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Abstract

Ninety-five randomly selected students at Longwood College responded to a questionnaire about their attitudes towards their peers with learning disabilities. The data was analyzed using a Three way analysis of variance to examine if gender, class and school had any effect on how students felt about their peers with learning disabilities. The results showed that there is a significant difference (p < .05) between the attitudes of males and females, females being more positive towards their peers with learning disabilities. Also, the results showed that there was a significant difference (p < .05) between the attitudes of students in the school of education and the students in liberal arts and sciences and business, with the education majors being more positive towards their peers with learning disabilities than students in the schools of liberal arts and sciences and business.
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A Comparative Study of Longwood College Freshmen and Senior Attitudes Towards Their Peers with Learning Disabilities

Students with learning disabilities are increasing in numbers in schools and staying in school longer. In fact, more and more learning disabled students are continuing their education and attending and graduating from college. Due to the increase there are growing concerns about these students, the advantages and disadvantages of attending to college are questioned and the attitudes that surround learning disabled students are being studied.

Studies indicated that in most communities, two year and four year colleges provide services for students with special needs including learning disabilities (Satcher & Dooley-Dickey, 1990). While that is encouraging, another study by Bursuck, Rose, Cowen, and Yahaya, indicated that only 30% of all learning disabled students who entered college actually graduated. Yet according to a third study, some colleges and universities reported having no identified learning disabled students (Satcher & Dooley-Dickey, 1990). Granted, it is voluntary as to whether a student wishes to disclose such personal information (Satcher, 1989) but sometimes even when they
did or when assessment was provided, the services were inappropriate for the post-secondary level (Bernie-Smith & Deck, 1989). Also, some colleges claiming to offer services and support for students with learning disabilities were not really providing any extra services than what were already available for all students (McGuire & Shaw 1987). This was inconsistent with Public Law 94-142 and it went against section 504 of Rehabilitation Act of 1973 which focuses on colleges.

According to a report cited in May, Bernie-Smith and Deck's research brief from 1982, it was estimated that 6% of all college freshmen had a learning disability. Then, in 1986, another national study reported that over 14% of the nation's freshmen who had disabilities considered themselves to be learning disabled, and this was a growing number (Brill, 1987). The concerns surrounding these students were justified considering their increasing numbers in the college classroom and the sometimes lack of services for students with learning disabilities.

Concerns for and about students with learning disabilities in post-secondary education are not without warrant. Since identification and recommendation of services can be quite an ordeal in itself, it should be easy to see why students with learning disabilities would want to avoid drawing attention to themselves as much as
possible. Therefore, social as well as academic concerns might arise in a student's college career. Some of the academic concerns may include study skills, reading and math abilities, and oral and written language. Bursuck et al. found that most schools provided these services. The social concerns have been noted and identified almost as much as the academic concerns, but suggestions for concerns were lacking. Satcher (1989) found that lack of social support and social deficits along with sexually inappropriate behaviors, aggressiveness, or withdrawal were major concerns. She recommended peer support groups, but did not cite any studies where that had been done. In fact, most of the literature concentrates more on the academics than on any social support for students with learning disabilities. Included with these social concerns were the attitudes of college and university professors towards students with learning disabilities and having them in their classroom.

School teachers, professors, and staff members' attitudes towards students with learning disabilities were found to be positive in most cases (Nelson, Dodd & Smith 1990; Mathew, Anderson & Skolnick 1987; Satcher 1992). Most college professors were willing to give extra help for students with learning disabilities in order to succeed at the college level. In almost all of the studies,
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studies, though, the areas that professors were most willing to allow accommodations in were the same. Fonosch and Schwab (1981) found much of the same results as other studies in that the professors they surveyed held positive attitudes towards students with disabilities and allowed accommodations for students with disabilities. Also, they found that faculty members in education and social sciences were more helpful towards their students than in other fields. By providing more information to post secondary professionals, not only is this reasonable and manageable, but it would help with the limited knowledge about students with learning disabilities, according to Aksamit, Morris and Leuenberger (1987). Houck, Asselin, Troutman and Arrington found that, the faculty were willing to make the most of the 23 accommodations ... such as allowing extra time for class projects to be completed, permitting oral responses to essay questions, permitting more time to finish tests, and so forth. Other studies agreed with these findings (Nelson et. al. 1990; Satcher 1992; Mathews et. al. 1987) and included allowing lectures to be taped as a high ranking accommodation. The results of these studies were very positive about the accommodations they would allow, but on the other hand, they were rather negative about certain accommodations they would not allow. Again, there were very much the same across the board.
Accommodations that were looked at more reluctantly were allowing for partial credit if a final answer was incorrect, permitting the students to misspell words and have incorrect grammar and punctuation without penalizing them, and permitting an assignment for extra-credit (Satcher, 1992). Houck et. al., Mathews et. al. and Nelson et. al. also found this to be true in the results of their studies. These studies were found to have a good portion of positive results and feedback, yet the negative attitudes seemed to prevail. In fact, one study cited that there was little evidence to support that faculty were accommodating students with learning disabilities by modifying their instructional practices (Nelson et. al. 1990).

Minner and Prater (1984) examined these teachers' and professors' attitudes towards their students and did a study on teachers' expectations. They conducted a study with 210 faculty members located in three Midwestern universities, Illinois, Kentucky, and Missouri. In their study they gave a description of a student named James. There were two descriptions given about his behavior and attitude, one positive and one negative. Also given were two descriptions about his learning abilities. Either he was a student with a learning disability or he was not. Altogether there were four different ways James could have been described to the subjects, positive behavior with
or without a learning disability and negative behavior with or without a learning disability. The results they found indicated that college faculty had the highest academic expectations for the student without a learning disability and positive behavior, followed by the student without a learning disability and negative behavior, then the student with a learning disability and positive behavior, and lastly the student with a learning disability and negative behavior. Their results indicated that teachers on a college level seem to be influenced by the labeling of their students and the description they receive about their students' behavior. Labeling appears to influence them more than a behavior description. This was best noted when a professor wrote on one of the returned questionnaires that he was not trained to teach students with disabilities, only bright students (Minner & Prater 1984).

A study by Mathews et. al. (1987) revealed a faculty member who participated in their study asked on a returned questionnaire why anyone would want to dilute a college education by admitting less than capable students into an already weakened system. However this was not found to be a prevailing thought throughout most studies done over the last ten years, but it was a reoccurring concern brought out by most research. In fact, this negative
attitude towards students with learning disabilities does not just start in post-secondary education, it appears in secondary education as well.

Semmel and Gao (1992) stated that the perceptions teachers have of students are important variables affecting these students' performance in school. Their study compared the teachers' perceptions of students' behaviors with and without handicaps. This study was done in China and some of the results were compared to America's teachers' perceptions. The authors found that teachers in China and teachers in the U.S. perceive their students similarly with disabilities. They expect less from their students with disabilities and more referrals are made on the basis of a student's behavior than what they are capable of learning.

Another study by Rodden-Nord, Shinn, and Good (1992) on attitudes of teachers who were having students reintegrated into their classrooms, indicated that before teachers were presented with academic information they were not willing to reintegrate students into their classrooms. Reading level had some effect on the willingness of teachers to reintegrate students into their classrooms. If the teachers' students who were being reintegrated were reading at their lowest reading group level, then teachers' willingness to reintegrate increased.
If the student was at a lower level than the teachers had in their classrooms then willingness decreased.

The results of these last two studies indicated that more education and help needs to be put towards teachers who will be working with students with special needs. Mathews et. al. (1987) showed that this has been done and is continuing with elementary and secondary teachers, but it is a new concept with post-secondary teachers. Furthermore, Mathews and colleagues stated that most college professors do not have a good understanding of the needs and abilities of students with learning disabilities. Other studies also found this to be true (Nelson et. al., 1990; Houck et. al., 1992; and Satcher 1992). Compounding this problem of teachers who were asking for more educational students with learning disabilities and teachers with negative attitudes towards students with learning disabilities, were the effects these teachers were having on the students themselves.

It has been a question that occurs in a lot of the studies as to what students with learning disabilities think of themselves. Research shows that overall students with any type of learning disability see themselves as performing on a lower academic level with less confidence in themselves as compared to regular education students (Lewis & Lawrence-Patterson, 1989; Margalit, Raviv, & Pahn-
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Steinmetz, 1988; Houck et. al. 1992; Renick & Harter, 1989). Margalit et. al. (1988) found that students with learning disabilities had less self-worth and viewed themselves as less acceptable socially than students in regular education. These results were based on the responses given by children verbally. Other studies found slight variations in the areas of their lives that students with learning disabilities felt were inadequate to regular education students.

Renick and Harter (1989) found that the way students with learning disabilities perceive themselves may be linked with how they view themselves academically. Also, they found that students with learning disabilities live in the world of regular education as well as special education. The researchers went on to explain that by this the children would rather compare themselves to their peers in regular education. The children would rather see themselves more like regular education students than other children with similar disabilities. Renick and Harter determined that it was important when doing these studies to find out which group the subjects were comparing themselves to because it could make a significant difference on how the results were perceived. It could tell if a child felt a little less confident when compared to peers performing at a lower academic level or to peers on an average or above average
academic level. A study by Parish, Baker, Arheart, and Adamchak (1980) found that normal and exceptional children view themselves in a positive way, when asked to self-evaluate. The researchers found this very encouraging, although all studies were not this positive.

Lewis and Lawrence-Patterson (1989) studied students' locus of control and how that affects the way they view their successes and failures. Lewis and Lawrence-Patterson (1989) compared students with learning disabilities to students in regular education with regard to how they viewed success and failure. They found that the students with learning disabilities believed their successes to be more external and their failures to be more internal. This indicated that these students attributed their success to chance without any regard to how they contributed to achieving this success, but the failures were all their fault or a result of their actions. This study showed how others perceived students with learning disabilities locus of control. Parents of students with learning disabilities knew how their children viewed successes and failures, while their teachers did not. The researchers indicated this by saying teachers may not be aware that children with learning disabilities do not credit their successes to themselves. If teachers do not realize this then they may not be able to help these students believe
that their successes are truly their own. Lewis and Lawrence-Patterson believed that everyone, including teachers, surrounding these students needed to be aware of where students with learning disabilities were coming from with their thinking in order to better help them.

Helping learning disabled students achieve greater success at the college level, or at any level, is important if they are to succeed. Fonosch and Schwab (1981) learned that the students attending colleges providing special services had more positive attitudes than students who did not attend colleges with these special services. As Lewis and Lawrence-Patterson (1989) indicated, teachers need to be aware of how to help their students view success as internal, not something brought about by chance. Furthermore, studies have indicated that what students may think of their peers could have an influence on these peers' success.

Peer pressure affects almost everyone at some time in their life, so peer's attitudes towards students with learning disabilities could affect their performance. Before going that far, though, the first step is knowing just what students think of their peers with learning disabilities. This could be especially important to know at the college level because statistics indicate that not many students with learning disabilities go on to college
and even fewer finish (Bursuck et. al. 1989). Therefore, this study will be looking at Longwood College's freshmen and seniors and their attitudes towards their peers with learning disabilities, since little research has been done in this area.

More and more students with learning disabilities are entering college and graduating. Therefore it is important to know the learning atmosphere they will be entering and provide the best assistance possible so that everyone succeeds.

The purpose of this study was to examine how students without disabilities perceive their peers with learning disabilities. Effects of demographic and experiential variables such as year in school, gender, and type of school also were examined. This was done to examine if these factors had any effect on students' perceptions. More specifically, the survey addressed the following questions:

Is there a difference in attitude between the freshmen and seniors?

Is there a difference in attitudes of freshmen and seniors based on gender, class and school?
Definitions

Attitudes - one's disposition or opinion.

Learning Disability - a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or in using language, spoken or written, which may manifest itself in an imperfect ability to listen, speak, read, write, spell, or do mathematical calculations.

Locus of Control - the way in which individuals perceive sources of control over events in their lives.

A. Internal locus of control (ILC) - an individual's belief that reinforcement is a function of his or her own behavior.

B. External locus of control (ELC) - an individual's belief that reinforcement is a result of forces such as fate, chance, or the actions of powerful others.
College Attitudes

Method

Survey research methods were used in this study in order to obtain the perceptions of freshmen and senior college students. A modified version of a standardized questionnaire was used to collect data from the subjects. The significance level used to test the hypothesis was < .05.

Subjects

The subjects were freshmen and seniors from a medium sized, 4-year Liberal Arts college in Virginia. There are approximately 2,937 undergraduates, roughly 910 of the students are freshmen and 668 are seniors. There are three different schools at this college. These schools are the School of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the School of Business and Economics, and the School of Education and Human Services. The School of Liberal Arts and Sciences has about 2,063 majors, of these 1099 are freshmen and seniors. The School of Business and Economics has about 478 majors, of these 271 are freshmen and seniors. The School of Education and Human Services has 396 majors, of these 208 are freshmen and seniors. A sample size of 119 subjects participated in this study. Freshmen and seniors were selected to determine if age and education might have any impact on how students view their peers.
with learning disabilities.

Instruments/Materials

The questionnaire used in this study was taken from a study on Faculty Perception of Attitude, Knowledge, and Accommodation for Students with Learning Disabilities, by Majewski. The questionnaire had two different sections. The first section was demographic background questions. These questions included gender, year in college, major, age, and interaction with students with learning disabilities. The second section of the questionnaire used a Likert scale and asked students their opinions about students with learning disabilities. However, only fifteen were used as the rest of the questions were for faculty or staff. The questionnaire was field tested on approximately twenty college students with various majors who were sophomores and juniors. At the end of the form there was space for any additional comments.

Procedure

The questionnaire was distributed at the beginning of the Spring semester of 1995 with permission of professors of English 100 and 101 and senior seminar classes, in each major (Appendix A). A cover letter went with the questionnaire explaining the purpose of the study, voluntary
participation, and confidentiality (Appendix B). The questionnaire was distributed to the students and they returned them either right away or at the end of class.

Scoring Procedures

The possible total score that could be obtained on the survey was between fifteen and seventy-five. Both positive and negative statements were included in the survey in order to avoid the potential effect of acquiescence to the positive. Thus, the scores on questions numbers 2, 3, 4, 6, 11, 13, 15 were reversed before calculating the raw score. When calculating the score, the lower the score the more positive the respondent's attitude towards their peers with learning disabilities. A cut off score of 45 indicated a positive attitude. This was determined as the cut off score for positive attitudes because this score was half way between 15 and 75. Any score below 45 would reflect a more positive attitude and 45 and above would reflect a more negative attitude.

Data Analysis

The analyses of the questionnaires were accomplished through the use of Longwood College's SPSS/PC+ computer program. The difference among means was tested using a three way Analysis of Variance. Additional comments
College Attitudes

elicited from the respondents were analyzed qualitatively.
Results

Presentation of the Data

One hundred and nineteen questionnaires were distributed to the student body. Of this forty were seniors and seventy-nine were freshmen. The questionnaires were distributed to randomly selected freshmen 100 and 101 level English classes and randomly selected senior seminar classes. All one hundred nineteen questionnaires were completed and collected. Of the one hundred nineteen completed questionnaires, only ninety-five were able to be scored. The twenty-four that were not able to be scored were the participants that did not fit the criteria on the demographic section.

Profile of the Respondents

The students first responded to section one of the questionnaire. Of the ninety-five respondents, sixty-one were females and thirty-four males. There were sixty freshmen and thirty-five seniors. Fifteen subjects were in the school of education, thirty-nine in the school of liberal arts and sciences, and forty-one were in the school of business (Table 1).

Total scores on the part II section of the questionnaire by each respondent was computed. As explained earlier, a person is considered to have positive attitudes
towards their peers with learning disabilities if he or she has a score of 45 or lower. A descriptive analysis of the scores indicated that 90% of the freshmen and 91.40% of the seniors possess positive attitudes towards their peers with learning disabilities.

Testing the Hypothesis

Hypothesis testing to determine significance difference based on gender, class and school were analyzed using a three way analysis of variance (Table 2). The $F(1,83)$ critical value was found to be $4.65, p < .034$ for the main effect gender. The female subjects scored significantly higher than the male subjects. There was also a significant main effect for school, $F(2,83) = 7.38, p < .001$ indicating subjects from education possess more positive attitudes than subjects from liberal arts and sciences and business. The difference was further tested by the post hoc multiple comparison (scheffe) method. The difference between the school of education and the schools of liberal arts and sciences and business ($F = 6.27, p < .05$) was significant. The results showed that education was significantly different from liberal arts and sciences and business and that liberal arts and sciences and business were not significantly different from each other. The interaction effect of the factors gender, class and school did not
reveal any significant differences.

Additional Comments

At the end of each questionnaire there was space provided for any additional comments. A few respondents commented on specific questions. One respondent commented "we as students should be aware of the different learning needs of our peers". This student also noted that they have a tutor who has a learning disability. Another respondent indicated that learning disabilities are often unnoticeable and that having a learning disability does not mean the person is a burden. A third student commented of having acquaintances with people with learning disabilities. This person added that people with learning disabilities simply learn differently and they work extra hard to learn. Also, this student felt that society should help people with learning disabilities and not hold them back.

All of the comments were not quite so accepting of peers with learning disabilities, yet they were not necessarily negative. One student responded that classroom environments were neither enriched nor not enriched by the presence of students with learning disabilities. Another student thought that it was possible to effectively teach students with learning disabilities, but not in the
areas where the learning disability was present. For example, a student could do well in English if their learning disability was in math, but they would not be able to do math. Finally, one student pointed out that they could have answered the questionnaire differently depending on how severe the peer's learning disability was, and indicated the difficulty they had with the questionnaire.
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Discussion

Overall, students responses were somewhat accepting and receptive towards their peers with learning disabilities. Most students seemed fairly positive about their peers' (with learning disabilities) academic ability and their contribution in school as well as in the community. The results showed significant differences with two main effects. First, females had more positive attitudes towards their peers with learning disabilities than did their male counterparts. This was not an unexpected result since, previous studies have shown similar results, females are thought of as being more understanding and receptive towards people with differences and disabilities.

Students comments revealed their willingness to accept students with heterogeneous abilities in higher education institutions. Yet, there was a misconception that was revealed by a respondent on the questionnaire. This respondent indicated that they believed that their peers with learning disabilities could only learn in areas where there was no learning disability.

The second significant result that occurred in the main effects was that the students in the school of education had more positive attitudes towards their peers with learning disabilities than the students in the schools
of liberal arts and sciences and business. Exactly why this occurred is uncertain. It may have been because students with more accepting and positive attitudes picked education as their major. Or, it could have been that once students were in the school of education they were taught to be more accepting of others and have better attitudes towards people with learning disabilities. Until students enter college and are randomly given a major to pursue, it would be hard to conclude why students in the school of education have more positive attitudes towards their peers.

Limitations

This study had a few limitations, including the time it took to locate students if their selected class was unable to participate for some reason. Yet, this was not a known problem until after contact had been made with all of the professors. To have avoided this delay, students could have been selected at random instead of classes, but getting the subjects to respond might have been another problem.

One limitation was randomly selecting classes instead of individual students. By doing this some students did not fit the demographics (year of schooling, for example) and could not be used; therefore, lowering the total number
of respondents.

The questionnaire itself had a few limitations. First, the experimenter had to assume that all of the respondents were answering the questionnaire honestly. Second, the questionnaire did not define the severity of the learning disability, therefore as indicated before, some respondents may have answered differently. Lastly, the questionnaire was short and the results may or may not have been different with a little bit more detailed questionnaire.

Recommendations

As for future studies, there are some suggestions which may help future researchers. First, a more in-depth questionnaire could be used to get better overall results about how students feel about their peers with learning disabilities.

Second, doing interviews may give more information to the researcher. Personnel interviews may allow for more understanding of the questionnaire, therefore allowing less restricted and more honest responses.

Thirdly, providing a definition of a learning disability on the questionnaire may clear up some confusion for those who are unsure about what a learning disability is. Also, this could eliminate some of the "don't know" responses.
Another suggestion would be to select either students or classes from all four years and not limit the study to freshmen and seniors.

Finally, the more in-depth the completed study the more information it will yield. This may take more time and that needs to be a consideration for the researcher. Also, the researcher could run different tests, such as multiple regressions and percentages to more detailed results.

More and more research is being done on students' attitudes towards their peers with learning disabilities and this appears to be necessary in order to learn how students view each other. The environment one lives in can greatly affect their daily and academic performance. Students' knowledge, or lack of, could make a difference on this environment. Students need to know about and understand just what people are like around them in order to improve their environment. Educating only part of a population about learning disabilities does not improve and environment, it only causes more confusion about that environment.
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Appendix A
January 30, 1995

Dear Longwood College Student

I am a graduate student who is currently working on a masters degree in the Psychology/Special Education program here at Longwood. The questionnaire that is attached is for the purpose of conducting research for the thesis for my masters.

Your cooperation is very important in order to complete the research. By returning a completed questionnaire, you help to give research needed for a relatively unresearched area of education.

The responses that you give will be kept in the strictest confidence and your name will never be identified.

I will appreciate you taking a few minutes to complete the questionnaire and returning it to me as you leave class today. The results of this study will be given to you upon the completion of the thesis. Thank you very much for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Tracy Hogan
Masters candidate
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Longwood College Student Questionnaire

Part 1: Place a check or X on the correctly corresponding line.

1. ___ Male  ___ Female
2. ___ Freshmen  ___ Sophomore
   ___ Junior  ___ Senior
3. ___ Age

4. Please list your major:

5. I have interacted with peers who have a learning disability.  No  Yes  I don't know

6. On what level have you interacted with a student with a learning disability. (If not applicable go onto 7)
   ___ class  ___ sports  ___ friend
   ___ college event  ___ other (specify)

7. I have taken a class here at Longwood that increased my awareness about learning disabilities.
   No  Yes
   If yes, please list the class.

8. I have been identified as having a learning disability.
   No  Yes

Part 2: Read each statement below and select one number which best represents your opinion. Use the following scale:
1--Strongly Agree
2--Agree
3--I Don't Know
4--Disagree
5--Strongly Disagree

1. Classroom environments are enriched by the presence of students with learning disabilities. 1 2 3 4 5

2. Having students with learning disabilities in the classroom takes away from the quality of education other students receive. 1 2 3 4 5

3. Peers with a learning disability should be exempt from some postsecondary graduation requirements. 1 2 3 4 5
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1--Strongly Agree
2--Agree
3--I Don't Know
4--Disagree
5--Strongly Disagree

4. To be realistic, postsecondary education standards should be different for students with learning disabilities. 1 2 3 4 5

5. It is possible to effectively teach persons with learning disabilities at the college level. 1 2 3 4 5

6. Few students with learning disabilities will succeed in college. 1 2 3 4 5

7. This college has special services for students with learning disabilities. 1 2 3 4 5

8. It is acceptable to spend additional funds to make this college accessible to students with learning disabilities. 1 2 3 4 5

9. Students with learning disabilities at the postsecondary level are protected from discriminatory educational practices by federal law. 1 2 3 4 5

10. I can recognize a peer with a learning disability. 1 2 3 4 5

11. I feel uncomfortable around people with a learning disability. 1 2 3 4 5

12. Students with learning disabilities should not be considered handicapped. 1 2 3 4 5

13. People with a learning disability take more from society than they give back. 1 2 3 4 5

14. Students with learning disabilities are often perceived as irresponsible. 1 2 3 4 5

15. Support services for students with learning disabilities at the postsecondary level tend to delay development of self-reliance and independence. 1 2 3 4 5

Please make any additional comments about the questionnaire.
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Appendix C
TABLE 1

PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Responses</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts &amp; Science</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY PROFILE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>FCV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>686.79</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62.44</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (A)</td>
<td>141.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>141.03</td>
<td>4.66*</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class (B)</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School (C)</td>
<td>448.025</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>224.01</td>
<td>7.38*</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x C</td>
<td>70.78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35.39</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B x C</td>
<td>45.27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.63</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B x C</td>
<td>19.52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Cell</td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3205.43</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P < .05