lafontaine
- Amphitryon 38 and Appollos of Bellac, Giraudoux
- A Lady from Chez Maxie, C. Feydeau
- Rhinoceros, Ionesco
- Laughter, Bergson

Much emphasis will be given to class participation and discussion. Some play reading and/or dramatic performance will be encouraged. There will be a minimum of three papers and two prepared oral presentations. A field trip to the Cleveland Playhouse or Cleveland Museum of Art is planned.

Liliane Fabre Akers, Associate Professor of French. Born and educated in France and has been a resident of this country since 1954. Baccalauréat Université d'Aix Marseille, Baccalauréat Université de Lyon, Licence en Lettres Université de Grenoble, Graduate Assistant and Instructor at Wellesley College. Additional graduate doctoral studies at the University of Nice. Former chairperson of the Foreign Language Department. Special interests: Contemporary French Literature, Women's Literature, French dramatic literature.
WAR AND REVOLUTION IN THE 20TH CENTURY

Take the world’s present population, pull aside one person in every 300, shoot him or her dead, and you will have the number of corpses caused by war since what Europeans still glibly call “the last war” ended in 1945. Since the end of the war the tally of 17 million war deaths, even allowing for an exaggeration here and there, is in absolute numbers larger than the Great War’s toll, and half a fairly cautious guess of what the world-wide slaughter of 1939-45 may have added up to. The fact that since 1945 the northern half of the world has been kept more or less at peace by horror-struck memories of those two murderous spells, the First World War (WWI) and Second World War (WWII), as well as by nuclear nervousness, lulls complacent northerners into ignoring the world’s other half, where war remains commonplace and the carnage continues. This colloquium will examine a select number of wars and revolutions that have erupted, and some of which are still in progress in order to learn about the causes of such developments. The aim of the colloquium will be not only to become acquainted with significant social, economic and political factors that contribute to war and revolution, but also to analyze the aftermath of these developments.

Classes will consist primarily of discussion with some class lectures. Several films that deal with war will be shown. Students will write four brief papers that will involve historical research as well as critical awareness of the event.

Texts:

Gayanne Dyer, War
Quincy Wright, A Study of War, 1965

Nosar Alaolal, Assistant Professor of Political Science; Ph.D., Miami University; M.A., Xavier University; B.A. & B.Sc., Northeast Missouri State University. He has published several articles related to the Revolution & legitimacy; Opposition to the Islamic Republic of Iran; and the New Left in Iran. He is presently working on Theories of Revolution as well as a book on the Persian Gulf since the Nixon Doctrine.
The title of this colloquium is borrowed from a short story by the contemporary American writer William Gass; it points up one inescapable fact about Hiram—we are a college out in the country, surrounded by farms and farmers and all the activities of farm life. The rural ideal and the pastoral impulse have played a significant role in American life since before the Revolution and form part of the central governing myths of the "American Way of Life." One of the reasons that the founders of the college chose this particular spot of northeast Ohio was to take advantage of the "salubrious climate" (according to an early college catalogue) far from the corrupting influence of the city.

This colloquium will explore some of the implications of being out in the country, not by any means overlooking the contradictions that are present in the whole dichotomy of city life versus country life. Plenty of people have hated the country. But equally as many—particularly generations of Hiram students—have loved it! The books which will be read, discussed and written about are drawn from literature, history, biography, as well as documents about rural life. There will be opportunities to explore the surrounding area in order to sample aspects of local, rural life in order to compare them with examples used in class. A field trip to the Jonathan Hale Farm and Village in Bath, operated by the Western Reserve Historical Society, will be part of the colloquium.

Readings will be from the following:

- Wright Morris, The Home Place
- Nathaniel Hawthorne, Blithedale Romance
- Joan Chase, During the Reign of the Queen of Persia
- Garrison Keillor, Lake Wobegone Days
- Verlyn Klinkenborg, Mowing Hay
- George Delli, The Earth Abideth
LIBERAL EDUCATION AND THE CLASSICS

Humans eat in order to live but we do not live in order to eat. Economic goods are a means to life but they are not its sufficient end. If we remind ourselves of this we begin to understand the relationship between "practical education" and "liberal education," between the useful arts and the liberal arts. Ultimately, the ends of liberal education are the development of the arts of apprehending, understanding and knowing.

Liberal education starts with an understanding of the Western intellectual tradition, the transmission of which begins in earnest Winter quarter for Hiram freshmen. This Colloquium will help prepare for that freshman two-course sequence, "The Idea of the West," by reading, discussing, interpreting, and writing about four classic works that are important as tangible embodiments of the Western intellectual tradition.

The texts are: Shakespeare, Richard II, Melville, Billy Budd, Conrad, Heart of Darkness and a future classic (in the instructor's humble opinion!), Norman Maclean's A River Runs Through It.

Each of the books raises questions about the nature of man, his relationship to civilization, government and society and his claim to freedom. In this sense the books are both timeless and timely. They are furthermore all works of fine art. They have the additional advantage of being written at considerably different times in our history allowing us to speculate on the extent to which one author has stood on the shoulders of another. The texts are not long but they are complex and demanding.

Class time will be devoted to discussion of the books and student writing. The instructor's role will be primarily to guide discussion, help define the issues, and raise questions. Our goals will be to develop the powers of reason and understanding and acquire new perspectives. Students will write four papers of moderate length, one on each of the texts. We will meet first period.

Gary Craig (Vice President for College Advancement and Dean of Admissions at Hiram) taught in the honors program at the Universities of Delaware and Washington prior to coming to Hiram. His academic interests include history, literature and politics; personal interests include sports, music and travel.
MEDICINE AND LITERATURE

This course examines literary portrayals of the problems encountered by those facing medical crises—both the victims of the ill health and the medical professionals working with them. Writers have often chosen such subjects because confrontations with serious health problems reveal much about the character and the values of the people involved, both the afflicted and individuals and those around them. Such subjects involve dramatic conflicts challenging to writers who, by transforming them into plays, poems, and stories, make those issues available for the reader's contemplation.

Texts for the course:

William Carlos Williams, The Doctor Stories
Jon Mukand, ed. Sutured Words: Contemporary Poetry About Medicine
Shaffer, Equus
Powell, Elephant Man
Kopit, Wings
Olive, Standing on My Knees
Hoffman, As Is

(the last five are plays)

Papers:

Students will write four papers for the class, one of which will be a documented library research paper. Papers will be discussed in class in draft form before the revised and corrected final paper is handed in.

Exams:

The course will include one final exam. Occasional quizzes will serve as checks on the reading. Students' grades depend on class participation, papers, quizzes, and the exam.

Carol Donley, Professor of English. Academic Background: B.A., Hiram College; M.A., Kent State; Ph.D., Kent State. Academic Interests: Modern American and British Literature, modern drama, interdisciplinary studies between literature and science.
THE GREAT LAKES

Referred to as the "Sweatwater Seas" by early French explorers, the Great Lakes have played a vital role in the development of an important section of the nation. In this colloquium we will look at the natural history, geography, human history, ecology, economy and politics of the Great Lakes region.

Four short papers and two oral presentations will be required of students. Group discussions, lectures, and a possible field trip will be features of the course. The class will meet Period 4.

Required readings will be put on reserve in the Library. Included will be:

- Ashworth, William. The Late Great Lakes: An Environmental History
- Bowen, Dana. Lore of the Lakes
- Burns, Noel H. Eerie: The Lake that Survived
- Eichenlaub, Val. Weather and Climate of the Great Lakes Region
- Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago. The Great Lakes Economy
- Feltman, Charles E. Great Lakes Maritime History: Bibliography and Sources of Information
- Flader, Susan L. The Great Lakes Forest
- Great Lakes Tomorrow. Decisions for the Great Lakes
- Hatcher, Harlan. The Great Lakes
- Havighurst, Walter. The Great Lakes Reader
- Heilman, Ronald. Great Lakes Transportation in the 80's
- Mason, Ronald V. Great Lakes Archaeology
- Piper, Don Courtney. The International Law of the Great Lakes
- Tannen, Helen Hornbeck, ed. Atlas of Great Lakes Indian History

Gorman L. Duffett, Director of the Library. Academic Background: A.B., Marietta College; M.A., Stanford University; M.S.L.S., Western Reserve University; Ph.D., University of Pittsburgh.
STUDIES IN SELF-IDENTITY

The nature of the self has fascinated human beings as far back as the Greek philosopher, Socrates, who insisted that self-knowledge was the most important knowledge to possess. But his advice to "know thyself" leads to the equally important questions "What is the nature of the human self?" In science, philosophy, literature, and art, human beings have addressed this topic by raising other questions concerning the concepts of the self and self-identity; How is the self distinguished from the world and other human beings? Does our identity change or remain the same throughout our lives? Do we possess a moral or social self-identity? How do we create or lose our self-identity? Is self-knowledge possible or desirable?

Some of the most interesting explorations into the human self are to be found in works of literature. Our colloquium will read and discuss various literary presentations of the self in modern literature, including plays, short stories, and brief novels. In discussing the works of literature, the class will focus upon the presentation of the self in terms of the individual, social, political, philosophical, physical, economic, sexual, and artistic dimensions of human life. These works will be read in order for the student to raise questions concerning their own self-identity with respect to the past, present, and future.

Classes will consist primarily of discussion with some oral presentations by students as well. The class will also watch and discuss a number of film adaptions of the works of literature read in class. Students will write several short papers on the assigned works and other literary works. The colloquium will meet during 6 & 7 periods on Monday and Thursday afternoons.

Texts:

Henrik Ibsen, A Doll's House
Joseph Conrad, Heart of Darkness
Kyoumouke Adutagawa, Rashomon
Herman Melville, Bartleby
Virginia Woolf, Mrs. Dalloway
James Joyce, Dubliners
Ken Kesey, One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest
Heinrich Boll, The Lost Honor of Katharina Blum
We commonly assume that adults and children are very different: Adults are powerful, controlled, competent, responsible, realistic, knowledgeable, hard-working, logical, and occupied with serious and eternal questions; children are helpless, spontaneous, incompetent, irresponsible, imaginative, ignorant, playful, emotional, and occupied with trivial and ephemeral concerns. In addition, we tend to assume that growing up means leaving behind the childish ways and taking on the adult characteristics. In this colloquium we will examine which of the assumed differences between adults and children are real and to what extent individual development consists of giving up the one set of characteristics in exchange for the other.

Readings will consist of literature, drama, poetry, essays and articles. We will examine four themes in the developmental process through which children become adults: Significant Others, Work and Play, Children and Adults in Society, and Being Grown Up (finding a meaning in life).

Class time will be used for analysis and discussion of readings and some lectures. Each student will write four papers and give two oral presentations. One of the papers or presentations will be on a topic of special interest to the student. The class will meet 11-12 MThF (Wednesdays are reserved for convocations).

The complete reading list is still to be chosen, but will include at least one film, some additional short stories, as well as the following:

Excerpts from Arthur Koestler. The Act of Creation
Dylan Thomas. "Fern Hill"
St. Exupery. The Little Prince
Athol Fugard. Master Harold and the Boys
Joshua Meyrowitz. "The Adultlike Child and the Childlike Adult"
Diana Baumrind. "Reciprocal Rights and Responsibilities of Parents and Children"
Herb Gardner. A Thousand Clowns

THE UNITED STATES AND ITS COLONIES

When Americans hear the words "empire," "Imperialism," and "colonies," several images spring to mind: The ancient worlds of Greece and Rome; the European explorers of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries who claimed strange and far away lands for their sovereigns; the British, French, German, and Japanese empires of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; or, perhaps, the "evil empire" that has obsessed so many American leaders since World War II. When asked to apply these concepts to their own nation's history, most Americans would point to how the thirteen American colonies defeated the great British Empire and won their independence. Americans often forget, however, that world history contains evidence not only of "other people's imperialism," but of their own imperialism, empire, and colonies.

In this colloquium we will explore the American Empire with its colonies and subjugated peoples. After defining and describing various forms of imperialism, we will examine America's political and socioeconomic policies toward its colonies in North America, the Caribbean, the Pacific, and Africa. We will concentrate on how those policies changed over time and on the nature of indigenous adaptation or resistance to American domination.

Readings include material written by American politicians and historians, as well as the literature of the colonial peoples themselves. Occasional lectures will provide background information. We will spend the bulk of class time discussing and analyzing the assigned readings. Each week students will prepare a brief oral critique of the required readings. Six short essays (approx. 3 pages each) will answer questions posed in class. A final essay (approx. 10 pages) will ask the student to analyze the major issues raised by the readings and discussions. The class will meet during Periods 647 M-Th.

Readings will include, among other works:

William A. Williams, Empire as a Way of Life
John Reithart, Black Elk Speaks
Steve Talbot, Roots of Oppression: The American Indian Question
Ramone Z. Ruiz, Cuba: The Making of a Revolution
Stephen R. Shalom, The United States and the Philippines
I. K. Somaranta, Black Scandal: America and the Liberian Labor Crisis
Adalberto Lopez, The Puerto Ricans: Their History, Culture, and Society
Noel J. Kast, Hawaii: Islands Under the Influence
Gordon Lewis, Virgin Islands: A Caribbean Lilliput
Carl Reina, Micronesia at the Crossroads

Dr. Nathan Godfried: B.A., N.A., Ph.D., University of Wisconsin-Madison. Author of a book on American foreign economic relations and of articles on American labor and broadcasting. Teaches courses on recent American history, U.S. foreign relations, American economic history, and Middle East history.
By rationality we mean thought or behavior that conforms to some system of rules or logical reasoning that is generally regarded as being fundamental, sound, even crucial. The purpose of this colloquium is to explore systems of rationality and search for answers to these questions: What are the limitations of such systems? How universal are they or should they be? What is a paradox? Can a paradox exist within a rational system? Given the negative connotation of "irrationality", are departures from rationality ever acceptable or desirable?

Much of what we study will involve mathematical concepts. Students who have completed a full curriculum of high school mathematics will be adequately prepared. Those who enjoy logic games, puzzles and problem solving may find this colloquium particularly interesting. We will study the foundations of systems of rationality and investigate paradoxes, attempting to "resolve" them. We will study models of human behavior, seeking the limits of their applicability and validity. We'll also have some fun with a few of the classical paradoxes, the folklore of mathematical, and the Puzzle of the Week.

Students will write four short papers and make two oral presentations. There will also be two examinations.

This colloquium meets periods 667, Monday and Thursday.

Required and recommended readings may include all or part of the following:

Wickelgren, How to Solve Problems
Rubinstein and Pfeiffer, Concepts in Problem Solving
Gardner, aha! Gotcha

Scholars believe that the classical dramas of Greek tragedy were sung rather than spoken. Around 1600, a group of artists in Florence, Italy attempted to revive this ancient Greek practice. The result of their experimentation was the birth of a new art-form: Opera — drama expressed through music. As opera rapidly grew in popularity, it developed into two distinct types: serious or grand opera, and comic opera. In turn, comic opera spawned two types of musical theatre that remain popular today: Operetta and the Musical.

This colloquium will study the development of the three major types of musical theatre: Opera, Operetta and the Musical. Class meetings will involve limited lectures, discussions of outside readings, and viewings, analyses and discussions of video cassette performances of two operas, two operettas and two musicals. Each student will write four short papers and give at least one oral presentation. The class will meet 4th period.

Outside reading and musical works will be selected from the following:

Monteverdi: Orfeo
Haydn: The Magic Flute
Bizet: Carmen
J. Strauss: Die Fledermaus
Bernstein: Candide
Sondheim: Sunday in the Park with George
Sondheim: Sweeney Todd
Wodden, Ethan: Splendid Art of Opera
Donnington, Robert: The Opera
Grout, Donald: Short History of Opera
Newman, Ernest: Stories of the Great Operas
Green, Stanley: World of Musical Comedy
THE REALITIES OF RUSSIA

We Americans tend to think of Russia as an enemy, a threat to our way of life, a country given to causing trouble from Warsaw to San Salvador, from Lebanon to Cambodia. This image of Russia is indeed one of the realities, an aspect that this colloquium will devote much time to. But there are other realities which deserve the serious student's close attention. Her history is remarkable, for she has faced through the centuries problems of astonishing complexity, caused by a harsh climate and countless invasions, which make her experience so different from ours. Russia's solution to her problems, while not to our liking, for they have to do with such unattractive institutions as autocracy and serfdom, nevertheless, enabled her to find the strength to surmount the many invasions and become one of the main states in Europe and indeed the largest state in the world.

There are other realities of Russia, realities which make her more than just a country which survived many difficult times. We refer here to Russia's culture, which has produced music, literature, ballet, and scientific advances, of such high quality that they are permanently part of mankind's treasury of art and science. What symphony repertoire would leave out Tchaikovsky or Shostakovich, where is the serious reader who has not thrilled to the lines of Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, and Solzhenitsyn, what chemistry student has not spent many hours gazing at Mendeleev's Periodic Table? Who did not marvel at the first sputnik?

A country which has produced so much art, literature, science—and trouble—for the world deserves study. This colloquium will range over the history and culture of Russia, looking at topics as diverse as fifteenth century Kremlin churches, and twentieth century revolutions, nineteenth century composers, and twentieth century forced labor camps.

Required Books:

David Shipler, Russia, Broken Idols, Solemn Dreams
J. Lawrence, History of Russia (paperback)
SOCIETY AND THE ARTS

The study of man and the world of aesthetics is crucial to the process of self-reflection. The fine and performing arts present us with a new and exciting avenue for this exploration. The purpose of this course is to examine the arts and discover how and why they influence us. Art, music, dance, and theatre provide us with opportunities to examine ourselves in relationship to today's ever-changing society in many new and exciting ways. The readings and assignments are designed to encourage students to scrutinize the effects that the arts have on them as individuals as well as, how the arts have been, and currently are, changed by our heritage and culture.

Class time will be devoted to discussion of the assigned readings. Each student will write several papers, maintain a journal, and give oral presentations on topics related to our discussions. Field trips will be made to various cultural events in northeastern Ohio. The field trip fee will be approximately $50.00 to $75.00 to cover extra expenses for tickets, etc.

Text:

Explorations in the Arts by Pinciss, Danziger, Basquin & Dynes

THINKING THE UNTHINKABLE

At 8:10 a.m. on August 6, 1945, Hiroshima became the first target for the military use of a nuclear bomb. Sixty-eight percent of the buildings of that city of 340,000 were destroyed, and 70,000 persons were killed. As we know, that bomb was relatively small by today's standards, as most nuclear warheads are now 50 to 80 times more powerful. We also know that there are thousands of such weapons in the hands not only of our nation, but of others as well.

This colloquium, therefore, proposes that we think carefully about what this weaponry means for mankind. We shall primarily focus on weapons policies and moral principles after reviewing the history of nuclear weapons and strategies for their use and prevention. In other words, we shall examine the debate about whether nuclear weapons serve the common good, protect human rights, and insure justice.

Along the way we shall discuss related topics such as the just war theory, the Cuban missile crisis, psychological studies of survivors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, treaties for control or disarmament of nuclear weapons, and the arts of the atomic age.

We shall read and discuss different points of view by those who favor a strong nuclear policy of deterrence and by those who are opposed. We shall go to Washington, D.C. to talk to representatives of various groups concerned about nuclear arms, pro and con. We shall do a reader's theatre production of the security hearing of J. Robert Oppenheimer, who was instrumental in developing the first bomb but who opposed the hydrogen bomb project.

In short, by thinking about the unthinkable we shall explore what it means to be human in the nuclear age, and we shall seek to use the resources of liberal education in our quest.

Students will write three short papers: a critique, a position paper, and a briefing paper. Each student will also complete a longer library research paper on a topic of his or her choosing. Sample topics might be: "Children and Nuclear Weapons," "Accidents Involving Nuclear Arms," "Laser Technology and SDI," "A Nuclear Winter?" "Humor in the Nuclear Age," "Religious Responses to the Nuclear Arms Race," and so on. Two short talks are also a part of the general requirement for each colloquium.

Readings will be selected from works like these:

Ford, John C. "The Morality of Obliteration Bombing"
Kipphardt, Heinz. In the Matter of J. Robert Oppenheimer
Lackey, Ronald. Moral Principles and Nuclear Weapons
Lifton, Robert J. Death in Life

Thomas Nicolls, Professor of Religion and College Chaplain. Academic Background: B.A., Park College; B.D., Louisville Presbyterian Seminary; M.A., Ph.D., Ohio University. Academic Interests: Religion and culture. Other Interests: trombone, clowning, woodworking.
LOVING RELATIONSHIPS

Is there anything more important to you than the loving relationships in your life? For me, there is not. I base this conviction on two assumptions:

1. Human beings want and need loving, satisfying interpersonal relationships.

2. Loving is a learned behavior that requires knowledge, skills, and dedicated hard work.

Loving relationships will be explored from an interpersonal communication perspective. To love another person without his/her knowing and feeling your love is to no avail. This means love is a "verb." It is action oriented, and the indicators of our actions are our verbal interactions and nonverbal messages.

Interpersonal communication bears the critical attributes of honesty and validation. When a person is honest, he/she deliberately attempts to describe his/her present experience and invites another to share in the experience. When a person is validating, he/she understands another and affirms his/her worth in the experience.

How does a person move toward more honesty and greater validation? Loving relationships are continual growth processes. This colloquium will explore these concepts through readings, discussions, reflections and observations. Students will write four brief papers and will make two oral presentations. The class will meet Period 4.

Selected readings:

Henrik Ibsen. A Doll's House
Daniel Kayes. Flowers for Algernon
Plato. Phaedrus
Anne Tyler. Dinner at the Homesick Restaurant, 1982

Linda Pierce, Associate Professor of Communication. Academic Background: B.A., Otterbein College; M.A. and Ph.D., Kent State University; additional work, Ohio University. Academic Interests: gender and communication, persuasion and attitude change, decision-making, nonverbal communication. Personal Interests: sailing, tennis, running, cross country skiing.
Among the countless victims of the Nazi Era very large numbers of Jewish civilians are included. Recently, however, the claim has been made that in fact only small numbers of Jews were killed under Nazi authority.

In our colloquium we shall have the chance to examine this claim in light of such things as the history of the Holocaust itself, the development of Western anti-Judaism, the attitudes of the Nazi period, the Nazi documents, the newspaper accounts, the works of art, the eyewitness materials (photos, films, personal statements of survivors), and the contemporary response of writers, rabbis and Christian clergy.

Colloquium activities include films (World at War-Genocide, Night and Fog, etc.), slides (I Never Saw Another Butterfly), class reports by students, presentations by several college faculty members as well as by Jewish and Christian religious leaders. Particularly important are personal visits with Jewish survivors of the Holocaust. Our reading will include Y. Bauer, A History of the Holocaust, a book on the death camp Treblinka and newspaper accounts from the period of the Holocaust. As time permits we shall also retrace the tragic story of the Jews who almost survived aboard the ship St. Louis.

"Can a machine think?" Many dismiss the question as self-evident nonsense. After all, we call ourselves Homo sapiens; declare that we think, therefore we are; and consider ourselves lifted above the rest of earthy beasts by our capacity for symbol making. If we're lifted above the beasts why talk about thinking machines?

Yet we find the idea of "thinking machines" irresistible. Our history is full of attempts to make artificial intelligence. The purpose of this colloquium is to explore these attempts particularly in the computer era.

While programming skills are not essential for this colloquium, any student who has done some programming in high school or on a home computer will better appreciate the issues involved. We will experiment with some artificial intelligence programs written in LISP.

Students will write four short papers and a term paper. There will be two oral presentations and two examinations. Some computer-oriented exercises will be required.

Required and recommended readings will include:

CHALLENGES, CHOICES, AND CHANGES: THE COLLEGE EXPERIENCE

The college experience is a unique stage of personal and intellectual development. For many of you, arrival at Hiram College is the first time you have lived in a community away from family members. It may be the initial step toward acquiring greater independence at, at the same time, developing interdependence within a new environment. Whatever the background and previous experiences of college students, all will inevitably be challenged by their experiences in the next four years.

Theorist Arthur Chickering has suggested that the stage of "young adulthood," ages 17 to middle or late 20's, contains developmental "tasks" which are distinct from either adolescence or adulthood. These seven major areas of student development will be studies in relationship to major aspects of the college experience.

This colloquium will explore the cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal dimensions of development as a young adult in a college community through readings, lectures, and discussions. Students will keep a journal throughout the colloquium. They will also write three brief papers, a longer library research paper, and make two oral presentations. The colloquium will meet periods 6 and 7, Monday and Thursday.

Readings:

John N. Gardner & A. Jerome Jawler. College is Only the Beginning: A Student Guide to Higher Education

Gerald Corey, I Never Knew I Had a Choice

Selected articles from the psychology literature and readings of fiction which examine development as a young adult.

Lynn B. Taylor, Associate Dean of Students/Director of Counseling. Academic Background: B.A., Western Michigan; M.Ed., Ph.D., Kent State University, licensed psychologist and licensed professional clinical counselor, State of Ohio. Academic Interests: counseling psychology, organizational development, psychology of women, student personnel, community mental health. Personal Interests: horses, rodeo, spectator sports, reading, needlecrafts, and chocolate.
Psychologist Arthur Chickering has suggested that, as our society approaches something akin to universal higher education, the new conditions of our increasingly technological society have created another developmental period tucked in between adolescence and adulthood. This developmental period, spanning from seventeen to the middle or late twenties, Chickering has identified as "young adulthood." Chickering’s thesis suggests that there are seven major areas of student development ("vectors" in his terminology) that young adults are engaged in and that these "vectors" can be considered in relation to six major aspects of college. This course will use Chickering’s thesis as a "jumping off place." We will examine Chickering’s theory and then view the college experience, both in terms of personal development theory and in terms of literature about the college experience.

Students will begin the course by taking a human potential instrument, the Personal Skills Map (PSM), which is a self-assessment of interpersonal, intrapersonal, and career/life management skills. The course will then utilize two books, College is Only the Beginning: A Student Guide to Higher Education, and I Never Knew I Had a Choice, as well as a packet of readings from literature, as basic texts for the course. The intent of the course is to focus on personal skills development by first, learning about the actual skill—e.g. assertiveness, time management, decision-making; and second, by reading about "young adulthood" characters in fiction who are also dealing with issues of personal growth. Examples of such reading are "Of This Time, Of That Place" by Lionel Trilling; "In The Region of Ice" by Joyce Carol Oates; and a selection from Blackbird Winter, by Margaret Hand.

A response journal will be kept throughout the colloquium and students will be expected to make weekly entries in response to guest speakers, small group discussion, and assigned readings. Students will write four brief papers and will be expected to make two oral presentations in class.

Stuart Tennant, Dean of Students. Academic Background: B.A.; M.A. (English) Ohio State University; A.B.D. (Student Personnel) Ohio State University. Academic Interests: English and American literature, developmental psychology, English composition, Teaching of English as a Second Language (TESOL), student personnel. Personal Interests: tennis, jogging, adult coed soccer, participatory parenting, noon-time "killer" basketball, and reading fiction about the college experience.
Psychologist Arthur Chickering has suggested that, as our society approaches something akin to universal higher education, the new conditions of our increasingly technological society have created another developmental period tucked in between adolescence and adulthood. This developmental period, spanning from seventeen to the middle or late twenties, Chickering has identified as "young adulthood." Chickering's thesis suggests that there are seven major areas of student development ("vectors" in his terminology) that young adults are engaged in and that these "vectors" can be considered in relation to six major aspects of college. This course will use Chickering's thesis as a "jumping off place." We will examine Chickering's theory and then view the college experience, both in terms of personal development theory and in terms of literature about the college experience.

Students will begin the course by taking a human potential instrument, the Personal Skills Map (PSM), which is a self-assessment of intrapersonal, interpersonal, and career/life management skills. The course will then utilize two books, College Is Only the Beginning: A Student Guide to Higher Education, and I Never Knew I Had a Choice, as well as a packet of readings from literature, as basic texts for the course. The intent of the course is to focus on personal skills development by first, learning about the actual skill—e.g. assertiveness, time management, decision-making; and second, by reading about "young adulthood" characters in fiction who are also dealing with issues of personal growth. Examples of such reading are "Of This Time, Of That Place" by Lionel Trilling; "In The Region of Ice" by Joyce Carol Oates; and a selection from Blackbird Winter, by Margaret Mead.

A response journal will be kept throughout the colloquium and students will be expected to make weekly entries in response to guest speakers, small group discussion, and assigned readings. Students will write four brief papers and will be expected to make two oral presentations in class.

Stuart Tennanc, Dean of Students. Academic Background: B.A.; M.A. (English) Ohio State University; A.B.D. (Student Personnel) Ohio State University. Academic Interests: English and American literature, developmental psychology, English composition, Teaching of English as a Second Language (TESOL), student personnel. Personal Interests: tennis, jogging, adult coed soccer, participatory parenting, noon-time "killer" basketball, and reading fiction about the college experience.
COSMOSOPHY, COSMOGONY, COSMOLOGY

The sky on a clear, cloudless night is a wonderful sight. It is almost frightening to realize that we see only about 3000 stars in a galaxy of billions of stars and that there are billions of galaxies. The moon and planets are insignificant specks in a vast universe. Humans have always observed the heavens. Early history records the use of the movement and position of objects in the sky as gods, to tell time, to create calendars, to navigate, and to predict the future.

Early beliefs and theories about the origin of the universe (cosmosophy) led gradually to serious studies of the origin and evolution of the universe (cosmogony) and to the study of the universe (cosmology). Efforts to really understand what can be observed in an orderly and harmonious universe (cosmos) are on-going. The history of these efforts include magnificent insights that led to new understanding. The questions we have today, when answered, will certainly alter our view of reality. Will the universe expand forever? Will it collapse? What is its shape? Are there many black holes? What is the source of energy in quasars?

This colloquium is not a science course, but a course about science. The emphasis will be to discuss the development of Ideas about the universe. The course will be non-mathematical and is intended for all students, not just potential science majors. Class time will be devoted to lectures, discussions, and analyses of assigned readings. Each student will write four papers and prepare two oral presentations. The class will meet period 4 MTThF.

The text will be Drama of the Universe by George O. Abell. Material and readings will also be selected from other sources including:

- *Before Philosophy*, Henri Frankfort
- *Greek Science*, Benjamin Farrington
- *The Ascent of Man*, J. Bronowski
- *Physics as a Liberal Art*, James S. Trefil
- Original writings of Plato, Aristotle, Euclid, Ptolemy, Copernicus, Galileo, Newton, Maxwell, and Einstein

Gordon Wepfer, Department of Physics. Academic Background: B.S.E., University of Michigan; H.S.E., University of Michigan, Ph.D., University of Michigan. Academic Interests: stellar evolution, quantum theory, solid state theory.
COLLOQUIUM EVALUATION

Colloquium Title and Professor

1. Student Self-Evaluation

A. This was my _____ (1st, 2nd, etc.) choice from the Colloquia offered.

B. Why did you pick this particular Colloquium? (Check as many as apply)

  - The course description sounded interesting
  - Professor was in my prospective major
  - Had an interest in this subject
  - Heard favorable recommendation about the professor
  - Other

C. How much time per week (including study, class, studio, lab, etc.) do you actually spend working on your Colloquium?

  - 0-5 hours
  - 6-10 hours
  - 11-15 hours
  - 16-20 hours
  - over 20 hours

D. Independent of how much you liked the Colloquium, how much do you feel you learned? (Circle one number)

  - little
  - an average amount
  - much

  - 1
  - 2
  - 3
  - 4
  - 5

E. In summary, rate your satisfaction with this Colloquium as a whole. (Circle one number)

  - little
  - an average amount
  - much

  - 1
  - 2
  - 3
  - 4
  - 5

F. What grade do you expect to receive in this Colloquium?

  - A
  - B
  - C
  - D

II. Evaluation concerning the purposes of the Colloquium Program.

A. Evaluate the extent to which this Colloquium focused on communication by answering the following:

1. How many papers did you write for your Colloquium? _____

2. Of the papers which you wrote, how many were:

   - 3-5 pages
   - 5-10 pages
   - 10-15 pages
   - more than 15 pages

3. Did you receive help concerning your writing? _____

   Please comment.

4. Did you prepare and present orally a speech, paper, or report to your Colloquium? _____
5. Did your Colloquium encourage discussion? ____

6. Did you receive help concerning your oral communication? ____
   Please comment.

B. Did you receive helpful academic advising? ____
   Please comment.

C. To what extent did your Colloquium stimulate you to think critically about your attitudes on significant issues and questions?
   (Circle one number)
   little 2 an average amount 3 much 5

III. Please comment further on your Freshman Colloquium.

A. What were the significant strengths of the Colloquium program?

B. What would improve the Colloquium program?

C. What was your evaluation of your assigned readings?
DISTRIBUTION OF CREDIT FOR FRESHMAN COLLOQUIUM

Colloquium Number and Title: 101-21 Young Adulthood: The College Experience

Professor: Stuart Tennant

Year and Quarter Taught: 1989-1990 Fall

Brief Description of the Colloquium (Two or three sentence summary):

See attached.

Distribution of Credit Hours: (We assume that category 1 will receive at least one hour because of your emphasis on written and oral communication. Employ those categories which apply to your Colloquium; the total must equal five.)

(1) Language and Composition: 2
(2) Literature: 1
(3) Mathematics and Science:
(4) Social Science: 2
(5) Arts, Philosophy and Religion:

Total Credit Hours: 5

Signature: [Signature]
Date: 3-15-90
SYLLABUS

Young Adulthood: The College Experience
FRC 101-20 6:7 M, Th
FRC 101-21 6:7 T, F

Donney Castle Seminar Room

Instructor: Stuart Tennant

Texts:

I Never Knew I Had a Choice -- Corey
College Is Only the Beginning -- Gardner & Jewler
Selected Readings

Purpose:
This colloquium is designed to help students develop an awareness and understanding of the level and nature of their personal skills and, by focusing on these personal skills, to enhance students' personal growth and development.

Objectives:
1. To promote self-awareness and develop values clarification skills.
2. To develop skills in interpersonal communication.
3. To promote a sense of empathy and understanding of others.
4. To develop a sense of comfort and acceptance in the transition to college life.
5. To encourage involvement with all dimensions of the college experience.
6. To develop "coping skills" so as to facilitate the adjustment to college.

Course Requirements:
Assigned readings, active class participation, completion of in-and-out-of-class assignments, response journal, 2 oral presentations, four short essays, and reading quizzes.

Quizzes:
There will be weekly quizzes on chapter readings assigned each week from the two texts College Is Only The Beginning and I Never Knew I Had a Choice, and the Readings selection(s) assigned for that week.

Oral Presentations:
There will be two (2) oral presentations of 5-7 minutes each; the 1st presentation will be a speech to persuade: "Why I am choosing the major I have declared," or "Why I have decided not to choose a major at this time." Due: week of September 26-30. The 2nd presentation will be a speech to inform, in which you will describe the research topic you have chosen for your short research paper. Due: week of November 7-11.
Written Assignments: There will be three (3) short themes (2-3 typewritten pages) assigned the second, fifth, and seventh weeks of the term, and a short research paper (5-7 typewritten pages) due the last week of classes.

Response Journal: You need to keep a journal throughout the quarter. You may use any kind of notebook you wish but you should plan to write a minimum of 5 pages each week. The purpose of the journal is to reflect on your own experience, both past and present, and on your personal growth and development in light of this course. Journals will be checked midway through the quarter—it would benefit you to do a little each week rather than wait until the last minute.

Class Participation: This class is intended to be a participatory learning experience; thus, your 100 possible points are not simply awarded for "being there." You are to come prepared, having read the assigned material, and be willing to interact with your classmates and the instructor.

Grading:
- Quizzes (10 @ 10 pts. each) 100
- Response Journal 100
- Themes (3 @ 75 pts. each) 225
- Research Paper 125
- Oral Presentations (2 @ 50 pts. each) 100
- Class Participation 100

Grading Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>712-750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>675-711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>652-674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>622-651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>600-621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>577-599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>547-576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>522-546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>502-521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>472-501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-</td>
<td>450-471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Below 450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monday(Tuesday): Administration and scoring of "Personal Skills Map" (PSM). Introduction to student development theory--Chickering's 7 vectors.

Thursday(Friday): Student development theorists continued (Perry and Kohlberg); discussion of assigned readings and weekly reading quiz.

Overview: Not only are you making the transition from high school to college but, as Chickering suggests, you are also making the transition from adolescence to young adulthood (ages 17--mid-20's). During this period of "young adulthood" there are 7 sets of developmental tasks--or "vectors:" 1) Achieving Competence; 2) Managing Emotions; 3) Becoming Autonomous; 4) Establishing Identity; 5) Freeing Interpersonal Relationships; 6) Clarifying Purposes; and 7) Developing Integrity. While Chickering addresses students' psycho-social development, theorists such as William Perry and Lawrence Kohlberg have focused on students' intellectual and moral development as well. Perry, for instance, notes nine levels of intellectual development, beginning with Position 1: Basic Duality, and ending with Position 9: Developing Commitment, the highest level of intellectual development. Kohlberg cites six levels of moral and ethical development, beginning with Stage 1, "Punishment and Obedience," and culminating in Stage 6, "Universal ethical principles." All three theorists believe that "higher is better." Thus, in order to develop, one needs to move "up" to the next highest stage or stages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Gardner &amp; Jewler--Chap. 5, &quot;Study Skills: Planning and Preparing&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 19-23</td>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>Readings--&quot;Letter From Birmingham Jail&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VCR--&quot;A Day to Remember&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st Theme Assignment due: 9/22-23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monday(Tuesday):**
Discussion of Corey chapters--video tape A Day to Remember... preparatory to "Letter From Birmingham Jail;" discussion of Trilling's short story; introduction to Empathy.

**Thursday(Friday):**
Introduction to Time Management--small group discussion of time management techniques; discussion of King reading; weekly reading quiz.

**Overview:**

(Empathy)--Nelson and Low define empathy as "How accurately you think you understand another person's thoughts, feelings, and behavior and how able you are to accept them."

The PSM skill of empathy can be likened, in some ways, to Chickering's 5th vector, Freeing Interpersonal Relationships, in which Chickering speaks of "...developing tolerance for a wider range of persons. Tolerance [Chickering explains] means not only to 'put up with,' but also not to be upset by dosages that earlier caused distress. Ideally, this tolerance develops not through increased resistance and immunization, but through increased capacity to respond to persons in their own right rather than as stereotypes or transference objects calling for particular conventions." (p.15)

(Time Management)--Nelson and Low define this personal skill as "How effective you are in organizing and using time to accomplish personal and career goals." Time management can be related to Chickering's 1st vector, Developing Competence. Certainly developing intellectual competence, one of the "tines" of competence, is related to students achieving the synthesizing and integrating skills necessary to manage several demanding classes, co-curricular activities, and their own personal lives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td>Interpersonal Comfort;</td>
<td>Corey--Chap. 8, &quot;Intimate Relationships&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 26-30</td>
<td>Communication Skills;</td>
<td>Gardner &amp; Jewler--Chap. 12, &quot;Standing Up for Yourself Without Stepping on Others&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Sexuality</td>
<td>Readings--&quot;Dangerous Parties&quot; &quot;Cecilia Rosas&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st Oral Presentation due</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Monday(Tuesday): Communication Style: assertion, deference, and aggression--role plays of roommate conflicts and discussion.

Thursday(Friday): Human Sexuality: guest speaker from Town House II or video tape on sexual attitudes; discussion of "Dangerous Parties" reading; weekly reading quiz.

Overview: (Interpersonal Comfort) (Communication Skills)

The authors describe Interpersonal Comfort as "How you see your own ability to judge appropriate social and physical distance in verbal and non-verbal interactions and how comfortable and relaxed you are with others." (Human Sexuality) With regard to sexuality, you as young adult men and women will, in many instances, gauge your sense of interpersonal comfort and intimacy with others in the context of satisfaction/dissatisfaction with your own sense of sexuality. By "sexuality," we are speaking more in the sense of sex roles--e.g. do you feel comfortable with your own sense of masculinity or feminity or are you unsure of your sense of sex roles?

Chickering's 1st vector, specifically the "time" of developing interpersonal competence, reflects both interpersonal comfort and communication style issues. Chickering notes that "this kind of development is the one of greatest concern to the young adult." This is perhaps all too obvious--being away from home, having new roommate relationships, often new dating relationships and living in close proximity to one another at a residential college can all make this 1st vector predominant for many young adults. Sexuality, while certainly part of Interpersonal Competence, also connects with Chickering's 2nd and 4th vectors. In the 2nd vector, Managing Emotions, Chickering observes, "There are basically two major impulses to manage: aggression and sex." In the 4th vector, Establishing Identity, Chickering cites "clarification of sexual identification" as a major aspect of the 4th vector.
Date | Topic | Assignment
---|---|---
Week 5, Oct. 10-14 | Personal Wellness & Alcohol and Substance Abuse | Corey--Chap. 4, "Your Body and Stress"
| | Gardner & Jewler--Chap. 13, "Developing a Healthy Lifestyle;" Chap. 15, "What You Should Know About Alcohol and Other Drugs"
| | Readings--"White Angel"
| | 2nd Theme Assignment due: 10/13-14

Monday (Tuesday): Wellness Inventory; Physical Testing; Developing a Healthy Lifestyle.

Thursday (Friday): Ann Reiss--workshop on alcohol and substance abuse.
FRIDAY -- CAMPUS DAY -- NO CLASSES

Overview: (Physical Wellness) The personal skill of Physical Wellness is defined by Nelson and Low as "The extent to which you have developed healthy attitudes and disciplined living patterns important in physical health and well being." Chickering's 1st vector, and the "tine" of physical and manual competence; his 2nd vector of Managing Emotions, and his 4th vector of Establishing Identity can all be related to this skill. "Healthy attitudes" have much to do with stress reduction and reflect good physical wellness. Very often much of our identity (4th vector) derives from our physical appearance and sense of well-being; in fact our first self-description is often tied to our physical identity--"I'm strong," "she's pretty," "he's sickly," etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 6</td>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>Gardner &amp; Jewler--Chap. 7, &quot;Choosing a Major, Planning a Career&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 17-24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Corey--Chap. 10, &quot;Work&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Readings--Sophie's Choice, &quot;Chapter One,&quot; p. 3-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday(Tuesday):</td>
<td>Choosing a Major &amp; Planning a Career.</td>
<td>Video: Sophie's Choice; discussion of &quot;Chapter One;&quot; reading quiz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday(Friday):</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Decision-Making) Nelson and Low define this personal skill as &quot;How able you find yourself to be in planning, initiating and implementing effective problem-solving procedures.&quot; This skill can be related to Chickering's 1st vector, the &quot;time&quot; of intellectual competence; and to the 3rd vector, Becoming Autonomous--specifically, instrumental independence--one component of which is the ability to carry out activities on one's own and be self-sufficient in that one can cope with problems without seeking help. The 6th vector, Clarifying Purposes, is the one in which a young adult develops a sense of purpose by answering such questions as &quot;Who am I going to be?&quot; and &quot;Where am I going?&quot; Obviously such questions require decisions to be made in order that they be answered in a meaningful fashion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 7</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 24-28</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Gardner &amp; Jewler</strong>--Chap. 19, &quot;The Minority Student on Campus,&quot; Chap. 20, &quot;The Disabled Student on Campus&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Corey</strong>--Chap. 5, &quot;Sex Roles&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Readings</strong>--&quot;College: DePauw&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3rd Theme Assignment due:</strong> 10/27-28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monday(Tuesday):** Video--*Black Like Me*: discussion of stereotyping, sex roles.

**Thursday(Friday):** Video--*Children of a Lesser God*: discussion of attitudes about "handicaps"--disabilities, age, etc.

**Overview:** (Empathy) As noted in Week 2's overview, Empathy in the PSM is "How accurately you understand another person's thoughts, feelings and behaviors and how able you are to accept them." Again, Chickering's 5th vector, Freeing Interpersonal Relationships; specifically, the aspect of increased tolerance and respect for those of different backgrounds, habits, values, and appearance, is applicable to Nelson and Low's skill of empathy. By focusing on how we treat minorities, handicapped individuals, and engage--to a greater or lesser degree--in sexual stereotyping, we seek to identify and overcome some areas of intolerance and enhance our capacity for empathy.
Date | Topic | Assignment
--- | --- | ---
Week 8 | Commitment Ethic | Gardner & Jewler--Chap. 11, "Establishing Rewarding Human Relationships in College"
Oct. 31-Nov. 4 | | Corey--Chap. 6, "Sexuality," Chap. 7, "Love"
| | Readings--"December 21st"

**Monday(Tuesday):** Making the connection between "commitment" and Chickering's vector of "Developing Purpose."

**Thursday(Friday):** "Intimacy as Commitment;" discussion of expectations for relationships with significant others; discussion of "December 21st;" reading quiz.

**Overview:**

(Commitment Ethic) Nelson and Low describe this personal skill as "How skillful you are in completing projects and job assignments in a dependable manner, even under difficult circumstances." This skill is closely related to time management--perhaps for obvious reasons--and drive strength, which is defined as "How able you are to effectively direct your own energy and motivation to accomplish personal and career goals." "Stick-to-itness" is a simplistic but not inaccurate way to characterize "commitment ethic." Commitment ethic relates to Chickering's 6th vector of Clarifying Purposes in that, until one clarifies and establishes his/her goals relating to vocational plans, life style, and recreational interests, it is difficult to make commitments, much less follow through on those commitments.
Date | Topic | Assignment
--- | --- | ---
Week 9 Nov. 7-11 | Sales Orientation, Drive Strength, Examining the Component of Leadership | Gardner & Jewler--Chap. 17, "On Becoming a Leader"
Readings--"Castle Rock"
2nd Oral Presentation due

Monday (Tuesday): Discussion of leadership--What are its components? What does it mean to lead?
Marcia Everett--guest

Thursday (Friday): Video--"Lord of the Flies"

Overview:
(Sales Orientation) Defined as "How skillful you see yourself being at positively impacting, persuading, influencing others, and in general, making a difference." This is obviously a leadership skill, for "influencers are leaders." This skill relates not only to Chickering's 4th vector, Establishing Identity but also to his 6th vector, Clarifying Purposes for, once one decides to what degree one is or is not a leader, then one can consciously develop leadership (sales) skills and "commit" to such a role.

(Drive Strength) "How able you are to effectively direct your own energy and motivation to accomplish personal and career goals" is how Nelson and Low define this skill. Again this relates to leadership in that we tend to view leaders as "doers"--just think of the Dewar's (pronounced "doers") Scotch whiskey commercials that tout young professionals who are obviously "on the way up." This skill also relates to Chickering's 6th vector of Clarifying Purposes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 10</td>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>Gardner &amp; Jewler--Chap. 10, &quot;How to Integrate Your Living/Learning Environments...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 14-18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Corey--Chap. 12, &quot;Meaning and Values: Putting Life in Perspective&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Readings--&quot;Phineas&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chickering's vector of identity--how the first 3 vectors &quot;add up.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Video--A Separate Peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday(Tuesday):</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chickering's vector of identity--how the first 3 vectors &quot;add up.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday(Friday):</td>
<td></td>
<td>Video--A Separate Peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview:</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Self-Esteem) Perhaps the most synergistic of Nelson and Low's eleven skills, self-esteem is defined as &quot;How satisfied you are with your current thoughts, beliefs, attitudes, general behavior; how much you are currently valuing yourself.&quot; This skill relates readily to interpersonal comfort, assertiveness, decision-making, sales orientation and stress management. Nelson and Low's self-esteem ties to Chickering in several ways. It is similar to the 4th vector of Establishing Identity, one of the primary components of which is meaningful achievement, in that Establishing Identity is synergistic as well since it more than encompasses the 1st, 2nd and 3rd vectors. Again, Nelson and Low's self-esteem ties to Becoming Autonomous (the 3rd vector), which includes manifesting the independence of maturity. Once you feel that you are &quot;in control,&quot; then you have developed a measure of self-esteem and reinforce that self-esteem by asserting that autonomy. Likewise, the ability to successfully Manage Emotions (2nd vector) can be linked to self-esteem, for once one is able to effectively manage one's emotions then interpersonal relationships are enhanced as well. Self-esteem is, then, a kind of &quot;capstone&quot; skill that builds on other skills development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIRST PAPER

Topic "A"

Empathy is defined as "identification with and understanding of the thoughts or feelings of another." (Webster's II) However, in "Letter From Birmingham Jail" Martin Luther King has stated that "shallow understanding from people of good will is more frustrating than absolute misunderstanding from people of ill will." (Why We Can't Wait, p. 85)

Think about your own life experience and a situation in which you or someone else may have fallen short of true empathy and may have been guilty of "shallow understanding." Discuss the experience and demonstrate how "shallow understanding" was hurtful. Be sure to provide an acceptable alternative solution—i.e. how might the situation have been dealt with in a way that truly reflects empathy?

Topic "B"

In "Of This Time, Of That Place" grades are very much a central theme—Tertan's seeming indifference to them; Blackburn's obsession with them; Howe's dilemma in awarding them. In a 750-word essay, examine the various attitudes among college students and their families toward earning high grades. How openly are achievements pursued and displayed? What hypocrisies are generally accepted? What happens when kindness, loyalty, and generosity come into conflict with ambitions? How do they sometimes fuel ambitions? Examine the problem closely and come to a specific conclusion about the way ambition for high grades can affect a student's character for better or worse.

Topic "C"

Francine G. McNairy, in writing the chapter "The Minority Student on Campus" in College Is Only The Beginning, observes, "Since the civil rights movement began, black students and faculty members have weighed the advantages and disadvantages of receiving a college education at a predominantly white college. The advantages often include access to more academic and multicultural resources and a broad social network leading to employment and/or graduate and professional schools. On the minus side, the high dropout level of black students negates the gains, and may be traced to the absence of a social life, differing faculty expectations, racism, and the attitudes of many black freshmen."

Evaluate this statement in light of your experience here already at Hiram. If all or part of McNairy's observations seem "on target," then what might Hiram College do to address these issues in such a way so as to show true empathy, rather than "shallow understanding?"
SECOND PAPER

Topic "A"

As noted in Corey's *I Never Knew I Had a Choice*, psychologist Erik Erikson has maintained that forming intimate relationships is the major task of early adulthood (p. 214). Corey further notes that intimacy can be emotional, intellectual, physical, spiritual, or any combination of these dimensions of a relationship.

Think about your values and what the term "intimacy" means to you. Develop your own definition of intimacy, being sure to relate it to Corey's discussion. Having defined intimacy, then expand your discussion by giving examples of intimacy that support your definition.

Topic "B"

Gardner and Jewler note in *College Is Only The Beginning*, that "Becoming a clear and honest communicator requires three personal qualities: personal clarity, a willingness to risk, and good communication skills." The authors further note that "alternate methods of communicating, such as second-guessing others, cause hurt feelings and frustrated needs, and are the basis for misunderstanding between people" (p. 159).

Using Gardner and Jewler's criteria for constructive communication either look for examples of clear or unclear communication in the readings assigned ("In The Region of Ice," "White Angel," "Dangerous Parties," and "Hills Like White Elephants"). (Hint, you should find lots more examples of unclear communication); or draw from your own personal observation of interaction between and among individuals whom you know. Be careful to formulate a thesis statement and, if you choose to draw from personal experience, be sure to do so only to illustrate your thesis--do not make of this a theme of personal experience only.

Topic "C"

Examine Gardner and Jewler's discussion of "Stress Management" in Chapter 19 and, drawing from personal experience (note: here you are invited to use personal experience) recall a particularly troublesome experience that you were personally involved in. Evaluate your stress/anxiety reaction--i.e. what actually did occur, then review your actions in light of what you now know about stress management and evaluate what you might do differently, should you find yourself in a similar situation again. Be sure to develop a thesis statement for your paper and draw a conclusion from your discussion.
Theme Assignment #3

Topic "A"

Compare and contrast Corey's description of "The All-American Male" (pp 134-138) and traditional male stereotypes with the portrait that the author draws of Xavier Donnell and Maxwell Smyth in the chapter "December 21st" of the novel, Linden Hills. Unspoken in Corey's discussion is the implication that it helps to be white in order to be an All-American male. If this assumption is part of Corey's male stereotype, then what might be some of the cultural differences for a Black "All-American male" and how might these differences account for Xavier and Maxwell's behavior and values?

Topic "B"

Corey's discussions about intimacy and sex roles, as well as Xavier and Maxwell's intense discussion about "to marry or not to marry" and whom to marry, may have raised issues for you as you contemplate "the perfect spouse" or ideal "partner" or "companion" for your own life. Write a paper in which you cite your criteria for an ideal companion and then illustrate from experience or anecdote or illustration the qualities that this ideal companion must possess in order to achieve your ideal.

Topic "C"

In "Castle Rock" from Lord Of The Flies Piggy asks, "Which is better--to have rules and agree, or to hunt and kill?" and again, "Which is better, law and rescue, or hunting and breaking things up?" Knowing that Lord Of The Flies is intentionally allegorical, (Golding has experienced the horror of the Second World War and the insanity of the Nazis intended genocide of the Jews), draw from life in the residence halls as your context and formulate an answer to Piggy's questions. Use examples to illustrate both the pros and cons of your thesis.

Topic "D"

In Knowles' story, "Phineas," Finny seems to have a strange sense of identity--of knowing just who he is, while the narrator, his roommate seems very uncertain about his own identity. At one point, when he puts on Finny's clothes, the narrator looks in the mirror and observes, "I was Phineas, Phineas to the life." Later, at story's end, the narrator states, "Tomorrow, back at Devon, I would be someone else." as Corey notes, our search for identity involves three key questions, "Who am I?" Where am I going?" "Why?" Again, Corey notes, the question "Who am I?" is never settled once and for all, for it can be answered differently at different times in our life. We need to revise our life, especially when old identities no longer seem to supply a meaning or give us direction...we must decide whether to let others tell us who we are or take a stand and define ourselves. (pp 341-342). Write a paper in which you reflect on your own identity. Do you see yourself as being more like Finney--i.e. secure in your own sense of self; more like the narrator--i.e. "trying on" identities; or more like Corey's suggestion--i.e. in transition between your "old" identity (high school, home, etc.) and a "new" identity (who you are now or are in the process of becoming)?

Topic "E"

Using Corey's "Resource 12: Writing Your Own Philosophy of Life" (pp 387-389), and his discussion of "Developing a Philosophy of Life" (pp 346-351), develop your own statement of your "dream" (Sheehy) or philosophy of life.
RESEARCH PAPER ASSIGNMENT

Examine one of the skills areas in the "Personal Skills Map" that may have been in the "change" or low "median" area of your map and use this as the topic for your research. Be sure to invert your skill area to a question—e.g., Why is good time management important for success in college?

Once you have chosen your subject, be sure to limit it—remember, 5-7 pages is not a lengthy paper. Consult section 34, "The Research Paper," in the Harbrace College Handbook (pp. 394-480). The attached "PSM Reading List" is intended to help suggest reference material; it does not constitute a thorough bibliography.
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APPENDIX F
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS TABLES
### TABLE 1
OBSERVED FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES BY GENDER (4 GROUP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 (E '88)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 (C '88)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3 (E '89)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4 (C '89)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2
OBSERVED FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES BY GENDER (2-GROUP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 (E '88, '89)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 (C '88, '89)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3
OBSERVED FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES BY RACE (4 GROUP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>African-American</th>
<th>Caucasian</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>% of group</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 (E '88)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 (C '88)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3 (E '89)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4 (C '89)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 4
OBSERVED FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES BY RACE (2-GROUP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>African-American</th>
<th>Caucasian</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>% of group</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 (E '88, '89)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 (C '88, '89)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5
OBSERVED FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES BY GENDER (2-GROUP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>African-American</th>
<th>Caucasian</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>% of group</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 (Females)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 (Males)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 6
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR 4-GROUP

**GROUP #1 E '88**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre Test</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Post Test</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.60</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>Assertion</td>
<td>25.36</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>5.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.24</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>Deference</td>
<td>15.72</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>60.60</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>65.72</td>
<td>10.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.68</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>20.28</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.48</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>Interpersonal Comfort</td>
<td>17.92</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.76</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>Sales Orientation</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>31.72</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>Drive Strength</td>
<td>33.48</td>
<td>7.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>Decision-Making</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.96</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>14.08</td>
<td>5.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.12</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>Change Orientation</td>
<td>12.76</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.64</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>Stress Management</td>
<td>32.16</td>
<td>8.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.92</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>Physical Wellness</td>
<td>26.40</td>
<td>7.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.48</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>Commitment Ethic</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Instrument - DIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre Test</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Post Test</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.40</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.09</td>
<td>10.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SAT Mean**

978
TABLE 6 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Instrument - CSEQ &quot;Quality of Effort Scales&quot;</th>
<th>Post Test only</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Library</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Course Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Student Union</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Art, Music, Theater</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Athletic/Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>7.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Clubs &amp; Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Personal Experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>6.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Student Acquaintances</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>5.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Science/Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>6.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Dorm/Frat/Soror.</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Topics in Conversation</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Information in Conversation</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>CSEQ &quot;Opinions About College&quot;</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Freshman Colloquium Evaluation</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. D</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. E</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GPA
2.77

Class Rank Percentile
24.55
TABLE 7
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR 4-GROUP
GROUP #2 C ’88

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre Test</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>Instrument - PSM</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Post Test</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 20.11</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>Assertion</td>
<td>28.89</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 6.96</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 18.78</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>Deference</td>
<td>17.52</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 58.62</td>
<td>10.24</td>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>65.33</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 19.41</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>19.85</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 14.15</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>Interpersonal Content</td>
<td>16.81</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 12.74</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>Sales Orientation</td>
<td>14.22</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 31.26</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Drive Strength</td>
<td>34.07</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 11.11</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>Decision-Making</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 15.85</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>16.15</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 12.74</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>Change Orientation</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 32.56</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>Stress Management</td>
<td>34.07</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 26.96</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>Physical Wellness</td>
<td>27.74</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 18.52</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>Commitment Ethic</td>
<td>18.63</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre Test</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>Instrument - DIT</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Post Test</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>13.72</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.27</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAT Mean

1068
TABLE 7 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Instrument - CSEQ &quot;Quality of Effort Scales&quot;</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Course Learning</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Student Union</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Art, Music, Theater</td>
<td>6.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Athletic/Recreation</td>
<td>9.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Clubs &amp; Organizations</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Personal Experiences</td>
<td>6.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Student Acquaintances</td>
<td>6.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Science/Technology</td>
<td>5.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Dorm/Frat/Soror.</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Topics in Conversation</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>CSEQ &quot;Opinions About College&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Freshman Colloquium Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| GPA         | 2.93                          |
| Class Rank Percentile | 17.58            |
TABLE 8
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR 4-GROUP

GROUP #3 E'89

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre Test</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Post Test</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>20.47</td>
<td>5.27 Assertion</td>
<td>25.94</td>
<td>6.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>3.38 Aggression</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>17.53</td>
<td>5.62 Deference</td>
<td>13.65</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>55.76</td>
<td>7.30 Self-Esteem</td>
<td>63.82</td>
<td>10.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>4.05 Empathy</td>
<td>20.53</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>14.88</td>
<td>2.45 Interpersonal Comfort</td>
<td>18.76</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>13.41</td>
<td>2.69 Sales Orientation</td>
<td>15.88</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>30.82</td>
<td>6.10 Drive Strength</td>
<td>33.88</td>
<td>5.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>12.29</td>
<td>4.06 Decision-Making</td>
<td>13.88</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>14.18</td>
<td>4.38 Time Management</td>
<td>15.65</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>3.68 Change Orientation</td>
<td>11.29</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>32.18</td>
<td>6.33 Stress Management</td>
<td>31.71</td>
<td>8.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>26.41</td>
<td>4.84 Physical Wellness</td>
<td>27.47</td>
<td>7.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>17.12</td>
<td>3.55 Commitment Ethnic</td>
<td>18.53</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre Test</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Post Test</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35.14</td>
<td>16.85</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.37</td>
<td>13.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAT Mean
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TABLE 8 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Post Test only</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Learning</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Union</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art, Music, Theater</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic/Recreation</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>9.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs &amp; Organizations</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Experiences</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Acquaintances</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/Technology</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorm/Frat/Soror.</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics in Conversation</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information in Conversation</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSEQ &quot;Opinions About College&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freshman Colloquium Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Rank Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 9
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR 4-GROUP
GROUP #4  C '89

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre Test</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Post Test</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>17.08</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>Assertion</td>
<td>23.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>20.77</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>Deference</td>
<td>18.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>56.15</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>63.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>13.46</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>Interpersonal Comfort</td>
<td>14.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>12.38</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>Sales Orientation</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>34.62</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>Drive Strength</td>
<td>36.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>11.23</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>Decision-Making</td>
<td>12.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>17.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>Change Orientation</td>
<td>9.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>30.85</td>
<td>9.37</td>
<td>Stress Management</td>
<td>36.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>26.46</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>Physical Wellness</td>
<td>29.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>19.15</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>Commitment Ethic</td>
<td>18.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre Test</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Post Test</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41.02</td>
<td>15.72</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.56</td>
<td>17.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAT Mean
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### TABLE 9 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>CSEQ &quot;Quality of Effort Scales&quot;</th>
<th>Post Test only</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Library</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Course Learning</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Student Union</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Art, Music, Theater</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Athletic/Recreation</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Clubs &amp; Organizations</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Personal Experiences</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Writing</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Student Acquaintances</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Science/Technology</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Dorm/Frat/Soror.</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Topics in Conversation</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>CSEQ &quot;Opinions About College&quot;</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Library</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Freshman Colloquium Evaluation</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. D</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. E</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GPA

3.11

Class Rank Percentile

15.23
TABLE 10
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR 2-GROUP
GROUP #1 E '88, '89

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Pre Test</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>Post Test</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrument - PSM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Assertion</td>
<td>20.55</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>25.60</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Deference</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>14.88</td>
<td>6.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-Esteem</td>
<td>58.64</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>64.95</td>
<td>10.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Empathy</td>
<td>17.81</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>20.38</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Interpersonal Comfort</td>
<td>14.64</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>18.26</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sales Orientation</td>
<td>14.24</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>15.95</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Drive Strength</td>
<td>31.36</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>33.64</td>
<td>6.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Time Management</td>
<td>13.45</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Commitment Ethic</td>
<td>17.33</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>18.81</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument - DIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.51</td>
<td>13.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.23</td>
<td>11.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAT Mean
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TABLE 10 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Post Test only</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Library</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Course Learning</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Student Union</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Art, Music, Theater</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Athletic/Recreation</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>8.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Clubs &amp; Organizations</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Personal Experiences</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Writing</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>6.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Student Acquaintances</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Science/Technology</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>6.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Dorm/Frat/Soror.</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>5.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Topics in Conversation</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. D</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. E</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GPA

2.80

Class Rank Percentile

26.83
TABLE 11
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR 2-GROUP

GROUP #2 C '88, '89

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument - PSM</th>
<th>Pre Test</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Post Test</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>19.13</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>Assertion</td>
<td>22.98</td>
<td>6.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>19.43</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>Deference</td>
<td>17.83</td>
<td>6.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>57.83</td>
<td>10.58</td>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>64.63</td>
<td>12.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>18.63</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>19.58</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>13.93</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>Interpersonal Comfort</td>
<td>16.15</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>Sales Orientation</td>
<td>13.83</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>32.35</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>Drive Strength</td>
<td>34.83</td>
<td>7.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>Decision-Making</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>15.90</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>16.65</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>12.35</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>Change Orientation</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>Stress Management</td>
<td>34.73</td>
<td>8.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>26.80</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>Physical Wellness</td>
<td>28.43</td>
<td>7.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>18.73</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>Commitment Ethic</td>
<td>18.65</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument - DIT</th>
<th>Pre Test</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Post Test</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38.31</td>
<td>14.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.69</td>
<td>14.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAT Mean
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### Table 11 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>CSEQ <em>Quality of Effort Scales</em></th>
<th>Post Test only</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Library</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Course Learning</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Student Union</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Art, Music, Theater</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Athletic/Recreation</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Clubs &amp; Organizations</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Personal Experiences</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Writing</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Student Acquaintances</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Science/Technology</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Dorm/Frat/Soror.</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Topics in Conversation</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>CSEQ <em>Opinions About College</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Freshman Colloquium Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. D</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. E</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| GPA                          | 2.99                           |
| Class Rank Percentile        | 16.79                          |
### TABLE 12
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS BY GENDER

**GROUP FEMALES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre Test</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Post Test</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.37</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>Assertion</td>
<td>24.73</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.47</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>Deference</td>
<td>16.86</td>
<td>7.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>58.88</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>64.65</td>
<td>10.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.20</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>20.37</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.45</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>Interpersonal Comfort</td>
<td>17.35</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.18</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>Sales Orientation</td>
<td>14.47</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>32.12</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>Drive Strength</td>
<td>34.84</td>
<td>6.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>Decision-Making</td>
<td>12.65</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.69</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>15.88</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>Change Orientation</td>
<td>11.29</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.96</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>Stress Management</td>
<td>31.92</td>
<td>8.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.51</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>Physical Wellness</td>
<td>27.18</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.25</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>Commitment Ethic</td>
<td>18.94</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre Test</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Post Test</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>39.32</td>
<td>14.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.22</td>
<td>13.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Instrument - PSM*

*Instrument - DIT*
### TABLE 12 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Post Test only</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Library</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Course Learning</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Student Union</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Art, Music, Theater</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Athletic/Recreation</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>8.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Clubs &amp; Organizations</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Personal Experiences</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Writing</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Student Acquaintances</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>5.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Science/Technology</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Dorm/Frat/Soror.</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Topics in Conversation</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Information in Conversation</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. D</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. E</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 13

**MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS BY GENDER**

**GROUP MALES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre Test</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Post Test</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>Assertion</td>
<td>23.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>7.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>17.35</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>Deference</td>
<td>15.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>57.19</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>65.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>16.58</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>19.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>14.03</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>Interpersonal Comfort</td>
<td>17.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>Sales Orientation</td>
<td>15.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>31.39</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>Drive Strength</td>
<td>33.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>11.58</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>Decision-Making</td>
<td>14.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>12.94</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>15.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>Change Orientation</td>
<td>11.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>32.71</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>Stress Management</td>
<td>35.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>27.16</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>Physical Wellness</td>
<td>28.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>17.61</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>Commitment Ethic</td>
<td>18.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre Test</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Post Test</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30.14</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.48</td>
<td>10.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Post Test only</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Library</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Course Learning</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Student Union</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Art, Music, Theater</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Athletic/Recreation</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Clubs &amp; Organizations</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Personal Experiences</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Writing</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Student Acquaintances</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Science/Technology</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Dorm/Frat/Soror.</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Topics in Conversation</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Information in Conversation</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CSEQ "Opinions About College"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Freshman Colloquium Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. D</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. E</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GPA**

2.77

**Class Rank Percentile**
### TABLE 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Satisfaction Score E '88</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 points</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 points</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 points</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 points</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 points</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 points</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 points</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Satisfaction Score C '88</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 points</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 points</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 points</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 points</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 points</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 points</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 points</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Satisfaction Score E '89</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 points</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 points</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 points</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 points</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 points</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 points</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 points</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 14 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Satisfaction Score C '89</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 points</td>
<td>70.0% Very satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 points</td>
<td>20.0% Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 points</td>
<td>-0- Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 points</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 points</td>
<td>-- Neutral to negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 points</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 points</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Satisfaction Score E '88, '89</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 points</td>
<td>12.5% Very satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 points</td>
<td>22.5% Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 points</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 points</td>
<td>15.0% Neutral to negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 points</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 points</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 points</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Satisfaction Score C '88, 89</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 points</td>
<td>36.1% Very satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 points</td>
<td>33.3% Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 points</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 points</td>
<td>5.6% Neutral to negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 points</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 points</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 points</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TABLE 15

CSEQ "QUALITY OF EFFORT" SCALES
COMBINED EXPERIMENTAL AND COMPARISON
GROUP MEANS COMPARED TO
PACE'S LIBERAL ARTS II NORMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>E '88, '89</th>
<th>Liberal Arts II</th>
<th>C '88, '89</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Learning</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Union</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art, Music, Theater</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics/Recreation</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs &amp; Organizations</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Experiences</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Acquaintances</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/Technology</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorms/Frat/Sor.</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics in Conversation</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information in Conversation</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 16
SUMMARY OF COLLOQUIUM PREFERENCES '89

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E '89 (n = 17)</th>
<th>C '89 (n = 14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st choice</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd choice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd choice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Assigned</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No students assigned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G
INFERENTIAL STATISTICS TABLES
### TABLE 17

SUMMARY OF 1-BETWEEN, 1-WITHIN MANOVA
POST TEST PSM SCORES
(WILK'S STATISTICS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>14,67</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.0122*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>14,67</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>.0001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex and time</td>
<td>14,67</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.1681***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (Significant at .05 level)
** (Significant at .0001 level)
*** (interaction effect not significant)

### TABLE 18

SUMMARY FOR 1-BETWEEN 1-WITHIN MANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F**</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>14,67</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.1187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>14,67</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Time</td>
<td>14,67</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.1107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .01 level
** F statistics here refer to the Wilk's criterion
### TABLE 19
MULTIPLE REGRESSION OF RANK, SAT & GROUP - GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Prob &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.469</td>
<td>7.716</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>19.841</td>
<td>0.2459</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>26.310</td>
<td>0.2140</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 20
PARAMETER ESTIMATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Parameter Estimates</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>T for #0:</th>
<th>Prob. &gt; T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.575</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>3.937</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>-1.286</td>
<td>0.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.857</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>-0.160</td>
<td>0.837</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 21
SUMMARY OF 1-BETWEEN; 1-WITHIN ANOVA FOR P SCORES OF DIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>698.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>673.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID (Condition)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>24771.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group * Cond.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID* Cond (Group)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3964.286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 22
TEST OF HYPOTHESES, FOR TYPE III ERROR ID (GROUP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
<th>PR &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>698.397</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.1371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 23
TEST OF HYPOTHESES FOR TYPE III ERROR ID * COND (GROUP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
<th>PR &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>673.084</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.230</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.5459</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H
FIGURES
Fig. 1. E '88, '89
Fig. 2. C '88, '89
Fig. 3. Females '88, '89
Fig. 4. Males '88, '89