

Chapter One: Introduction

The Student Learning Imperative (Schroeder, C.C., Astin, A., Astin, H., Boland, P., Cross, K.P., Hurst, J., Kuh, G. Marchese, T., Nuss, E. Pascarella, E., Pruitt, A., & Rooney, M. 1996) has served as a catalyst for student development programs in higher education. The authors urge educators to link in class and out of class learning. “Learning, personal development and student development are inextricably intertwined” (Schroeder et al. 1996 pg. 118). Traditionally, academic development and personal development have been separate and distinct in the minds of educators. Research has shown, however, that various in-class and out-of-class experiences contribute to learning and development (Schroeder, et al., 1996).

Student affairs practitioners are educators who can collaborate with faculty, staff, and administrators to educate students. Practitioners are developing a renewed commitment to student learning and academic success. This learning is not limited to the classroom, but can take place through student organizations, campus events and residence life (Alexander, 1996).

Residence life can enhance academic success in a variety of ways. “The impact of residential learning stems from two conditions. First, in residential living, the ‘teachers’ are primarily fellow students. Second, the informal environment and rich range of problems and relationships offer many opportunities for learning” (Riker, 1981 pg. 672). Universities can promote academic success and student learning by making a specific effort to create

learning communities (Pike, Schroeder & Berry, 1997). This can be done through a variety of methods. Special interest housing is one such method.

Special interest housing is a hall, house, wing or floor of a residential facility designed around a specific interest or theme. Examples of themes around which special interest housing units have been designed include language houses, engineering floors, Greek housing, wellness housing, and freshmen transition housing. Students in special interest housing are given the opportunity to explore an area of interest while living with others who share the same interest.

Freshmen year programs (FYPs) are a type of housing designed to aid first year students in the transition from high school to college. This type of housing can help create a supportive community and emphasize important issues such as personal safety and tolerance for diversity (Zeller, Fidler, & Barefoot, 1991).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine if freshmen housing programs enhance academic success. The information concerning freshmen programs is extensive, however little has been done to examine the academic success of students in FYPs. This study defined academic success and surveyed students in a FYP at a large research institution to determine if students in FYPs were more academically successful than students in non-FYP housing.

Academic success, as a concept, has been defined differently by scholars in a variety of studies. Definitions of academic success often include factors such as faculty reports, advisor reports, membership in honors programs, grades, academic records, public recognition for academic achievement, timely

graduation, independent scholarship, social confidence, dealing with people, and increased awareness of moral issues and social problems (Anastasi, Meade, & Schneiders 1960; Richards, Hollands & Lutz, 1967; Willingham 1985).

The definition of academic success used for this study includes many of the same variables that scholars have used in other research. For the purposes of this study, academic success is defined as those elements of students' collegiate experiences that relate to retention and graduation. For this study, academic success will be broken into two constructs: scholastic achievement and social adaptation. Scholastic achievement is academic success brought about by effort, including grade point average, but it goes beyond grades. Other factors involved in scholastic achievement are making progress to degree, making efficient use of academic resources on campus, establishing purpose, and participating in the learning process (Howe & Post, 1997). Each factor has been operationalized to aid in the measurement of the construct. Table 1 outlines the factors of scholastic achievement and the manner in which they are operationalized.

The second construct associated with academic achievement is social adaptation. Social adaptation relates to associating with the campus in a way that produces a good match of the university environment (i.e., the college's physical features, the atmosphere, and the composition of the student population) for the student. Factors contributing to social adaptation include whether contacts within the university have been established or not, the degree to which the student is involved in the college, and the appropriateness of the college environment for

Academic Success and Freshmen Year Programs 4

Table 1

Scholastic Achievement

Descriptors	Methods of Measurement
Making Progress to Degree	GPA
	Number of units taken
	Understanding academic requirements
Making Use of Resources	Using academic services
	Understanding academic policies
	Time with advisors
Participation in the Learning Process	Attendance
	Active involvement in class
	Time spent studying
Establishing Purpose	Setting goals for career
	Taking steps towards goals

the student (Howe & Post, 1997). Each of the factors in social adaptation has been operationalized. Table 2 outlines each of the factors and the manner in which they are operationalized.

Research Questions

The present study was designed to examine the following research questions:

1. Are there significant differences in the academic success between students in FYP and first-year students in non-FYP housing as regards to academic achievement and social adaptation?
2. Are there significant differences in the academic success between women in FYP and first-year women in non-FYP housing as regards to academic achievement and social adaptation?
3. Are there significant differences in the academic success between men in FYP and first-year men in non-FYP housing as regards to academic achievement and social adaptation?
4. Are there significant differences in the academic success between minority students in FYP and first-year minority students in non-FYP housing as regards to academic achievement and social adaptation?
5. Are there significant differences in the academic success between majority students in FYP and first-year majority students in non-FYP housing as regards to academic achievement and social adaptation?

Table 2

Social Adaptation

Descriptor	Methods of Measurement
Establishing Contacts	Contact with student
	Contact with faculty
	Contact with administrators
	Contact with staff
University Involvement	Number of organizations participated in
	Time spent with organizations
	Number of university events attended
University Environment	Physical environment (Class size, architectural design, aesthetics)
	Heterogeneity vs. Homogeneity

Significance of the Study

This study had implications for both professional practice and future research. In terms of professional practice, this study provided information to student affairs practitioners about the relationship between FYPs and academic success.

Second, the study provided data to practitioners who might be considering implementing a FYP. Practitioners who are considering implementing a FYP were provided information about the benefits of FYPs and whether promoting academic success is a benefit of FYPs.

Finally, the study may inform prospective students who may be considering living in an FYP about the potential personal benefits of such a program.

This study also had implications for future research. Results of this study could lead to research that examines issues such as retention rates between FYP and non-FYP students and graduation rates between the two groups. Other research studies could look at the cognitive development and psychosocial development of students in the two groups.

Many administrators are interested in the reasons that students leave school and how to increase retention. Future research might include comparing the retention rates and decisions to leave school between FYP students and non-FYP students.

Student affairs practitioners are also concerned about promoting student development. Future research might include describing the student development

of FYP students and non-FYP students. For example, instruments measuring cognitive development may be used to compare the two groups of students.

Limitations of the Study

As with all research, there were several limitations to this study. For example, there were factors other than the residence hall environment that influenced academic success and could not be controlled by the study. Students have different experiences in the classroom and outside the hall. Some students may have encountered family problems or other difficulties that affected their overall college experience. Such uncontrolled variables could have influenced the results of the study.

A second limitation involved the environment of the sample group and control group. The sample group lived in a small hall of approximately 275 residents. The control group was made up of first year students who lived in co-educational housing on campus. Some of the students lived in small halls while others lived in large halls. This environmental difference could have affected the outcomes of the study.

The third limitation also relates to the environment in which the students live. FYP housing is made up of all freshmen. Fourteen non-freshmen students live in the hall as student staff (i.e., resident advisors, student assistants and computer assistants). The non-FYP students live in an environment that includes sophomore, junior and senior residents as well as resident advisors. Differences observed between the FYP and non-FYP participants could result from the influence of older students rather than the program itself.

The next limitation involves self-selection. The FYP group chose to participate in the FYP. The non-FYP participants were assigned to a residence hall based on their stated preferences and space available in those preferred halls. The residents in the control group were allowed to declare preferences for housing, which were considered during the housing placement process, but the student preferences, however, were not guaranteed. It is likely then, that some of the students in the control group were placed in a hall that they did not choose.

The Hawthorne effect could also be a limitation in this study. The FYP participants were part of several studies the year this research was done. The participants may have realized that they were under observation and responded accordingly. Despite the limitations the present study was designed to elicit data relevant to the issue of FYPs and academic success.

Organization of the Study

This study is organized around five chapters. The first chapter introduced the phenomenon under study, the purpose of the study, the research questions, and the significance and limitations of the study. The second chapter provides an overview of the literature related to academic success, special interest housing, FYPs, gender differences in academic success and racial differences in academic success. The third chapter discusses the method of the study, sample selection, data collection procedures and data analysis procedures. Chapter four outlines the results of the study, while the chapter five discusses the findings and their implications for future practice and research.

Chapter Two: Review of Literature

To address the topic under study, it was necessary to examine the literature and research relating to the study. Literature concerning academic success, gender and racial issues in academic success, special interest housing as a whole, and freshmen year programs were reviewed in preparation for this study.

Academic Success

The literature about academic success is extensive. Each study on the topic defines academic success differently. Common definitions of a student's academic success include faculty ratings, faculty advisor reports, membership in honors programs, academic records, public recognition for academic achievement, class rank, and standardized test scores. (Anastasi, Meade, & Schneiders, 1960; Richards, Holland & Lutz, 1967; Whigham, 1985.) Other definitions included acquiring intellectual skills, independent scholarship, timely graduation, social confidence (i.e., dealing with people), increased awareness of moral issues, and creative works (Willingham, 1985). These definitions were similar, and the differences among the definitions typically existed because each of the definitions was centered around specific research studies. For example, research describing academic achievement among female engineers might rely on standardized tests more than research describing academic achievement among African American students.

The definition used for this project divides academic achievement into two constructs: scholastic achievement and social adaptation.

Scholastic Achievement

Scholastic achievement includes making progress toward a degree, making efficient use of campus resources, establishing a purpose, and participation in the learning process. Some literature can be found concerning participation in the learning process. However, research was limited for the other areas of scholastic achievement.

Students who are involved in the academic process are more likely to exhibit moral, affective and intellectual development (Whitla, 1981). Students who are involved in the learning process are more likely to be satisfied and successful. Involvement in the learning process can include class discussion, preparation for class and class attendance (Astin, 1984).

Social Adaptation

The second construct of academic success, social adaptation, includes establishing contacts in the university, student involvement in the university, and the college environment (i.e., physical environment and population composition.)

Research has shown that students who are involved in the educational environment tend to be more satisfied and successful in college. Involvement in the academic environment includes making contact with members of the educational community and participating in the learning process (Astin, 1984). Students who have contact with faculty members outside the classroom are also more likely to be academically successful and satisfied with their college experience. Students become more comfortable interacting with faculty and are more likely to be comfortable in the classroom (Endo & Harpel, 1982).

Researchers have also found that the environment plays a powerful role in student behavior. Administrators can change student behavior by changing the environment (Carney, 1991). Administrators can create a learning environment and affect the academic behavior of students. For example, more study areas, enforced quiet hours, and academic programming can help create a learning environment.

Creating a welcoming environment for students can also be significant to academic success. Students who feel welcome and involved in the learning may be more academically successful. This environment can be affected by the physical layout or size of the learning environment, the make up of the student population, architectural design, and aesthetics. (Allen & Niss, 1989). Students who feel comfortable in their residence hall, are more likely to persist. A sense of community in the residence hall can also enhance academic success in other ways, such as increasing faculty contact (Berger, 1997).

Academic Success, Gender and Race

Does a student's gender or race affect their academic success? Most research claims that it does indirectly. For example, a woman may have more difficulty being successful in the field of engineering because of the pressure from advisors, parents, educators and peers (Whigham, 1985). At a predominately white institution, African American students may be dealing with racism and feelings of isolation, which would make it difficult to focus on being academically successful. (Willie & McCord, 1972; Suen, 1983).

Gender

Women often may have different academic experiences than men and may react differently to the academic environment. Women in college may be more academically successful when residence hall visitation is enforced and a structured study environment is in place (Moen, 1986). This could be because many women feel societal pressure not to appear studious in front of men (Whigham, 1985).

Women tend to have different academic characteristics than men. For example, women tend to show more evidence of career maturity and establishing and clarifying purpose (Dawson-Threat, 1993).

Race

Race can also be an important factor in academic success. Minority students on predominately white campuses can feel isolated and alone (Suen, 1983). This can make it hard to concentrate on grades and make contacts on campus. The African American student population typically has a higher attrition rate and slower progression path (i.e., a second year student has sophomore credit, a third year student has junior credit, etc.). A study of student athletes produced results describing differences between African American students and Caucasian students in graduation rates, final examination preparation, and roommate choices. These differences can affect overall academic success (Gosman, Danridge, Nettles, & Theony, 1983; Snyder, 1996).

The type of living environment can play an important role in the academic success of African American students. African American students may feel

isolated in their residence halls, the place where they live, sleep, study and make friends (Fields, 1991). Roommate situation and racial constituency of residences can affect college GPA among minority students (Trippi & Baker, 1989).

Housing obviously plays an important role in academic success. Knowing this, administrators attempt to create environments that promote learning. One way of accomplishing this goal is through special interest housing.

Special Interest Housing

Special interest housing is found on campuses across the country. Special interest housing, or theme housing as it is sometimes called, is an alternative to traditional housing. Typically, students are assigned to residence halls based on preference for a roommate or a building and may have little in common with other residents. In special interest housing, residents are assigned to halls, floors or wings because they share a common interest in an academic major, fraternity or sorority, social or political issue, ethnic group, language, international status, or wellness issues, among others. The extent of theme housing is limited only by imagination (Grimm, 1993).

Research suggests that students need to be allowed to choose the type of housing in which they will learn. Several premises support special interest housing. First, students' environment has an impact on their development. Not every environment will benefit every student. Some students will be much more suited to a wellness hall than others. That same student may not be suited to a ethnic hall (Grimm, 1993).

Second, different types of programs provide different opportunities for student development. It is possible that traditional housing no longer meets the needs of today's students who are consumer minded and technology oriented. They are from a generation that has grown up on television and video games. The traditional programs and designs of housing may not be as appealing to this generation of students (Grimm, 1993).

Finally, by providing variety in housing, colleges and universities can appeal to more students. Students act as consumers when they are searching for colleges. The more options and alternatives a university offers them, the more appealing the college may be to the student (Grimm, 1993).

Not all reports support theme housing. The main criticism is that theme housing creates a homogeneous environment. (Grimm, 1993). This seems most apparent in theme housing centered around ideas or politics (Moore and Ostrander, 1980; Schroeder, 1980; Clarke, Miser, & Roberts, 1980). The criticism may also apply to Freshmen Year Programs. The next section will examine Freshmen Year Programs and discuss the validity of that criticism.

Freshmen Year Programs

Freshmen year programs are based on the idea that creating a special environment for freshmen exclusively helps ease the transition from high school to college. Freshmen programs are often combined with other types of theme housing such as freshmen honors halls or freshmen living-learning environments. Zeller, Fidler, and Barefoot (1991) outlined several goals for the freshmen experience in the residences halls, including providing structured social,

academic, educational, and leadership opportunities that a freshmen might not otherwise have. They suggest that all-freshmen housing helps create a supportive community and teaches freshmen about important issues such as safety and tolerance of diversity. Goals such as those reported by Zeller, Fidler, and Barefoot (1991) reflect some of the important issues in FYPs.

Another type of freshmen year housing is freshmen interest groups. These groups arrange for a small group of freshmen to take some or all of their classes together. Many also include a residential component, a freshmen year seminar, and/or peer mentors (Pike, Schroeder, and Berry, 1997). Students in these groups report higher faculty interaction, as well as higher levels of achievement, commitment, and persistence than students who did not participate in the program (Tinto & Goodsell, 1993).

Research findings about the outcomes of all-freshmen housing are inconclusive. The literature suggests that all-freshmen housing which has a specific focus, such as wellness or an academic theme, is more effective than general all-freshmen housing (Zeller, Fidler, & Barefoot, 1991; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1981).

So when all-freshmen housing is combined with other types of theme housing does it enhance student development? The answer is unclear. Clarke, Miser, and Roberts (1988) studied freshmen in a variety of different housing settings including living-learning environments, traditionally housing, theme housing, and faculty-based housing. They found that theme housing seemed to isolate freshmen. First year students in theme housing became very studious, but

were not very satisfied with their overall college experience. Findings also indicated that allowing freshmen to select special interest housing for their first year limited their exploration of campus. For example, a student living in an environment focused on an academic major may never consider another major or area of study. Students in the living learning environment reported the most varied interests, but also the most difficulty balancing their priorities.

Cade (1979) compared freshmen in a freshmen hall in which faculty lived with the students, a traditional freshmen hall, and those living in a hall mixed by academic class (i.e., with sophomores, juniors). She used an instrument to measure autonomy, impulse expression, personal integration and anxiety level. She found no evidence that any of the halls affected the students on the aforementioned variables.

Others have found that age segregation creates additional problems. The first group of people with whom students live determine how they see themselves, how they see the world, and what type of behavior is appropriate (Schelhas, 1978). Limiting exposure to just first year students could limit self-awareness and affect behavior.

Other studies have shown that freshmen who are segregated from the rest of campus earn grades similar to other first year students, but those in age-mixed groups are more satisfied with the college experience (Herber, 1966).

There are more rigid expectations of dating and other types of social conformity in freshmen halls. While there appears to be a sense of community and rapport, that community appears to be easily manipulated by other groups

such as fraternities. When freshmen live in age-mixed halls, upper-class students act as role-models, demonstrating self-confidence and individuality that lead freshmen to resist peer pressure to a significant degree (Schelhas, 1978). Results such as these would suggest that the benefits of freshmen housing are mixed.

Some literature that supports freshmen housing, however. Pascarella and Terenzini (1981) reported that freshmen in living-learning arrangements earned higher grades and reported greater satisfaction with faculty relationships than freshmen who lived in traditional housing. They suggested however, that the higher grades may have been a result of stronger relationships with faculty and not due to any direct impact from the environment. Nevertheless, living learning residence halls seem to have a positive, albeit, indirect effect on student grades.

Several universities have reported very successful freshmen year programs. Georgia Southern University created a Freshmen Year Experience program in 1990. A longitudinal study revealed higher retention rates and higher grades among the students in the program (Knight, 1993).

Georgia Institute of Technology also established a freshmen year program in response to a very high attrition rate. After the first year, attrition among the FYP participants dropped from 18% to 10%. In addition, the program expanded as more students wanted to live in the environment. In the fall of 1992, 25% of the freshmen class participated in the freshmen year program. In the fall of 1995, 75% of the freshmen class participated (Sichta & Avery, 1995).

Such programs reflect more than just separate housing for freshmen students. Staff devote time and energy to helping freshmen adapt to all aspects of

college life. FYPs generally provide common living areas, peer support networks, freshmen seminar classes, interaction with faculty, in residence hall classes, focused programming, and a high student-staff ratio (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1981; Zeller, Fidler & Barefoot, 1991; Sichta & Avery, 1995).

The effects of freshmen year programs are inconsistent. This study was designed to explore the freshmen year program participants' academic success.

Chapter Three: Method

The purpose of this study was to explore differences in the academic success of students in FYP housing and students in non-FYP housing.

Specifically, the study explored the following research questions:

1. Are there significant differences in the academic success between students in FYP and first-year students in non-FYP housing as regards to academic achievement and social adaptation?
2. Are there significant differences in the academic success between women in FYP and first-year women in non-FYP housing as regards to academic achievement and social adaptation?
3. Are there significant differences in the academic success between men in FYP and first-year men in non-FYP housing as regards to academic achievement and social adaptation?
4. Are there significant differences in the academic success between minority students in FYP and first-year minority students in non-FYP housing as regards to academic achievement and social adaptation?
5. Are there significant differences in the academic success between majority students in FYP and first-year majority students in non-FYP housing as regards to academic achievement and social adaptation?

Sampling and Selection

Two samples were needed for this study: FYP participants and non-FYP participants. The FYP is housed in a co-ed hall of approximately 275 students and staffed with six resident advisors (RAs). In addition, the FYP had six student assistants and two computer assistants. The student assistant position was designed to promote academics in the hall, assist with the seminar in which all FYP students are required to enroll during the first semester and serve as an upper-class role model.

The non-FYP participants were randomly selected from other halls on campus. The first-year residents come from a variety of halls on campus. Some are large halls of more than 800 residents while others are smaller halls. Some have public computer labs. RAs are placed around the hall at a ratio of approximately 1:40. None of these halls have computer assistants for the residents. Student assistants are also unique to the FYP.

The FYP group and the non-FYP group were selected from the housing department's database. The housing department generated a list of all non-staff residents in the FYP and a list of first semester, non-transfer students from other buildings on campus. The group used in the pilot test was taken from a specific building, which was not used in the study to ensure that those chosen for the pilot test were not included in the study.

Several groups of students were eliminated from the study. First, the researcher was also serving as a hall director at the institution studied. All of the

students from that building were not included in the study so as to avoid bias.

Second, a question on the study asked the students if the Fall 1998 semester was the first full semester (excluding summer school) that the student had been enrolled. This was done to ensure that the students were in their first year of college and were not listed as freshmen because they had not earned enough credits to qualify as sophomores. All students who were not in the first year of their college career were eliminated. Finally, students enrolled in the Corps of Cadets, a military program at the university, were excluded. The cadets' environment is very different than the environment experienced by civilian students on campus, and therefore, comparing them to the FYP would likely skew the results.

A sample of 535 students was chosen from the FYP housing (experimental group) and the non-FYP housing (control group). The experimental group included 264 students who lived in FYP housing during the fall, 1997 academic semester. One hundred-thirty five members of the experimental group were female and 136 were male. The control group was comprised of 167 men and 104 women who lived in non-FYP housing during the fall, 1997 academic semester.

Instrumentation

The instrument designed by the researcher was organized around eight sections. Seven of the eight sections were designed to elicit information about one of the characteristics associated with academic success. The eighth section was designed to gather demographic information.

The first section was designed to gain information about how the students are making use of resources. This section asked questions about use of academic services, the students' understanding of academic policies and the time they spend with their advisors.

The second section pertained to student participation in the learning process. Questions about class attendance, involvement in class and study time were used.

The topic of the third section was establishing purpose. Questions in this section seek information about student goals for the future, as well as how much time is spent with career services staff to help focus on a potential career.

The fourth section focused on establishing contacts. The instrument elicits information about how much communication takes place between the students and classmates, faculty and administrators.

University involvement was the topic of the fifth topic. The instrument addressed the number of organizations the students were involved in and how much time was spent with each organization. The instrument also asked questions about the number of campus events such as speakers, concerts, and movies that the students attended.

The topic of the sixth section was students' progress to degree. This elicited information about QCA, units taken, units completed, and the students' understanding of academic policies.

The seventh section elicited information about the college environment.

Questions in this section addressed how comfortable students felt in the university community.

The final section dealt with demographics. This section requested information about major, college, gender and ethnic group. This information was used so that not only FYP and non-FYP could be compared, but also gender groups and ethnic groups.

Each section was designed to correlate with a different factor of one of the constructs of academic success. Each factor was operationalized, and then questions were written from there to gather the data needed. Tables 3 and 4 matches each question on the instrument with the factors.

Validity

In order to ensure content validity, a panel of experts was asked to review the instrument. This panel included the Director of the Academic Assessment Program, the Director of Residence Education, and researchers in the field of student affairs.

A group of sophomore, junior and senior students were also asked to review the instrument. Approximately 20 students reviewed the instrument and provided feedback.

Finally, a pilot test was initiated in which approximately 20 first year students were asked to review the survey. The students were chosen from a computer generated random list of first year, non-transfer students in a specific building. The students were invited to attend one of two sessions where free pizza

was provided. A second invitation was sent the day of the session to remind them to attend (Appendix C). The students answered the survey the first time they read it, and then went back and added comments. They were specifically asked to comment on a question they did not understand or know how to answer. The information provided by the administration, upper class students and first year students was used to refine the instrument and several changes were made as a result.

Procedures

The instruments were sent to students two weeks after the spring semester started. The instruments were due back one week later. A cover letter (Appendix B) was sent to each resident selected explaining that the student was invited to participate in a study about students' academic experiences. As an incentive to promote participation, each student who agreed to participate was entered in a drawing for a cash prize. Four prizes were awarded: \$100, \$50, and two \$25 prizes. The survey was delivered by campus mail. A follow up post card was sent out one week later (Appendix D). Several days later, an email was sent to each student who had not returned the survey (Appendix D). Two days later the students who had not returned their surveys were sent an additional survey attached to another cover letter (Appendix D). Students were sent a return, pre-addressed envelope to make returning the survey easy and free for the students.

Table 3

Scholastic Achievement and Corresponding Instrument Items

Descriptors	Methods of Measurement	Corresponding Item(s) on Instrument
Making Progress to Degree	GPA Number of units taken Understanding of academic requirements	35 33, 34 31, 32
Making Use of Resources	Using academic services Understanding academic policies	5 28, 29, 30
	Time with advisors	1, 2, 3, 4
Participation in the Learning Process	Attendance Active involvement in class	8 6
	Time spent studying	7, 9
Establishing Purpose	Setting goals for career Taking steps towards goals	10, 13 11, 12

Table 4

Social Adaptation and Corresponding Instrument Items

Descriptors	Methods of Measurement	Corresponding Item(s) on Instrument
Establishing Contacts	Contact with students	16
	Contact with faculty	14, 15
	Contact with administrators and staff	17
University Involvement	Number of organizations participated in	24, 25
	Time spent with organizations	26, 27
	Number of university events attended	18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23
	Physical environment	36, 37, 38
University Environment	Heterogeneity vs. Homogeneity	39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using t-tests and chi-square analysis. Questions pertaining to GPA, class credits in which enrolled, class credits completed, the number of organizations in which a student participated, and the time a student spent with organizations were analyzed using a t-test analysis because the student entered a specific number. The other questions on the instrument gave the participant a choice of answers. They were analyzed using chi-square analysis. The FYP and non-FYP groups were also divided into gender groups and minority/non-minority groups. Each question on the instrument was analyzed and the data were used to establish whether or not there were significant differences between the groups and determine if there were significant differences between the academic success of the groups.

Chapter Four: Data Analysis Results

The data analysis was done using SPSS software. All of the analysis used chi-square or two-tailed t tests.

Profile of Participants

Five hundred and thirty five students were asked to participate in the study. Of those 535, 132 (24.7%) were FYP men and 132 (24.7%) were FYP women, for a total of 264 (49.4%) FYP students. There were 271 (50.7%) non-FYP students in the sample, including 167 (31.2%) men and 104 (19.4%) women. The instrument was sent to the students during the second week of classes in the spring semester, so rosters were not completely up to date. Nineteen (3.6%) of the 535 students no longer lived at the addresses listed on the roster. Of those 19, there were four FYP men, six non-FYP men, no FYP women, and seven non-FYP women. Four students indicated that they were not first year students on their surveys, so they were not included in the study. This left 514 students in the sample. A total of 249 usable surveys were returned resulting in an overall return rate of 48.4%.

The return rate for FYP men was 26.5% (36 students) and FYP women was 59.3% (80 students). The total FYP return rate was 45% (116 students). Non-FYP participants returned their instruments at a rate of 51.6% (133 students). The return rate for non-FYP men was 42.5% (71 students) and for non-FYP women

was 59.6% (62 women). It was expected that the FYP students would return their instruments at a lower rate than the non-FYP participants. The FYP students were requested to participate in numerous studies.

The sample selection was a computer generated random list, and did not control for ethnic demographics. The list did not include demographic information, so the specific return rate of minority and non-minority students is unknown. In the campus demographics, 5.4% of students did not report their ethnic background. Of those who did report their ethnic background, 15.5% were minority students and 84.5% were majority students. Of all the students in FYP, 7.5% did not report their racial background. Of those that did, 23.2% were minority students and 81.5% were majority students. There was not a significant difference between the campus majority/minority population and the control group respondents majority/minority population ($\chi^2= 1.674$, df=1).

Of the students returning the sample, 8.2% (20) listed themselves as minority students participating in FYP, 38.1% (93) listed themselves as majority students in FYP, 6.1% (15) listed themselves as minority students not participating in FYP, and 47.5% (116) listed themselves as majority students not participating in FYP. Because the number of minority students was so small, the students were grouped together into one group rather than listing specific ethnic groups. There was not a significant difference between the majority/ minority

student population in the FYP population and in the respondent population ($\chi^2=0.17$, df=1).

Academic Success of FYP and non-FYP Students

The first research question asked, “Is there a significant difference in the academic success between students in FYP and first-year students in non-FYP housing as regards to academic achievement and social adaptation.” Academic success was tested using a 47-question test. The results showed that there were significant differences in the academic success between participants and non-participants.

Academic success was broken into seven sections: Making Progress to Degree, Making Use of Academic Resources, Participation in the Learning Process, Establishing Purpose, Establishing Contacts, University Involvement and University Environment. Each of these sections was broken down in methods of measurement and questions on the instrument.

Making Progress to Degree

This section included GPA, number of class units taken, and understanding academic requirements. FYP students had a significantly higher GPA than non-FYP students. The GPA data was run using a two-tailed t-test. The question was significant at the .05 level using a t-test. FYP students had a mean GPA of 2.94 and non-FYP students having a mean GPA of 2.73 (Table 5).

Number of units taken included two questions: the number of units in which a student enrolled and the number of units a student completed. FYP students enrolled in more class credits and completed more class credits. The first question was significant at the .001 level using a t-test. The mean number of classes FYP students enrolled in was 16.59, while the mean number of classes non-FYP in which students enrolled was 15.55 (Table 6).

The mean units completed were also calculated using a two-tailed t-test. The question was significant at the .001 level. The mean number of units FYP students completed was 16.08 and the mean number of units non-FYP students completed was 14.86 (Table 7).

Understanding academic requirements was measured by asking two questions. These questions were analyzed using chi-square analysis, and neither question showed any significant finding.

Making Use of Resources

The next section was making use of resources. This section included questions about using academic services, understanding academic policies, and time with advisors.

Table 5

FYP and Non-FYP: Grade Point Averages

Differences of Two Means

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard	Standard Error
			Deviation	of Mean
FYP	114	2.94	.564	.053
Non-FYP	131	2.74	.705	.062

Mean Difference: .2044

p<.05

t=2.52

df: 241

Table 6

FYP and Non-FYP: Class Credits Enrolled in Fall 1997

Differences of Two Means

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard	Standard Error
			Deviation	of Mean
FYP	116	16.60	1.694	.157
Non-FYP	133	15.56	1.593	.138

Mean Difference: 1.0384

p<.001

t = 4.98

df: 247

Table 7

FYP and Non-FYP: Class Credits Completed Fall 1997

Differences of Two Means

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard	Standard Error
			Deviation	of Mean
FYP	116	16.08	2.289	.213
Non-FYP	132	14.86	2.877	.250

Mean Deviation: 1.2180

 $p < .001$ $t = 3.65$

df: 246

Use of academic services was measured with one question broken into five parts. Five campus services were listed and the students were asked to mark all services they had used. Each of the five parts was calculated using a chi square analysis. No significance was found.

Understanding academic policies was measured using three questions. All three were calculated using chi-square analysis. Only one questions was found to show significant differences. The question concerned when a specific academic policy could be used. FYP students answered the question correctly significantly more often than non-FYP students. The difference was significant at the .01 level ($\chi^2=8.03$, df=1), with 39.1% of FYP students answering the question correctly, while only 22.6% of non-FYP students answering correctly (Table 8).

Time with advisor was broken into four questions. From the comments students wrote beside question one, it was apparent that different people interpreted it different ways. The students put question marks beside the question, or wrote what they thought it meant. Because the students interpreted the question in a variety of ways, it was not used in this study. The other three questions showed no significant difference between the two groups.

Participation in the Learning Process

This section was broken into attendance, active involvement in class, and time spent studying. Only one question, in the time spent studying section, had

Table 8

FYP and Non-FYP: Academic Policy Answer

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	Answered Correct	Answered Incorrect
FYP	39.1%	60.9%
Non-FYP	22.6%	77.4%

Total Number of Cases: 248

 $p < .01$ $\chi^2 = 8.03$ $df = 1$

any significant finding. Using chi-square analysis, the results were significant at the .05 level ($\chi^2=8.09$, df=3). FYP students were more likely to complete all of their assignments before class. According to the responses, 26.1% report that they always complete assignments, 58.3% almost always complete their assignments, 13.9% usually do, and 1.7% never do. In comparison, 15% non-FYP participants reported that they always complete assignments before class, 57.1% almost always do, 23.3% usually do, and 4.5% never complete their assignments before class (Table 9).

Establishing Purpose

This section was broken into two parts: setting goals for career and taking steps towards their goals. Each part had two questions on the instrument. Only one question of the four was found to show significant differences. The question concerned discussions of career plans with advisors, mentors, and/or professionals. This question was measured using chi-square analysis and was significant at a .05 level ($\chi^2=8.46$, df=3). According to the results, FYP participants were more likely to discuss career plans than non-FYP participants. FYP participants responses showed that 81.8% had discussed career plans with a advisor, mentor or professional while 73.5% of non-FYP participants had (Table 10).

Table 9

FYP and Non-FYP: How Often Student Completes Assignments Before Class

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	Always	Almost Always	Usually	Rarely
FYP	26.1%	58.3%	13.9%	1.7%
Non-FYP	15.0%	57.1%	23.3%	4.5%

Total Number of Cases: 248

 $p < .05$ $\chi^2 = 8.09$ $df = 3$

Table 10

FYP and Non-FYP: Students Have Spoken to Advisors, Mentors or Professionals about Career Plans

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
FYP	29.6%	52.2%	17.4%	0.9%
Non-FYP	22.0%	51.5%	18.2%	6.3%

Total Number of Cases: 247

p < .01

$\chi^2 = 12.30$

df = 3

Establishing Contacts

Establishing contacts was the next section of Academic Success. This was broken into three parts: contact with student, contact with faculty, and contact with administrators and staff. One question in this section was found to show significant differences, and it asked about contact with faculty. FYP participants were more likely to communicate with faculty other than those that taught their classes. The question was analyzed using chi-square, and was significant at the .01 level ($\chi^2=12.30$, df=3). Of the FYP sample, 28.4% said they never communicated with other faculty, 49.1% said rarely, 18.1% said occasionally, and 4.3% said frequently. In comparison, 46.6% of the non-FYP participants said that they never communicated with other faculty, 42.9% said rarely, 18.2% said occasionally and 3.2% said frequently (Table 11).

University Involvement

University involvement was made up of number of organizations in which students participated, time spent with those organizations, and the number of university events attended. The number of organizations in which students participated was measured with two questions, neither of which showed significant difference. The time spent with organizations was measured with two questions, neither of which found a significant difference. The number of

Table 11

FYP and Non-FYP: How Often Do Students Communicate with Faculty Other than Their Own Instructors

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variables	Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Frequently
FYP	28.4%	49.1%	18.1%	2.8%
Non-FYP	46.6%	42.9%	9.8%	.8%

Total Number of Cases: 249

p < .01

$\chi^2 = 12.30$

df = 3

university events attended was measured with six questions. Two were found to have significant differences.

The first question to that showed a significant difference asked about speaking events outside of class. FYP participants indicated that they heard more speakers than the non-FYP participants. The question was analyzed using chi-square, and was significant at the .05 level ($\chi^2=11.07$, df=3). Of the FYP responses, 39.7% reported that they had seen no speakers, 25% had seen one, 18.1% had seen two and 17.2% had seen three or more. In comparison, 36.1% of the non-FYP respondents reported seeing no speakers, 36.1% had seen one, 8.3% had seen two speakers, and 9.0% had seen three or more speakers (Table 12).

The second question asked about residence hall programs attended. Participants in the FYP were more likely to attend residence hall programs. Of the FYP respondents, 14.7% reported attending no programs, 78.5% reported attending between one and six programs, and 6% reported attending ten or more programs. On the non-FYP participants, 36.1% reported attending no programs, 60.9% attended between one and six programs and 3.9% attended ten or more programs. The question was significant at the .001 level ($\chi^2= 16.07$, df 2). This question initially broke responses into four categories, but the estimated frequency was so low that data responses had to be collapsed in order to be able to run chi-square analysis (Table 13).

Table 12

FYP and Non-FYP: Number of Speakers Students Heard Outside of Class

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	None	One	Two	Three or More
FYP	28.4%	49.1%	18.1%	4.3%
Non-FYP	46.6%	42.9%	9.8%	.8%

Total Number of Cases: 249

 $p < .05$ $\chi^2 = 11.07$ $df = 3$

Table 13

FYP and Non-FYP: Number of Non-Required Residence Hall Programs Attended

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	None	1-6	7 or more
FYP	15.0%	63.7%	21.2%
Non-FYP	36.4%	53.0%	10.6%

Total Number of Cases: 245

 $p < .001$ $\chi^2 = 16.07$ $df = 2$

University Environment

University environment is comprised of two sections: physical environment and heterogeneity v. homogeneity. Physical environment was measured by three questions. Two of the questions did not show a significant difference. The third was broken into three parts. The students were asked to rank their top three study places. The estimated frequency was below 0.5, so the responses were collapsed into three answers: on campus (other places than residence hall), in the residence hall, or other. Part B of the question, the students second favorite place to study showed a significant difference at the .01 level ($\chi^2=9.41$, df=2). FYP were more likely to study in their residence hall than non-FYP students. FYP responses indicated that 4.5% studied on campus, 77.5% studied in their residence hall and 18% studied other places. Of the non-FYP responses, 11.9% reported studying on campus, 59.5% studied in the residence hall, and 28.6% reported studying in other places (Table 14).

The last section was heterogeneity v. homogeneity. There were nine questions in this section. The first four questions concerned students' perceptions of diversity on campus. The next four questions concerned students' perceptions of diversity in their residence hall. The last question concerned students' comfort level interacting with students on campus. Of the four questions concerning diversity on campus, one was found to show a significant finding after data were

Table 14

FYP and Non-FYP: Second Favorite Study Place

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	In Residence Hall	Other Places On Campus	
		Other Places On Campus	Other Places
FYP	77.5%	4.5%	18.0%
Non-FYP	59.5%	11.9%	28.6%

Total Number of Cases: 237

 $p < .01$ $\chi^2 = 9.41$ $df = 2$

collapsed into two responses. FYP students were more likely to respond that they felt there were people from a variety of countries on campus. Using chi-square analysis, there was a significant difference at the .01 level ($\chi^2=6.76$, df=1). Among FYP students, 88.7% agreed or strongly agreed that there were people from a variety of countries on campus, while 11.3% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Among the non-FYP students, 75.9% agreed or strongly agreed and 24.1% disagreed or strongly disagreed that there were people from a variety of countries on campus (Table 15).

The next four questions concerning diversity in the residence hall all showed a significant difference. The first question concerned religious diversity in the residence hall. FYP students were more likely to feel that there were a variety of religious views in the hall. Among FYP students, 88.7% agreed or strongly agreed that there were a variety of religious views in the hall and 11.3% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Among non-FYP participants, 76.2% agreed or strongly agreed and 23.8% disagreed or strongly disagreed. There was significance at the .05 level ($\chi^2=6.51$, df=1) (Table 16).

The second question concerned diversity of racial backgrounds in the residence hall. Students in FYP were more likely to respond that there were people from a variety of racial backgrounds in the residence hall. The question was found to show a significant difference at the .01 level ($\chi^2=6.76$, df=1).

Table 15

FYP and Non-FYP: Perception of Diversity of People from Other Countries

on Campus

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	Agree or Strongly Agree	Disagree or Strongly
		Disagree
FYP	88.7%	11.3%
Non-FYP	75.9	24.1%

Total Number of Cases: 248

 $p < .01$ $\chi^2 = 6.76$ $df = 1$

Table 16

FYP and Non-FYP: Perception of Diversity of Religious Background in the Residence Hall

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	Agree or Strongly Agree	Disagree or Strongly Disagree
FYP	88.7%	11.3%
Non-FYP	76.2%	23.8%

Total Number of Cases: 245

p < .05

$\chi^2 = 6.51$

df = 1

Among FYP students, 86.2% agreed or strongly agreed that there were people with a variety of racial backgrounds in the hall and 13.8% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Among non-FYP participants, 72.7% agreed or strongly agreed and 27.3% disagreed or strongly disagreed (Table 17).

The third question asked if there were people from a variety of states in the residence halls. There was a significant difference at the .05 level ($\chi^2=3.90$, df=1). Among FYP students, 88.7% agreed or strongly agreed and 11.3% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Among non-FYP participants, 79.4% agreed or strongly agreed and 20.6% disagreed or strongly disagreed (Table 18).

The last question asked students if there were people from a variety of countries in the residence hall. There was significant difference found at the .001 level ($\chi^2=25.45$, df=1). Among FYP students, 80.7% agreed or strongly agreed and 19.3% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Among non-FYP students, 49.6% agreed or strongly agreed, while 50.4% disagreed or strongly disagreed (Table 19).

Conclusion

Each section of the academic success definition had at least one significant finding. There were significant differences found between the academic success of FYP students and non-FYP students.

Table 17

FYP and Non-FYP: Perception of Diversity of Racial Background in the Residence Hall

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	Agree or Strongly Agree	Disagree or Strongly Disagree
		Disagree
FYP	88.7%	11.3%
Non-FYP	72.7%	27.3%

Total Number of Cases: 248

p < .01

$\chi^2 = 6.76$

df = 1

Table 18

FYP and Non-FYP: Perception of Diversity of People from a Variety of States in the Residence Hall

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	Agree or Strongly Agree	Disagree or Strongly Disagree
FYP	88.7%	11.3%
Non-FYP	79.4%	20.6%

Total Number of Cases: 246

p < .05

$\chi^2 = 3.90$

df = 1

Table 19

FYP and Non-FYP: Perception of Diversity of People from a Variety of Countries
in the Residence Hall

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	Agree or Strongly Agree	Disagree or Strongly Disagree
FYP	80.7%	19.3%
Non-FYP	49.6%	50.4% %

Total Number of Cases: 243

p < .001

$\chi^2 = 25.45$

df = 1

Academic Success of Women in FYP and Non-FYP

The data analysis of female responses was similar to the overall sample responses. While there was not an overwhelming significant differences, several areas of academic success stood out. Many of the same items that were found to have significant difference in the total sample analysis were found to have significant differences in this analysis. There were also several items that were found to have significant differences when comparing women in FYP and first-year women not in FYP that did not show any significant differences in the total sample.

Making Progress to Degree

No significant differences were found in comparisons of GPA or understanding of academic requirements. There were significant differences found in the number of class credits taken and completed. Two tailed t-tests were used to analyze the two questions. The first question compared the number of credits in which students enrolled. There was a significant difference at the .001 level using a t-test. FYP women enrolled in a mean of 16.59 credits, while women in non-FYP housing enrolled in a mean of 15.26 credits (Table 20). Women in FYP completed more class credits also. FYP women completed a mean of 16.14

Table 20

FYP Women and Non-FYP Women: Number of Class Credits Enrolled in Fall
1997

Differences of Two Means

Variables	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard	Standard Error
			Deviation	of Mean
FYP Women	80	16.5875	1.548	.173
Non-FYP Women	61	15.2623	1.570	.201

Mean Difference: 1.333

p<.001

t = 5.01

df = 128

credits, while non-FYP women completed a mean of 14.90. There was a significant finding at the .001 level using a t-test. (Table 21).

Making Use of Resources

There were no significant differences between the two groups in the areas of using academic resources or time with advisors. There was one question found to show significant differences under the section of understanding academic policies. It was not the same question found to show a significant difference in the total sample analysis. The question found to show a significant difference between the two groups in this area asked about an academic policy and how a grade would affect the students' GPA and transcript. Although few respondents answered correctly, the FYP women responded correctly more often than the non-FYP women did. FYP women answered correctly 7.5% of the time, while non-FYP women answered correctly 6.7% of the time. There was a significant finding at the .05 level ($\chi^2=4.19$, df=1) (Table 22).

Participation in the Learning Process

This section had three parts: attendance, active involvement in class and time spent studying. Like the comparison of FYP and non-FYP students, only one question in the comparison of women in FYP and non-FYP was found to show a significant difference between the two groups. It was the same question as before, which asked how often students completed all assignments before class.

Table 21

FYP Women and Non-FYP Women: Number of Class Credits Completed in Fall
1997

Differences of Two Means

Variables	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard	Standard Error
			Deviation	of Mean
FYP Women	80	16.14	1.819	.203
Non-FYP Women	61	14.90	1.859	.238

Mean Difference: 1.24

 $p < .001$ $t = 3.96$ $df = 139$

Table 22

FYP Women and Non-FYP Women: Academic Policy Answer

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variables	Answered Correctly	Answered Incorrectly
FYP Women	84.8%	15.2%
Non-FYP Women	70.5%	29.5%

Number of Cases: 140

 $p < .05$ $\chi^2 = 4.19$ $df = 1$

Responses indicated that FYP women were more likely to complete their assignments before class. This question showed a significant difference between the two groups at the .05 level ($\chi^2=9.14$, df=3). Among FYP women, 27.8% reported that they always complete their assignments before class, 57% almost always, 12.7% usually do so, and 2.3% rarely complete their assignments before class. Among non-FYP women, 9.8% always complete their assignments, 60.7% almost always complete their assignments, 26.2% usually do, and 1.7% rarely complete their assignments before class (Table 23).

Establishing Purpose

Establishing purpose is comprised of setting goals for career and taking steps towards those goals. In the FYP and non-FYP comparison, there was one question that showed a significant difference between the two groups. In the comparison of women in FYP and women not participating in FYP, there were no significant differences found in establishing purpose.

Establishing Contacts

Establishing contacts included students, faculty and administrators and staff. There were four questions in this section. One question showed a significant difference between the two groups. It was the same one that the FYP/non-FYP comparison showed a significant difference. The question asked

how often students spoke with faculty other than those that taught their classes.

The question

Table 23

FYP Women and Non-FYP Women: How Often Student Completes Assignments

Before Class

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	Always	Almost Always	Usually	Rarely
FYP Women	27.8%	57.0%	12.7%	2.5%
Non-FYP	9.8%	60.7%	26.2%	3.3%
Women				

Total Number of Cases: 140

 $p < .05$ $\chi^2 = 9.14$ $df = 3$

showed a significant difference between the two groups at the .05 level ($\chi^2=9.50$, df=3). Among FYP women, 76.3% responded that they never or rarely spoke to other faculty, 17.5% reported that they occasionally spoke to other faculty and 6.3% frequently communicate with other faculty. In comparison, 50.8% of women in the non-FYP group reported that they never or rarely communicated with other faculty, 8.2% reported occasionally doing so and none reported frequently communicating with faculty other than their instructors. FYP women reported communicating with other faculty more often than their non-FYP counterparts (Table 24).

University Involvement

University involvement was measured by the number of organizations in which students participated, the time spent with those organizations and the number of university events attended. There was question that showed a significant difference between the two groups in the number of events attended. FYP women heard more speakers outside of class than non-FYP women. Using chi-square analysis, there this question had a significant finding at the .05 level ($\chi^2=9.73$, df=3). There were originally four possible responses, but due to a low estimated frequency, two responses were combined. FYP women reported that 11.4% of them heard no speakers out of class, 65.8% heard between one and six speakers, and 22.8% heard seven or more speakers. The responses from non-FYP

Table 24

FYP Women and Non-FYP Women: How Often Do Students Communicate with Faculty Other than Their Own Instructors

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variables	Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Frequently
FYP Women	31.3%	45.0%	17.5%	6.3%
Non-FYP	50.8%	41.0%	8.2%	0.0%
Women				

Total Number of Cases: 141

p < .05

$\chi^2 = 9.50$

df = 3

women indicate that 30% heard no speakers, 58.3% heard between one and six and 11.7% heard seven or more speakers outside of class (Table 25).

University Environment

The students' perceptions of the university environment was measured by their perception of the physical environment and their perception of the heterogeneity and homogeneity of the campus population. There were no significant differences found in the perception of physical environment. The perception of heterogeneity and homogeneity was divided into perception of the general campus population and perception of the student's residence hall population. There was no significant differences found between the two groups on the questions about the campus population, but all four of the questions about the residence hall population indicated significant differences. FYP women indicated that their residence hall had a more diverse make up than did non-FYP women. The first of the four questions asked there were people with a variety of religious backgrounds in the residence hall. Of the FYP women, 86.1% agreed or strongly agreed while 13.9% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Of the non-FYP women, 72.4% agreed or strongly agreed and 27.6% disagreed or strongly disagreed. A significant difference was found between the two groups at the .05 level ($\chi^2=3.95$, df=1) (Table 26).

Table 25

FYP Women and Non-FYP Women: Number of Speakers Students Heard

Outside of Class

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	None	One	Two	Three or More
FYP Women	37.5%	32.5%	13.8%	16.3%
Non-FYP	55.7%	34.4%	6.6%	3.3%
Women				

Total Number of Cases: 141

 $p < .05$ $\chi^2 = 9.73$ $df = 3$

Table 26

FYP Women and Non-FYP Women: Perception of Diversity of Religious Background in the Residence Hall

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	Agree or Strongly Agree	Disagree or Strongly Disagree
FYP Women	86.1%	13.9%
Non-FYP Women	72.4%	27.6%

Total Number of Cases: 137

p < .05

$\chi^2 = 3.95$

df = 1

Next, students were asked to respond to the statement “There are people from a variety of racial backgrounds in my residence hall.” This question was found to show a significant difference between the two groups at the .05 level ($\chi^2=5.31$, df=1). Among FYP women, 82.5% agreed or strongly agreed and 17.5% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Of the non- FYP women, 65.6% agreed or strongly agreed while 34.4% disagreed or strongly disagreed (Table 27).

The third question asked about people from a variety of states. A significant difference between the two groups was found at the .01 level ($\chi^2=7.09$, df=1). FYP women responded “agree” or “strongly agree” 92.4% and “disagree” or “strongly disagree” 7.6% of the time. Non-FYP women responded “agree” or “strongly agree” 76.3% and “disagree” or “strongly disagree” 23.7% of the time (Table 28).

The final question that was found to show a significant difference between FYP women and non-FYP women asked students to respond to a statement that there were people from a variety of countries in the residence hall. There was a significant difference found at the .001 level ($\chi^2=15.93$, df=1). FYP women responded “agree” or “strongly agree” 77.2% and “disagree” or “strongly disagree” 22.8% of the time. Non-FYP women responded “agree” or “strongly agree” 44.1% and “disagree” or “strongly disagree” 55.9% of the time (Table 29).

Table 27

FYP Women and Non-FYP Women: Perception of Diversity of Racial Background in the Residence Hall

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	Agree or Strongly Agree	Disagree or Strongly Disagree
FYP Women	82.5%	17.5%
Non-FYP Women	65.6%	34.4%

Total Number of Cases: 141

p < .05

$\chi^2 = 5.31$

df = 1

Table 28

FYP Women and Non-FYP Women: Perception of Diversity of People from a Variety of States in the Residence Hall

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	Agree or Strongly Agree	Disagree or Strongly Disagree
FYP Women	92.4%	7.6%
Non-FYP Women	76.3%	23.7%

Total Number of Cases: 138

p < .01

$\chi^2 = 8.55$

df = 1

Table 29

FYP Women and Non-FYP Women: Perception of Diversity of People from a Variety of Countries in the Residence Hall

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	Agree or Strongly Agree	Disagree or Strongly Disagree
		Disagree
FYP Women	77.2%	22.8%
Non-FYP Women	44.1%	55.9%

Total Number of Cases: 138

p < .001

$\chi^2 = 15.93$

df = 1

Conclusion

The research question for this section was “is there a difference in the academic success of FYP women and non-FYP women.” There were several significant areas of difference. Questions showed significant differences between FYP women and non-FYP women in the areas of making progress to degree, making use of resources, participation in the learning process, establishing contacts, university involvement, and the university environment.

Academic Success of FYP Men and Non-FYP Men

The comparison of men in FYP and first-year men not participating in FYP resulted in findings similar to the overall sample comparison of FYP and non-FYP. Two questions showed significant differences in the comparison of men that did not show significant differences in the overall comparison. Those two questions dealt with understanding academic requirements and time with advisors. The results will be outlined in more detail below.

Making Progress to Degree

Making progress to degree was comprised of questions about GPA, number of class credits taken, and understanding of academic requirements. FYP men had a significantly higher GPA than non-FYP men. FYP men had a mean GPA of 3.00 while non-FYP men had a GPA of 2.64. The question was found to show a significant difference at the .05 level using a t-test (Table 30).

FYP men also enrolled in more class credits than non-FYP men did. FYP men enrolled in a mean of 16.61 class credits, while non-FYP men enrolled in a mean of 15.82 class credits. The question was found to show a significant difference at the .05 level using a t-test. There were no significant differences found in the number of class credits completed (Table 31).

There was one question found to show a significant difference significant difference concerning the students' understanding of academic requirements. The question asked what the required GPA was to remain in good standing at the university. There was not a significant difference in the responses of the overall comparison of FYP and non-FYP students, but there was a significant difference found at the .05 level ($\chi^2=6.16$, df=1) in the comparison of FYP men and non-FYP men. FYP men were less likely to answer the question correctly than non-FYP men. Of the FYP men, 22.9% answered wrong and 77.1% answered correctly. In comparison, 6.1% of non-FYP men answered incorrectly and 93.9% answered correctly (Table 32).

Making Use of Resources

Making use of resources was measured use of academic services, understanding of academic policies, and time with advisors. Two significant

Table 30

FYP Men and Non-FYP Men: Grade Point Average

Differences of Two Means

Variables	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard	Standard Error
			Deviation	of Mean
FYP Men	35	3.00	.683	.115
Non-FYP Men	70	2.64	.735	.088

Mean Difference: .36

 $p < .05$ $t = .244$ $df = 103$

Table 31

FYP Men and Non-FYP Men: Class Credits Enrolled in Fall 1997

Differences of Two Means

Variables	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean
FYP Men	36	16.6111	2.004	.334
Non-FYP Men	71	15.8169	1.588	.189

Mean Difference: .7942

 $p < .05$ $t = 2.23$ $df = 105$

Table 32

FYP Men and Non-FYP Men: Academic Requirements Question

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	Correct Response	Incorrect Response
FYP Men	77.1%	22.9%
Non-FYP Men	93.9%	6.1%

Total Number of Cases: 101

 $p < .05$ $\chi^2 = 6.16$ $df = 1$

differences were in this section. The first question asked about the students' understanding of academic policies, and the second asked about time spent with advisors.

The first question asked about the used appropriate time to used a specific academic policy. The question was found to show a significant difference at the .01 ($\chi^2=7.76$, df=1). FYP men answered the question correctly 47.2% of the time and incorrectly 52.8% of the time. Non-FYP men answered correctly 21.1% of the time and incorrectly 78.9% of the time (Table 33).

The second question that showed a significant difference asked about topics discussed during advising sessions. There was a significant difference found at the .05 level ($\chi^2=4.30$, df=1). FYP men were more likely to discuss choosing a major with their advisor than non-FYP men were. Fifty percent of FYP men indicated that this was a topic during their sessions, while 29.6% of non-FYP did (Table 34).

Participation in the Learning Process

This section was measured by reported class attendance, active involvement in class, and time spent studying. There was no significant differences found in this section in the comparison of FYP men and non-FYP men.

Table 33

FYP Men and Non-FYP Men: Academic Policy Question

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	Correctly Answered	Incorrectly Answered
FYP Men	47.2%	52.8%
Non-FYP Men	21.1%	78.9%

Total Number of Cases: 107

 $p < .01$ $\chi^2 = 7.76$ $df = 1$

Table 34

FYP Men and Non-FYP Men: Discuss Choosing a Major with Advisor

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	Did Discuss Choosing		Did Not Discuss Choosing
	Major	Major	Major
FYP Men	50.0%		50.0%
Non-FYP Men	29.6%		70.4%

Total Number of Cases: 107

 $p < .05$ $\chi^2 = 4.30$ $df = 1$

Establishing Purpose

Establishing purpose was measured by setting goals for the future and taking steps towards those goals. There was no significant differences found in this area in the comparison of FYP men and non-FYP men.

Establishing Contacts

Establishing contacts was measured by contact with students, faculty, and administrators and staff. There were no significant differences found in this section in the comparison of FYP men and non-FYP men.

University Involvement

University involvement was measured by the number of organizations in which students participated, the time spent with those organizations, and the number of university events the student attended. There was one significant difference found in this section. The question asked about the number of speakers a student heard outside of class. FYP men were more likely to hear multiple speakers outside of class than their non-FYP counterparts. There was a significant difference found between FYP men and non-FYP men at the .01 level ($\chi^2=12.46$, df=1). Among the FYP students, 44.4% reported hearing no speakers, 8.3% reported hearing one, 27.8% reported hearing two and 19.4% reported hearing three or more speakers out of class. Of the non-FYP men, 39.4% reported

hearing no speakers, 36.6% reported hearing one speaker, 9.9% reported hearing two speakers, and 14.1% reported hearing three or more speakers (Table 35).

University Environment

University environment was measured by the students' perceptions of the physical environment, and the students' perceptions of the heterogeneity and homogeneity of the student population on their campus. There were no significant differences between FYP men and non-FYP men in the perception of the physical campus. The next section had four questions about the homogeneity and heterogeneity of the campus population and four questions about the homogeneity and heterogeneity of the student's residence hall population. There was one question about the campus population that showed a significant difference, and three questions about the residence hall population that showed a significant difference between FYP men and non-FYP men. The first question asked students to respond to the statement, "In my opinion, within the student population on campus, there are people from a variety of countries." FYP men were more likely to agree or strongly agree than their non-FYP counterparts. Among FYP men, 97.2% agreed or strongly agreed and 2.8% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Among non-FYP men, 78.0% agreed or strongly agreed, while 21.1% disagreed or strongly disagreed. The question showed a significant difference between the two groups at the .05 level ($\chi^2=6.32$, df=1) (Table 36).

Table 35

FYP Men and Non-FYP Men: Number of Speakers Heard Outside of Class

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variables	None	One	Two	Three or More
FYP Men	44.4%	8.3%	27.8%	19.4%
Non-FYP Men	39.4%	36.6%	9.9%	14.1%

Total Number of Cases: 107

 $p < .01$ $\chi^2 = 12.46$ $df = 3$

Table 36

FYP and Non-FYP: Perception of Diversity of People from Other Countries on Campus

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	Agree or Strongly Agree	Disagree or Strongly Disagree
FYP Men	97.2%	2.8%
Non-FYP Men	78.9%	21.1%

Total Number of Cases: 107

p < .05

$\chi^2 = 6.34$

df = 1

The next questions asked about people from a variety of religious backgrounds in the residence hall. FYP men were more likely to agree or strongly agree than non-FYP men. This question showed a significant difference between FYP men and non-FYP men at the .05 level ($\chi^2=4.33$, df=1). Of FYP men, 94.4% agreed or strongly agreed and 5.6% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Of non-FYP men, 78.9% agreed or strongly agreed and 21.1% disagreed or strongly disagreed (Table 37).

The next question asked about racial backgrounds in the residence hall. FYP men were more likely to agree or strongly agree to the statement than non-FYP men were. The question showed a significant difference between FYP men and non-FYP men at the .05 level ($\chi^2=4.44$, df=1). Among FYP men, 94.4% agreed or strongly agreed and 5.6% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Of non-FYP men, 78.6% agreed or strongly agreed and 21.4% disagreed or strongly disagreed (Table 38).

The final question that showed a significant difference between FYP men and non-FYP men asked about a variety of people from different countries in the residence hall. FYP men were more likely to agree or strongly agree than non-FYP men. This question showed a significant difference at the .001 level ($\chi^2=12.53$, df=1). Among FYP men, 88.6% agreed or strongly agreed and 11.4%

Table 37

FYP Men and Non-FYP Men : Perception of Diversity of Religious Background
in the Residence Hall

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	Agree or Strongly Agree	Disagree or Strongly Disagree
FYP Men	94.4%	5.6%
Non-FYP Men	78.9%	21.1%

Total Number of Cases: 107

p < .05

$\chi^2 = 4.33$

df = 1

Table 38

FYP Men and Non-FYP Men: Perception of Diversity of Racial Background in the Residence Hall
 Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	Agree or Strongly Agree	Disagree or Strongly Disagree
FYP Men	94.4%	5.6%
Non-FYP Men	78.6%	21.4%

Total Number of Cases: 106

p < .05

$\chi^2 = 4.45$

df = 1

disagreed or strongly disagreed. Of non-FYP men, 53.6% agreed or strongly agreed and 46.4% disagreed or strongly disagreed (Table 39).

Conclusion

The research question for this section asked “is there a significant difference in the academic success of men in FYP and men who are not participating in FYP.” The results of this research showed that there were significant differences between FYP men and non-FYP men found in several areas. The areas of making progress to degree, making use of resources, university involvement and university environment all had questions that showed significant differences between the two groups.

Academic Success of FYP Minorities and Non-FYP Minorities

The return rate for minority students was the smallest return rate, and therefore many of the data analyses could not be run. Whenever possible, the data were collapsed to increase the estimated frequency and cell size.

There were five questions on the survey that showed statistically significant differences between FYP minority students and non-FYP minority students. None of the questions in the making progress to degree, participation in the learning process, establishing contacts, university involvement, or university environment sections had a significant finding.

Table 39

FYP Men and Non-FYP Men: Perception of Diversity of People from a Variety of Countries in the Residence Hall
 Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	Agree or Strongly Agree	Disagree or Strongly Disagree
FYP Men	88.6%	11.4%
Non-FYP Men	53.6%	46.6%

Total Number of Cases: 104

p < .001

$\chi^2 = 12.53$

df = 1

Making Use of Resources

Three of the five questions that showed a significant difference between the two groups came in this section. A question that asked about the use of a specific academic policy showed that FYP minority students answered correctly significantly more often than non-FYP minority students did. The question showed a significant difference at the .05 level ($\chi^2=5.87$, df=1). FYP minority students answered correctly at a rate of 80% and incorrectly at a rate of 20% while non-FYP minority students answered correctly at a rate of 40% and incorrectly at a rate of 60% (Table 40).

Two questions having to do with the time spent with advisors also showed a significant difference between FYP minority students and non-FYP minority students. According to responses, 100% of FYP minority students said they did not discuss study skills or time management with their advisors, while 26.7% (Table 41) of non-FYP minority students said they discussed study skills with their advisors, and 33.3% (Table 42) said they discussed time management with their advisors. The first question showed a significant difference at the .05 level ($\chi^2=6.02$, df=1) and the second question showed a significant difference at the .01 level ($\chi^2=7.78$, df=1).

Table 40

FYP Minority Students and Non-FYP Minority Students: Answer to Academic Policy Question

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	Correct Answer	Incorrect Answer
FYP Minority Students	80.0%	20.0%
Non-FYP Minority Students	40.0%	60.0%

Total Number of Cases: 35

p < .05

$\chi^2 = 5.87$

df = 1

Table 41

FYP Minority Students and Non-FYP Minority Students: Study Skills Discussed
with Advisor

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variables	Discussed	Not Discussed
FYP Minority Students	0.0%	100.0%
Non-FYP Minority Students	26.7%	73.3%

Total Number of Cases: 35

p < .05

$\chi^2 = 6.02$

df = 1

Table 42

FYP Minority Students and Non-FYP Minority Students: Time Management

Discussed with Advisor

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	Discussed	Not Discussed
FYP Minority Students	0.0%	100.0%
Non-FYP Minority Students	33.3%	66.7%

Total Number of Cases: 35

 $p < .01$ $\chi^2 = 7.78$ $df = 1$

Establishing Purpose

Two questions were found to show a significant difference in this section. Students were asked to respond to the statement, “While in college, I plan to participate in part time jobs, summer jobs, co-ops, or volunteer work that relate to my future career.” FYP minority students were more likely to agree or strongly agree than non-FYP minority students were. Eighty five percent FYP minority students indicated agree or strongly agree while 46.7% of non-FYP minority students indicated agree or strongly agree. The question showed a significant difference between FYP minority students and non-FYP minority students at the .05 level ($\chi^2=4.37$, df=1) (Table 43).

The second question asked students to respond to the statement, “I have spoken with advisors, mentors, and/or a professional about my chosen career. One hundred percent of the FYP minority students agreed or strongly agreed, while 80% of non-FYP minority students agreed or strongly agreed (Table 44).

Conclusion

The research question for this area was “is there a significant difference in the academic success of FYP minority students and non-FYP minority students?” The data results showed significant differences in several areas of academic success. The areas of making use of resources and establishing purpose had

questions that showed a significant difference between FYP minority students
and

Table 43

FYP Minority Students and Non-FYP Minority Students: Spoken to Mentors,
 Advisors, or Professionals About Chosen Career
 Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	Agree or Strongly Agree	Disagree or Strongly Disagree
FYP Minority Students	100.0%	0.0%
Non-FYP Minority Students	80.0%	20.0%

Total Number of Cases: 35

p < .05

$\chi^2 = 4.37$

df = 1

Table 44

FYP Minority Students and Non-FYP Minority Students: Planning on
 Participating in Part Time Jobs, Summer Jobs, Co-ops, or Volunteer Work that
 Relate to Chosen Career

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	Agree or Strongly Agree	Disagree or Strongly
		Disagree
FYP Minority Students	85.0%	15.0%
Non-FYP Minority Students	46.7%	53.3%
<hr/>		

Total Number of Cases: 35

p < .05

$\chi^2 = 1.29$

df = 1

non-FYP minority students. The low sample size of minority students could have prevented significant statistical findings in other areas.

Academic Success of FYP Majority Students and Non-FYP Majority Students

The final section compares FYP majority students and non-FYP majority students. There were several areas that showed a significant difference of academic success in this comparison. The significant areas often mirrored the significant areas of the overall FYP/non-FYP comparison. Many of the same questions were found to show a significant difference between the two groups, and there was one question found to show a significant difference in this comparison that was not found to show a significant difference in the overall comparison. It was in the university involvement section. In this comparison, there were no significant differences found in the participation in the learning process and establishing purpose sections.

Making Progress to Degree

Significant differences were found in the comparisons of GPA, credits in which students enrolled and credits completed. FYP majority students had a higher mean GPA than non-FYP majority students. FYP majority students had a mean GPA of 2.94 ($t = .023$) and the non-FYP majority students had a mean GPA of 2.74 (Table 45).

Table 45

FYP Majority Students and Non-FYP Majority Students: GPA

Differences of Two Means

Variables	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean
FYP Majority	91	2.94	.578	.061
Students				
Non-FYP	115	2.74	.704	.066
Majority				
Students				

Mean Difference: .204

 $p < .05$ $t = 2.23$ $df = 207$

FYP majority students were more likely to enroll for more class credits.

The question showed a significant difference between FYP majority students and non-FYP majority students at the .001 level using a t-test. FYP majority students enrolled in a mean of 16.67 credits and non-FYP majority students enrolled in a mean of 15.47 credits (Table 46). FYP majority students were also more likely to complete more class credits. FYP majority students completed a mean of 16.20 credits and non-FYP majority students completed a mean of 14.78. The question showed a significant difference between the two groups at the .001 level (Table 47).

Making Use of Resources

Two questions in this section were found to show a significant difference between FYP majority students and non-FYP majority students. The first question asked about the students' knowledge of a specific academic policy. The second question asked about the topics a students discussed with their advisors.

FYP majority students were more likely to answer the question about academic policy correctly at the .05 level of significance ($\chi^2=5.23$, df=1). FYP majority students answered the question correctly 35.9% of the time and incorrectly 64.1% of the time. Non-FYP majority students answered correctly 21.6% of the time and incorrectly 78.4% of the time (Table 48).

Table 46

FYP Majority Students and Non-FYP Majority Students: Class Credits in Which
Students Enrolled

Differences of Two Means

Variables	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard	Standard
			Deviation	Error of Mean
FYP Majority	93	16.68	1.663	.172
Students				
Non-FYP	116	15.47	1.518	.141
Majority				
Students				

Mean Difference: 1.203

p < .001

t = 5.46

df = 207

Table 47

FYP Majority Students and Non-FYP Majority Students: Class Credits

Completed

Differences of Two Means

Variables	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean
FYP Majority	93	16.20	2.328	.241
Students				
Non-FYP	115	14.78	2.947	.275
Majority Students				

Mean Difference: 1.4158

 $p < .001$ $t = 3.78$ $df = 206$

Table 48

FYP Majority Students and Non-FYP Majority Students: Question About Knowledge of Academic Policy
 Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	Correct Answer	Incorrect Answer
FYP Majority Students	35.9%	64.1%
Non- FYP Majority Students	21.6%	78.4%
<hr/>		

Total Number of Cases: 208

p < .05

$\chi^2 = 5.23$

df = 1

The second question in this section asked about topics discussed during time with their academic advisors. FYP majority students reported discussing choice of major more often than non-FYP majority students did. The question showed a significant difference between the two groups at a .05 level ($\chi^2=4.89$, df=1). Of the FYP majority students, 50.5% reported discussing the topic and 49.5% did not. Of the non-FYP majority students, 35.3% reported discussing the topic and 64.7% did not (Table 49).

Establishing Contacts

There was a significant difference found in one question concerning contacting faculty. FYP majority students reported communicating with faculty other than those that taught their classes more than non-FYP majority students. Of the FYP majority students, 32.3% reported never communicating with other faculty, 48.4% said rarely, 15.1% said occasionally, and 4.3% said frequently. Of the non-FYP majority students, 49.1% reported never, 40.5% said rarely, 9.5% reported occasionally, and .9% said frequently. The question showed a significant difference at the .05 level ($\chi^2=8.15$, df=1) (Table 50).

University Involvement

There were three questions that were found to show significant differences between FYP majority students and non-FYP majority students in the number of university events attended. The questions asked about speakers outside of class,

Table 49

FYP Majority Students and Non-FYP Majority Students: Discussed Choosing Major with Advisor

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	Did	Did Not
FYP Majority Students	50.5%	49.5%
Non- FYP Majority Students	35.3%	64.7%
<hr/>		

Total Number of Cases: 209

p < .05

$\chi^2 = 4.88$

df = 1

Table 50

FYP Majority Students and Non-FYP Majority Students: Communication with Faculty Other Than Own Professors

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variables	Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Frequently
FYP Majority	32.3%	48.4%	15.1%	4.35
Students				
Non-FYP	49.1%	40.5%	9.5%	0.9%
Majority				
Students				

Total Number of Cases: 209

p < .05

$\chi^2 = 8.15$

df = 1

university sponsored entertainers, and residence hall programs that students attended.

FYP majority students were more likely to hear speakers outside of class than non-FYP majority students. The question showed a significant difference at the .01 level ($\chi^2=15.55$, df=3). Of the FYP majority students, 39.8% indicated they had heard no speakers, 22.6% said one, 19.4% heard two, and 18.3% heard three or more speakers. Of the non-FYP majority students, 48.3% heard no speakers, 37.1% heard one, 8.6% heard two, and 6.0% heard three or more speakers (Table 51).

FYP majority students were also more likely to see multiple university sponsored entertainers. The question showed a significant difference at the .05 level ($\chi^2=7.90$, df=3). Of the FYP majority students, 54.8% indicated they'd heard no speakers, 33.3% said one, 10.8% heard two, and 1.1% heard three or more speakers. Of the non-FYP majority students, 46.6% heard no speakers, 49.1% heard one, 3.4% heard two, and .9% heard three or more speakers (Table 52).

The third significant difference between the two groups in this section concerned the number of non-required residence hall programs the students attended. FYP majority students attended significantly more programs than non-

FYP majority students did. The question showed a significant difference at the .01

Table 51

FYP Majority Students and Non-FYP Majority Students: Number of Speakers

Students Heard Outside of Class

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	None	One	Two	Three or More
FYP Majority	39.8%	22.6%	19.4%	18.3%
Students				
Non-FYP	48.3%	37.1%	8.6%	6.0%
Majority				
Students				

Total Number of Cases: 209

 $p < .01$ $\chi^2 = 15.55$ $df = 1$

Table 52

FYP Majority Students and Non-FYP Majority Students: Number of University Sponsor Entertainers Student Saw

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	None	One	Two	Three or More
FYP Majority	54.8%	33.3%	10.8%	1.1%
Students				
Non-FYP	46.6%	49.1%	3.4%	0.9%
Majority				
Students				

Total Number of Cases: 209

p < .05

$\chi^2 = 7.90$

df = 3

level ($\chi^2=15.25$, df=5). Of the FYP majority students, 15.1% did not attend any programs, 61.3% attended between one and three programs, 18.3% attended between seven and nine programs and 1.1% attended ten or more programs. Of the non-FYP majority students, 31.6% did not attend any programs, 50.9% attended between one and three programs, 8.6% attended between seven and nine programs and .9% attended ten or more programs (Table 53).

University Environment

There were five questions that showed a significant difference between FYP majority students and non-FYP majority students in this section. The first one had to do with perceptions of diversity in the campus population and the last four asked about students' perceptions of diversity in the residence hall population. The first question asked students to respond to the statement, "In my opinion, within the student population on campus, there are people from a variety of countries." FYP majority students were more likely to agree or strongly agree than their non-FYP counterparts. The question showed a significant difference at the .05 level ($\chi^2=6.5$, df=1). Among FYP majority students, 90.2% agreed or strongly agreed and 9.8% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Among non-FYP majority students, 76.7% agreed or strongly agreed, while 23.3% disagreed or strongly disagreed (Table 54).

Table 53

FYP Majority Students and Non-FYP Majority Students: Number of Non-Required Residence Hall Programs Attended

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	None	1-3	4-6	7-9	10 or More
FYP	15.1%	61.3%	18.3%	3.2%	1.1%
Majority Students					
Non-FYP	37.1%	50.9%	8.6%	2.6%	0.9%
Majority Students					

Total Number of Cases: 209

p < .01

$\chi^2 = 15.26$

df = 5

Table 54

FYP Majority Students and Non-FYP Majority Students: Perception of Diversity
of People from a Variety of Countries on Campus
Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	Agree or Strongly Agree	Disagree or Strongly Disagree
FYP Majority Students	90.2%	9.8%
Non-FYP Majority Students	76.7%	23.3%

Total Number of Cases: 208

p < .05

$\chi^2 = 6.53$

df = 1

The first of the four questions about residence hall populations asked there were people with a variety of religious backgrounds in the residence hall. This question showed a significant difference at the .05 level ($\chi^2=4.53$, df=1). Of the FYP majority students, 89.1% agreed or strongly agreed while 10.9% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Of the non-FYP majority students, 77.9% agreed or strongly agreed and 22.1% disagreed or strongly disagreed (Table 55).

Next, students were asked to respond to the statement “There are people from a variety of racial backgrounds in my residence hall.” Among FYP majority students, 89.2% agreed or strongly agreed and 10.8% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Of the non-FYP majority students, 74.1% agreed or strongly agreed while 25.9% disagreed or strongly disagreed (Table 56). The question showed a significant difference between FYP majority students and non-FYP majority students at the .05 level ($\chi^2=7.61$, df=1).

The third question asked about people from a variety of states. FYP majority students responded “agree” or “strongly agree” 90.2% and “disagree” or “strongly disagree” 9.8% of the time at a significance level of .05 ($\chi^2=4.19$, df=1). Non-FYP majority students responded “agree” or “strongly agree” 79.8% and “disagree” or “strongly disagree” 20.2% of the time (Table 57).

The final question that showed a significant difference between FYP majority students and non-FYP majority students asked students to respond to a

Table 55

FYP Majority Students and Non-FYP Majority Students: Perception of Diversity
of Religious Background in the Residence Hall
Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	Agree or Strongly Agree	Disagree or Strongly Disagree
FYP Majority Students	89.1%	10.9%
Non-FYP Majority Students	77.9%	22.1%

Total Number of Cases: 205

p < .05

$\chi^2 = 4.54$

df = 1

Table 56

FYP Majority Students and Non-FYP Majority Students: Perception of Diversity
of Racial Background in the Residence Hall
Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	Agree or Strongly Agree	Disagree or Strongly Disagree
FYP Majority Students	89.2%	10.8%
Non-FYP Majority Students	74.1%	25.9%

Total Number of Cases: 209

p < .01

$\chi^2 = 7.61$

df = 1

Table 57

FYP Majority Students and Non-FYP Majority Students: Perception of Diversity
of People from a Variety of Countries in the Residence Hall
Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	Agree or Strongly Agree	Disagree or Strongly Disagree
FYP Majority Students	90.2%	9.8%
Non-FYP Majority Students	79.8%	20.2%

Total Number of Cases: 206

p < .001

$\chi^2 = 27.20$

df = 1

statement that there were people from a variety of countries in the residence hall.

The question showed a significant difference at the .001 level ($\chi^2=27.20$, df=1).

FYP majority students responded “agree” or “strongly agree” 82.4% and “disagree” or “strongly disagree” 17.6% of the time. Non-FYP majority students responded “agree” or “strongly agree” 46.9% and “disagree” or “strongly disagree” 53.1% of the time (Table 58).

Conclusion

The research question for this section asked if there was a significant difference in the academic success of FYP majority students and non-FYP majority students. The data showed several significant areas of differences. The areas of university environment, university involvement, establishing contacts, making use of resources, and making progress to degree all had questions that showed a significant difference between FYP majority students and non-FYP majority students.

Conclusion

The answer to all of the research questions was “yes.” There were significant differences in numerous areas of academic success between FYP students and non-FYP students. These results will be discussed in more depth in the next chapter.

Table 58

FYP Majority Students and Non-FYP Majority Students: Perception of Diversity

of People from a Variety of Countries in the Residence Hall

Chi-square Test of Significance

Variable	Agree or Strongly Agree	Disagree or Strongly
		Disagree
FYP Majority Students	82.4%	17.6%
Non-FYP Majority Students	46.9%	53.1%

Total Number of Cases: 204

Pearson Significance: .001

Chapter Five: Discussion and Implications

The data reported in Chapter Four showed that the answer to all five research questions was “yes.” There were significant differences of FYP students and non-FYP students in some areas of academic success. FYP students reported higher grades, more classes completed, higher levels of interaction with faculty, and higher levels of involvement on campus. FYP students were also more likely to be taking steps towards their career goals. These are just a few of the positive results this study found. They will be discussed in more depth in the following chapter.

Academic Success of FYP and non-FYP Students

FYP students had a higher GPA, enrolled in more classes and completed more classes. This contradicted Herber’s (1966) study, which found no grade differences between first year students in all freshmen housing and those in mixed housing. This is a significant part of academics success. Students who complete more classes are more likely to graduate on track.

This study concurred with other research. In a longitudinal study, Knight (1993) found that students in the FYP at Georgia Southern University had higher grades than students who were not in the program.

This study re-enforced Pascarella and Terenzini’s (1981) findings, which reported that first year students in living learning environments earned higher

grades and reported greater satisfaction with faculty relationships than first year students in traditional housing.

This study did not investigate the quality of faculty relationships, but it did examine the quantity of faculty relationships. FYP students reported increased contact with faculty other than their own instructors. This seems to fall in line with work done by Pascarella and Terenzini (1981). Endo and Harpel (1982) also reported that students who had contact with faculty outside the classroom were more likely to be academically successful. The FYP students had higher grades, more completed classes and increased faculty contact outside the classroom.

One possible explanation is self-selection. It is possible that the students who applied for the program were more determined to succeed in college and would have sought out resources and made good grades whether they were in the program or not.

FYP students also showed some increased understanding of academic policies. While FYP students answered correctly more often than non-FYP students, the correct response rate was very low for both groups. FYP students answered correctly 39.1% of the time and non-FYP students answered correctly 22.6% of the time. This indicates that most first year students do not understand the policy, but FYP students exhibit more understanding than non-FYP students.

FYP students were more likely to complete all their assignments before class. Completing assignments before class is a significant part of participating in the learning process. Astin (1984) reported that students who were more involved in the learning process were more likely to be successful in school. Using GPA and class credits as a basic guide, this study supports Astin's findings. FYP students reported higher grades and more completed class credits in addition to being more likely to complete assignments before class.

Clarke, Miser, and Roberts (1988), found that theme housing seemed to isolate freshmen. This study did not support that finding. There was no significant difference in the amount of student contact reported by FYP and non-FYP students. FYP student reported attending more hall programs and hearing more speakers on campus. It appeared that FYP students were slightly more likely to become involved on campus.

Eight questions on the instrument asked about the students' perception of diversity on campus and in the residence hall. There was a significant difference found in one question about diversity on campus. FYP students felt more strongly than non-FYP students that there was a variety of people from various countries on campus. The next four questions asked about a people with a variety of religious views, racial backgrounds, people from a variety of states and people from a variety of countries in the residence hall. There were significant

differences on all four questions. FYP students felt more strongly that there was diversity in their residence hall than non-FYP students. This could be statistically true. Of the students who indicated their ethnic background in university documents, 15.5% of the students on campus are minority students, while 23.22% of students in FYP are minority students. Information about students' state of residence and religious background was not available.

FYP students were also more likely to talk to advisors, mentors or professionals about career plans. Increasing students' sense of purpose and encouraging them to talk to advisors and mentors about future careers is something with which administrators struggle. Alumni report that they considered establishing a purpose in college important but did not attain that sense of purpose (Alumni Survey). It is therefore significant that the FYP may be able to increase this aspect of academic success.

Academic Success of FYP Women and Non-FYP Women

Like the overall comparison of participants, women in FYP also enrolled in more classes and completed more classes. As noted before, this could be a result of self-selection. The women in the program could have enrolled in the program because they recognized opportunities to help them increase their academic success, and would have been successful whether they entered the program or not.

FYP women also had a better understanding of academic policy. The correct answer rates for both FYP women and non-FYP women were still very low, with only 7.5% of FYP women answering correctly, and 6.7% of non-FYP women answering correctly. This seems to indicate that while the majority of first year students are not sure how the policy works, FYP women are have slightly more understanding of the policy.

FYP women were also more likely to complete their assignments before class than non-FYP women were. Astin (1984) said that completing assignments was part of being involved in the learning process, which could increase academic success. FYP women were more likely to communicate with faculty other than their own instructors. Endo and Harpel (1982) found that an increase in faculty contact outside the classroom could increase academic success. While there was no difference in grades for women, there was a significant increase in the number of classes FYP women completed.

Clarke, Miser, and Roberts (1988) said that theme housing seemed to isolate first year students. There were no significant difference in the amount of student contact of FYP women and non-FYP women, and FYP women did hear more speakers on campus. This seems to counter what Clarke, Miser, and Roberts found.

Like the overall comparison, the FYP women felt more strongly that there is a diversity of people in their residence halls than non-FYP women did. Again, statistically, there is a higher rate of minority students in the FYP than in the campus population as a whole.

Academic Success of FYP Men and Non-FYP Men

FYP men had a higher GPA and enrolled in more class credits than non-FYP men. There was not significant difference in the class credits completed. It should be noted that students enrolled in classes during summer orientation, before they entered the FYP. The information about class credits seems to support the self-selection idea.

FYP men were also less likely to answer a question about academic requirements correctly, but more likely to answer a question about academic policy correctly. FYP men were more likely to discuss choosing a major with their advisor. The above findings are examples of how this study could be followed up with a qualitative study to discover why these disparities exist.

Clarke, Miser, and Roberts (1988), found that theme housing isolated freshmen. However, FYP men were also more likely to hear multiple speakers on campus. Additionally, there was no significant differences in the contacts made on campus. This seems to counter the 1988 study.

Like the FYP/non-FYP comparison, FYP men were more likely to feel that there was a variety of people from different countries in the campus population. FYP men were also more likely to feel that there was diversity in their residence hall. As noted before, statistically there were more minority students in the FYP than in the campus population.

Academic Success of FYP Minority Students and non-FYP Minority Students

Minority students in FYP were more likely to answer correctly on questions about academic policy. Again, the correct response rate was low, but FYP students seemed to have a better understanding than non-FYP students.

One significant difference was in the area of time with advisors. FYP minority students indicated that they did not discuss study skills or time management with their advisors at all. There are a few possible explanations for this result. First, the sample size was very small. Only twenty FYP minority students and fifteen non-FYP minority students returned their survey. The second possible explanation is that the FYP minority students are getting this information through the FYP program, either through student advisors, hall programs, or the seminar.

The third significant area was in the area of establishing purpose. Helping students establish purpose is an on-going struggle for administrators (Alumni Survey, 1995). There was a significant difference in two of the four questions in

this section for minority students. First, FYP minority students were more likely to plan on participating in co-ops, summer jobs, internships, and volunteer work that relates to their career. Second, FYP minority students were more likely to speak to mentors, advisors, or professionals about their career plans.

Although there were statistically more minority students in the FYP than on campus, there was no difference in the perceptions of minority students. There were also no differences in grades or the number of class credits taken. There are several possible explanations for this. First, the sample size was very small. There were only 20 FYP minority students and 15 non-minority students represented. Second, for the purposes of this study, minority was defined as all people of color. Due to low numbers, the study could not examine specific ethnic groups. While approximately 23% of the students in FYP, only 8.8% of FYP students are African American, one student is American Indian, 7.7% are Asian or Pacific Islander, and 1.9% are Hispanic. This is still an increase in the campus percentages. African Americans make up 5.1% of the students on campus, .20% of the students on campus are American Indian, 7.3 are Asian American or Pacific Islander, and 2% are Hispanic. Despite the increase, from a minority students' perspective, there are still few people with their ethnic background. This is not necessarily something the FYP can resolve.

Academic Success of FYP Majority Students and Non-FYP Majority Students

Findings in this section closely matched the findings of the FYP/non-FYP comparison. FYP majority students had higher grades, enrolled in more class credits and completed more class credits. This seems to support Pascarella and Terenzini (1981) who found that freshmen in FYPs had higher grades. It also supports literature from Knight (1993) who found that students in a FYP had higher grades. This counters Herber (1966) who found no significant grade difference. Again, this could be due to self-selection as discussed earlier in this chapter.

FYP majority students showed more knowledge of academic policy than did non-FYP majority students. Neither group of students had a high correct answer rate. FYP majority students were also more likely to discuss choice of major with their advisor.

Endo and Harpel (1982) found that students who communicate with faculty outside of class earned higher grades. This study seemed to concur with Endo and Harpel. FYP majority students were more likely to communicate with faculty other than their own professors, and they had higher grades.

Clarke, Miser, and Roberts (1988), found that theme housing isolated freshmen. However, FYP majority students were more likely to hear multiple

speakers on campus, attend more university-sponsored entertainers, and attend more hall programs. Additionally, there was no significant differences in the contacts made on campus. This seems to counter Clarke, Miser and Roberts' findings.

Like the FYP/non-FYP comparison, FYP majority students were more likely to feel that there was a variety of people from different countries in the campus population. FYP majority students were also more likely to feel that there was diversity in their residence hall. As noted before, statistically there were more minority students in the FYP than in the campus population.

Implications for Practice

This study shows that through intentional efforts, practitioners can help students make connections between in-class and out-of-class learning and give students opportunities to increase their level of academic success. The results reflect a very successful program that positively affects the participants in a variety of ways. The study also uncovered some problem areas for all students, however, in most cases FYP students reported few problems in those areas than non-FYP students. This will be examined more in this section.

There are numerous implications for practice from this study. The first has to do with the students' knowledge of academic policies and academic requirements. While the FYP students seemed to have more knowledge about the

policies and requirements than the non-FYP students, the rate of correct answers were very low. Responsibility for communication of these policies and requirements is not the responsibility of any one person or department on campus. FYP administrators may want to consider using the FYP seminar and/or working with academic deans to present the information to students.

There were two areas that could be further emphasized: establishing purpose and participation in the learning process. These are two areas that are important to academic success and can be difficult for students to develop. The FYP program appears to positively affect the areas, however, it is possible more could be done. Some suggestions would be increased discussion in the seminar, more programs on the topics, and informational bulletin boards.

Another suggestion for future practice is housing focused on second-year issues, third-year issues, and graduating senior issues. Each level during the students' college career brings a variety of issues and topics. Housing themes focused on these issues could help students make transitions throughout their college career as well as the transition from college to career.

The program seems to be positively affecting academic success of the participants. The program should be continued, refined and perhaps expanded to allow other students into the program. Specific aspects of the program could be expanded to other halls, even if it is not possible to expand the entire program.

For example, a program could be established to increase faculty contact with students in traditional housing. This could take the form of a faculty masters program, an “adopt a faculty” program, or simply bringing faculty into the building to do programs. Peer mentors similar to the student assistant position could be established in various halls. Resident assistants could be trained on the issues that their building is likely to have based on their student population. For example, a building that typically has upper-class students could train RAs about the transitions facing those students and how to address those issues. Similar training could be done for buildings that have a high number of athletes, Greeks, etc.

Implications for Research

There definitely should be continued research and evaluation on freshmen year programs. The first suggestion is a longitudinal study. As these students continue into their second year and move towards graduation, it will be interesting to see if there is a continued difference in grades, involvement in the university, use of resources, and other areas of academic success. Other differences in academic success may develop. Another piece of information that could be important to administrators is the retention and graduation rates of these students.

A follow-up project to this one would be very beneficial also. This project answered some questions, and created others. The question, “Why?” seems to keep coming up. For example, why do FYP minority students not talk to their advisors about study skills and time management? Is it because the FYP answers questions for them or because of a small sample size or some other reason? A qualitative research project could answer some of those questions.

Finally, for future research it is recommended that the participants’ high school grades or SAT /ACT scores be taken into account. This will help control for self-selection.

Conclusion

It appears that the FYP has positive impact on the academic success of the participants. This was true for men, women, minority students and majority students. Men and majority students especially seem to benefit from the program. There were a few questions that seemed to indicate a negative impact, but there were not enough to suggest that the program was not a success. This study shows that through intentional efforts, practitioners can connect in-class and out-of-class experiences, giving students the opportunity to increase their level of academic success.

Reference

- Allen, B.P. and Niss, J.F. (1989). The college classroom climate: A chilly one for minorities, women and international students. Pre-publication copy.
- Alexander, K.L. and Eckland, B.K. (1974). Sex difference in the educational attainment process. American Sociological Review, 39, 668-682.
- Alexander, R. (1996). The residential nexus: A focus on student learning. Talking Stick, 13(7), 6-12.
- Alumni Survey, (1995). Office of Academic Assessment, Virginia Tech.
Unpublished data.
- Anastasi, A., Meade, M.J. and Schneider, A.A. (1960). The validation of a biographical inventory as a predictor of college success. College Entrance Examination Board: New York.
- A profile of incoming freshmen at Virginia Tech. (1995). Unpublished document.
- Astin, A.W. (1984). Student involvement: A development theory for higher education. Journal of College Student Personnel, 25, 297-308.
- Berger, J.B. (1997). Students' sense of community in residence halls, social integration, and first-year persistence. Journal of College Student Development, 38(5), 441-452.

Cade, S.M. (1979). A comparison of the developmental impact of homogeneous and heterogeneous housing conditions on freshmen. The Journal of College and University Student Housing, 9(2), 18-21.

Clarke, J., Miser, K., and Roberts, A. (1988). Freshmen residential programs: Effects of living learning structure, faculty involvement, and thematic focus. Journal of College and University Student Housing, 18(2), 7-13.

Dawson-Threat, J. (1993). Career maturity of college seniors as a function of gender, sex-role identification, and choice of major. Dissertation, Iowa State University: Ames, Iowa.

Endo, J.J. and Harpel, R.L. (1982). The effect of student-faculty interaction of students' educational outcomes. Research in Higher Education, 16(2), 115-135.

Fields, V. (1991). An investigation into factors affecting academic success associated with on-campus and off-campus living experiences for African-American undergraduate students at Iowa State University. Dissertation. Iowa State University: Ames, Iowa.

Gardner, J.N. Reflections on the first-year residential experiences. In Zeller, W.J., Fidler, D.S. & Barefoot, B.O. (1991) Residence life programs and the first year experience. Columbia, S.C.: Association of

College and University Housing Officers-International/Resource Center
for the Freshmen Year Experience.

Gosman, E.J., Dandridge, B.A., Nettles, M.T. and Theony, A.R.
(1983). Predicting student progression: The influence of race and other
student and institutional characteristics on college student performance.
Research in Higher Education, 18, 209-237.

Grimm, James C. (1993). Residential alternatives. In R.B. Winston, Jr.,
S. Anchors & Associates (Eds.), Student housing and residential life. San
Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gurin, P. and Epps, E. (1975). Black consciousness, identity, and
achievement. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Herber, D.J. (1996). The relationship between the percentage of freshmen
on a residence hall corridor and the grade point averages of the occupants.
College and University, 348-352.

Howe, K.E. and Post, J.B. (1997). Suggestions for data collection for the
college of forestry and wildlife resources. Unpublished document.

Knight, W.E. (1993). Success in “U” program study. Georgia Southern
University: Office of Institutional Research and Planning.

Moen, J. (1986). Freshmen's academic performance and perceptions of residence hall living as related to roommates' academic classification. Master's thesis. Iowa State University. Ames, Iowa.

Moore, L.J., and Ostrander, E.R. (1980). Physical and social determinants of student satisfaction in university residence halls: Theme dorm concept. Housing and Society, 7(1), 26-34.

Muckenhirk-Wishart, M.E. (1988). Characteristics of students reinstated Fall 1981-Spring 1987 by the college of education at Iowa State University and the relationship of these characteristics to academic success. Master's thesis. Iowa State University: Ames, Iowa.

Pascarella, E.T., and Terenzini, P.T. (1981). Residence arrangement, student/faculty relationships, and freshman year educational outcomes. College Student Personnel 22, 147-155.

Pike, G.R., Schroeder, C.C., and Berry, T.R. (1997). Enhancing the educational impact of residence halls: The relationship between learning communities and first-year college experiences and persistence. Journal of College Student Development 38, 609-621.

Richards, J.M., Jr., Holland, J.L., and Lutz, S.W. (1967). Predication of student accomplishment in college. Journal of Educational Psychology 58(6), 343-55.

- Riker, H.C. (1981). Residential Learning. In The Modern American College, Chickering, A.W. (Ed.) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schelhas, C.L. (1977-78). Can freshmen residence halls be justified? The Journal of College and University Student Housing, 7(2), 21-24.
- Schroeder, C.C. (1980). The impact of homogeneous housing on environmental perceptions and student development. The Journal of College and University Student Housing 10(2), 10-15.
- Schroeder, C.C., Astin, A., Astin, H., Boland, P., Cross, K.P., Hurst, J., Kuh, G. Marchese, T., Nuss, E. Pascarella, E., Pruitt, A., and Rooney, M. (1996). The student learning imperative: Implications for student affairs. The Journal of College Student Development, 37(2), 118-122.
- Sichta, T. and Avery, R. (1995). Meeting a mandate at Georgia Tech. Talking Stick 13(2), 10-12.
- Snyder, P.L. (1996). "Comparative levels of expressed academic motivation among Anglo and African American university student athletes." Journal of Black Studies, 26(6), 651-667.
- Strange, C. (1991). Managing college environments: Theory and practice. In Administration and leadership in student affairs: Actualizing student development in higher education, Miller, T.K. and Winston, R.B.Jr. (Eds.) Muncie, Indiana: Accelerated Development, Inc. 159-199.

- Terenzini, P.T., and Pascarella, E.T. (1979). Toward the validation of Tinto's model of college student attrition: A review of recent studies. Paper presented at the annual forum of the AIR, San Diego, California.
- Tinto, V., & Goodsell, A. (1993). Freshman interest groups and the first year experience: Constructing student communities in a large university. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the College Reading and Learning Association, Kansas, MO.
- Trippi, J. and Baker, S. (1989). Student and residential correlates of black student grade performance and persistence at a predominately white university campus. Journal of College Student Personnel, 30, 136-143.
- Suen, H. (1983). Alienation and attrition of black college students on a predominantly white campus. Journal of College Student Personnel, 24, 117-121.
- Whigham, M.A. (1985). Variables related to the academic success of women engineering students. Dissertation. Iowa State University: Ames, Iowa.
- Whitla, D.K. (1981). Value added and other related matters. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University, Office of Instructional Research and Evaluation.
- Willie, C., and McCord, A. (1972). Black students at white colleges. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Willingham, W.W. (1985) Success in college: The role of personal qualities and academic ability. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Zeller, W.J., Fidler, D.S., and Barefoot, B.O. (1991). Resident life programs and the first year experience. Columbia S.C.: Association of College and University Housing Officers International/Resource Center for the Freshmen Year Experience.

**Appendix A
Academic Experience Survey**

Academic Experiences Survey

Section I

1. How many times this semester have you met with your academic advisor?

- A. Never
- B. 1-2 times
- C. 3-5 times
- D. more than 5 times

2. What topics are discussed during your meetings with your academic advisor? (Check all that apply)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Courses/scheduling | <input type="checkbox"/> Personal issues |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Study Skills | <input type="checkbox"/> Career Choices |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Time Management | <input type="checkbox"/> Choosing a Major |

3. On average, how long does each meeting with your advisor last?

- A. Less than 10 minutes
- B. 11-20 minutes
- C. 21-30 minutes
- D. 31-60 minutes
- E. over an hour

4. How often did you meet with your advisor last semester?

- A. Never
- B. Once
- C. 2-3 times
- D. 4 or more times
- E. Not applicable (Didn't attend Virginia Tech last semester)

5. Place a check next to the campus services you have utilized this semester:

- Tutoring through the Center for Academic Enhancement
- Career Services
- University Counseling Center
- Academic Advising with your advisor
- the Library

Section II

6. On average, how often do you participate in academic discussions in class?

- A. 3 or more times a class
- B. 1-2 times per class
- C. Less than once a class
- D. Never

7. On average, how many hours a week do you spend studying and working on homework?

- A. More than 20 hours
- B. 10-19 hours
- C. 5-9 hours
- D. Less than 5 hours a week

8. On average, how many classes do you miss in a week?

- A. More than 4 times
- B. 3-4 times
- C. 1-2 times
- D. Never

9. How often do you complete all assignments before attending class (i.e. reading assignment, homework)

- A. Always
- B. Almost Always
- C. Usually
- D. Rarely
- E. Never

Section III

10. I have a firm conviction of my future career. (In other words, you definitely know what you want to do when you graduate.)

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

11. I have participated in part time jobs, summer jobs, co-ops, or volunteer work that relates to my future career.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

12. While in college, I plan to participate in part time jobs, summer jobs, co-ops, or volunteer work that relate to my future career.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

13. I have spoken with advisors, mentors, and/or a professional about my chosen career.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

Section IV

14. How often do you communicate with your professors or instructors outside of class? (i.e., office hours, email, phone calls, organizations, clubs, meetings, other)

- A. Never
- B. Rarely
- C. Occasionally
- D. Frequently

15. How often do you communicate with other faculty (other than those teaching classes you are taking) outside of class each week?

- A. Never
- B. Rarely
- C. Occasionally
- D. Frequently

16. How often do you communicate with other students from your classes?

- A. Never
- B. Rarely
- C. Occasionally
- D. Frequently

17. How often do you communicate with professional staff (administrators) on campus?

- A. Never
- B. Rarely
- C. Occasionally
- D. Frequently

Section V

18. Outside of class, how many speakers did you hear on campus last semester?

- A. None
- B. 1
- C. 2
- D. 3 or more

19. How many University sponsored concerts on campus did you attend last semester?

- A. None
- B. 1
- C. 2
- D. 3 or more

20. How many University sponsored movies on campus did you see last semester?

- A. None
- B. 1
- C. 2
- D. 3 or more

21. How many University sponsored entertainers (comedians, hypnotists, etc.) did you see on campus last semester?

- A. None
- B. 1
- C. 2
- D. 3 or more

22. How many non-required residence hall programs or activities did you attend last semester?

- A. None
- B. 1-3
- C. 4-6
- D. 7-9
- E. 10 or more

23. How many University sponsored plays or productions did you attend last semester?

- A. None
- B. 1
- C. 2
- D. 3 or more

24. In how many academic organizations (ex. clubs relating to your major, honor societies) do you hold membership? _____

25. In how many non-academic organizations (ex. Greek organizations, service organizations) do you hold membership? _____

26. On average, how much time do you spend with academic organizations each week? _____

27. On average, how much time do you spend with non-academic organizations each week? _____

Section VI

28. Which statement about the freshmen rule is correct?

- A. Any student can use the freshmen rule.
- B. Some colleges and departments allow students to use the freshmen rule and some do not.
- C. Don't know.
- D. Not sure what the freshmen rule is.

29. When can you implement the freshmen rule?

- A. Anytime in your college career, but it must affect classes taken in the first 30 hours.
- B. Only in your first 30 hours.
- C. Only in your first 60 hours, but it must affect classes taken in the first 30 hours.
- D. Don't know.

30. Which statement is correct?

- A. The freshmen rule eliminates the grade from your transcript and QCA.
- B. The freshmen rule eliminates the grade from your QCA, but not your transcript.
- C. The freshmen rule eliminates the grade from your transcript, but not your QCA.
- D. Don't Know.

31. What is the required QCA to remain in good academic standing ?

- A. 1.0
- B. 1.5
- C. 2.0
- D. 2.5
- E. Don't know

32. If you fall below the required QCA, you will:

- A. Be suspended
- B. Be placed on probation one semester
- C. Be placed on probation for one year
- D. Nothing happens
- E. Don't know

33. Hours Taken Fall '97_____

34. Hours Completed Fall '97_____

35. What was your Fall '97 QCA? _____

Section VII

36. Where are the three places you study most often? (please rank the place you study most as "1", the place you study second most as "2", and so on; if you do not study in a place, leave it blank.)

- the library
- your room
- a study lounge in the hall
- a friend's room
- Deet's
- a student union (Squires or GBJ)
- Other

37. To me, the university community (population, classes, etc.) at Virginia Tech is:

- A. Too big
- B. A good size
- C. Too small

38. To me, the Virginia Tech campus is:

- A. Too big
- B. A good size
- C. Too small

39. In my opinion, within the student population at Virginia Tech, there are people from a variety of religious backgrounds.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

40. In my opinion, within the student population at Virginia Tech, there are people from a variety of racial backgrounds.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

41. In my opinion, within the student population at Virginia Tech, there are people from a variety of states in the United States.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

42. In my opinion, within the student population at Virginia Tech, there are people from a variety of countries around the world.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

43. In my opinion, within the student population in my residence hall, there are people from a variety of religious backgrounds.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

44. In my opinion, within the student population in my residence hall, there are people from a variety of racial backgrounds.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

45. In my opinion, within the student population in my residence hall, there are people from a variety of states in the United States.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

46. In my opinion, within the student population in my residence hall, there are people from a variety of countries in the world.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

47. I feel comfortable interacting with most of the students at Virginia Tech.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

Section VIII

Demographics: please mark the items that identify you the best.

48. Ethnicity: African-American American Indian Asian American
 Hispanic American International Student Caucasian
 Other _____

49. Gender: Male Female

50. College: _____ Major: _____

51. Is this your first year in a college or university? (Circle One) Yes No

Thank you for your time! Please return this survey to Jennifer Post; Apt. East AJ; Blacksburg, VA 24060-0022. An envelope has been provided for your convenience. Just drop it in campus mail! Your name will be entered in a drawing for cash prizes.

**Appendix B
Communication with Student Sample**

January 12, 1997

Dear Student,

You could have already won **\$100!!!** Ok, not already, but you do have a chance to enter a drawing for **\$100**. My name is Jennifer Post and I am a master's student in Student Affairs in Higher Education. I would like to invite you to participate in a project designed to find out about students' academic experiences. This will help administrators get a better idea of how to improve the academic experiences on college campuses.

I have included a survey that I would like you to complete. After that, you put it in the big brown envelope I've included, and drop it in the campus mail slot. The campus mail slot is by the mailboxes right by the regular US mail slot. It's a very simple process. You don't even have to address the envelope or put a stamp on it!!

You are probably wondering what I meant about the hundred dollars, right? Well, everyone who completes the survey and sends it back to me by **January 29, 1998**, will be placed in a drawing to win **CASH!!!!** There will be four prizes given out: **\$100**, **\$50**, and two **\$25** prizes!!! You can't win if you don't play!!

The information you fill in on the survey will be completely confidential. Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Post

Informed Consent for Participants

This project is designed to gain more information about the academic experiences and academic success of freshmen students. Approximately 600 first year students at Virginia Tech are being invited to participate in this project.

To participate in this project, you are asked to take 10-30 minutes to complete the survey included in this packet. After it has been completed, you should place the survey in the envelope included in the packet and place it in the campus mail slot. This information will be used to gain a broad sense of the academic experiences of first year students. All information participants give will be kept completely confidential.

All participants who return a completed survey and a signed consent sheet by the deadline, will be eligible for a drawing for cash. Participants may withdraw from this study at anytime. Participants are free not to answer any question that they do not feel comfortable answering.

This project has been approved, as required, by the Institutional Review Board for Research Involving Human Subjects at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, the Department of Residential and Dining Services, and by the Department of Educational Policy and Leadership Studies.

I have read and understand that the Informed Consent and conditions of this project. I have had all my questions answered. I hereby acknowledge the above and give my voluntary consent for participation in this project.

If I participate, I may withdraw at any time without penalty. I agree to abide by the rules of this project.

Signature

Date

I would like to thank you for taking the time
to complete the survey on academic
experiences.

If you haven't gotten it in yet, please do so
as soon as possible in order to be eligible
for the drawing.

The chance of **winning a CASH prize** is
better than 1 in 125.

You can't win if you don't play!

\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$

Dear Student,

I am sending this email to you because I haven't received your Academic Experience Survey yet (remember, the one where you can win up to \$100 cash). If you have already sent it, thank you. The mail has been a little slow 'cause of the snow. If you haven't sent it yet, please do so as soon as possible. It is really important to get your perspective.

If you did not receive a copy of the survey, or can no longer find yours, I can send you another copy. In the interest of saving the trees, please try to find your original first. If you need a second copy, just email me your name and on campus address. Thanks for your time and your help!!

Jennifer B. Post

Appendix C:
Contact with Students in Pilot Study

Want some FREE PIZZA?????

Really, I'm serious! Here's how:
I'm interested in first year students'
academic experiences. I want to hear
about yours. Nothing hard, I promise. It
will only take 20-30 minutes. Sounds
good, huh?

OK, I know you have a busy schedule,
so I have set up two different times that
you can participate:

Monday, November 17 at 7PM

or

Wednesday, November 19 at 7PM

AJ 3rd Floor CrossOver Lounge

If you have any questions, please email me at jpost@vt.edu or call me at 232-2700.

This research has been approved by Residential and Dining Programs and by the Institutional Research Board