DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 049 691   HE 002 095

AUTHOR   Dispenzieri, Angelo; Giniger, Seymour
TITLE   Student Expectations and Experiences as Predictors
                of College Performance.
INSTITUTION   American Educational Research Association,
                Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE   Feb 71
NOTE   27p.; Paper presented at the 55th Annual Meeting of
                the American Educational Research Association, New
                York, February, 1971

EDRS PRICE   EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS   *Academic Performance, College Students, *Community
                Colleges, Educationally Disadvantaged, *Expectation,
                *Higher Education, Prediction, *Student Attitudes,
                Student Experience
IDENTIFIERS   *City University of New York

ABSTRACT
                Questionnaires measuring college expectation and
experiences were administered to special program students, those
below the academic level of the City of New York Community Colleges'
regular matriculants, and to regular students. The purpose of the
questionnaire was to determine how the prediction of academic success
was related to students' expectations and experiences as college
freshmen. Eight expectations and experience clusters were derived by
factor analysis and served as predictors of first semester GPA and
credits earned, and first year GPA and credit earned in stepwise
multiple regression analyses. Demographic characteristics such as
high school average and diploma track, college attended, ethnicity,
sex, and student population served as control variables. Realistic
expectations of academic demands, insight into personal abilities,
and readiness to work hard were positively related to performance.
This paper also makes recommendations for utilization of the findings
by guidance counselors and educational administrators. (Author/AF)

STUDENT EXPECTATIONS AND EXPERIENCES
AS PREDICTORS OF COLLEGE PERFORMANCE

Angelo Dispenzieri and Seymour Giniger

Baruch College of The City University of New York

Each year increasing numbers of high school graduates are
taking advantage of expanded opportunities for post-secondary
education. Every student enters college with expectations about
his educational future: some expectations concerning success and
failure in courses, some concerning plans for social or intel-
lectual activities, and others concerning survival in a maze of
academic demands. Once involved in the college environment,
students experience varying amounts of fulfillment of their
expectations. The degree of satisfaction or disappointment with
college may, in large measure, be due to the reality, accuracy,
and usefulness of one's expectations.

To explore the phenomenology of college attendance--how
students perceive, feel, and react to the college environment--
a program of research was begun with two major goals: first, the
description of expectations and experiences of entering college
freshmen; second, the prediction of academic success and failure
in relation to these expectations and experiences. A report on
the first objective has been presented elsewhere. (Dispenzieri
and Giniger, 1969). The present paper will focus on the second

objective, the prediction of success and failure in college.

Research on the prediction of success as a function of expectations has been conducted with several different populations. Weitz (1956) found that insurance agents who, prior to hiring, were given a booklet describing their future job duties survived on the job longer than those agents not given the booklet. Youngberg (1963) replicated Weitz's findings and also found that agents given booklets describing their jobs were more satisfied than agents not given booklets. Both researchers felt that the realistic job expectations imparted to the agents accounted for successful adjustment.

Katzell (1968) found low but statistically significant negative correlations between withdrawal from school and confirmation of expectations among student nurses; fewer expectations of satisfaction were fulfilled for dropouts than for survivors.

Safer (1965a, 1965b)measured the expectations of an incoming freshman class of a large metropolitan university and correlated scores in her expectation scale with first semester grade point averages. The questionnaire stressed the student's expectations of his own behavior, and she found significant correlations between many of the scale items and academic achievement.

Method

Questionnaires. The present research program has p ceeded
primarily by employing two original instruments--the Expectati ns
and the Experiences questionnaires.

In selecting items for inclusion in the experiment ' forms,
the guiding principle was that the questionnaires were tc inquire
about any activities, stimuli, and environmental characteristics
which might be relevant to performance in college and about wh.ch
students might have expectations before entering and experie ces
after entering school. The viewpoint of the questionnaires is
phenomenological: the respondent describes and evaluates from
the standpoint of a participant in the college environment.

The research instruments were designed to allow stud nts
to describe their expectations at a relatively concrete level,
specifying those activities they thought they and other students
would engage in, those activities teachers and administrators
were expected to perform, the resources students expected to use,
as well as the kinds of stimulation they expected to receive from
the college environment. The questionnaires thus circumvented the
problem of translating psychological needs into policy decisions
by allowing students to express their needs in terms of physical
and social reality.

In the Expectations questionnaire, all items began with the phrase "I expect to find..." or an equivalent phrase denoting interest in expectations. Responses to most questions were on five-point Likert-type scales. The second instrument inquired about the students' first semester experiences. The Experiences questionnaire was parallel to the Expectations questionnaire, except that all items began with the phrase "I found..."

When administered at several colleges, the questionnaires can assist in discovering differential educational needs among institutions. Further, the research instruments could be used to compare groups of students, such as regular matriculants and students in special programs for the educationally disadvantaged.

Special Program Students. One of the earliest and largest programs for special students in this country was the College Discovery Program. The College Discovery Program was designed to provide higher education for socially disadvantaged students of intellectual promise whose high school scholastic averages, aptitude test scores and personal finances precluded admission under regular procedures to baccalaureate programs of The City University of New York. The goal of the program was to have students complete their first two years of college work at a community college and then to transfer to a senior college to complete their baccalaureate requirements.

The students selected for the program were "near-misses."
Their high school averages fell just below the average required
for college admission and they had not passed the college entrance
examination. However, they had completed at least 12 academic
units, including one year in science and one year in mathematics.
They were a highly selected population, nominated by guidance
counselors, teachers and principals, and ranked on the basis of
motivation and potential ability.

All College Discovery students were required to complete the
research instruments.

Regular Matriculants. A sample of regular matriculants in
the baccalaureate-transfer programs of the community colleges of
The City University of New York were selected for testing on a
random basis.

Procedure. Prior to the start of the Fall, 1966 semester, the
Expectations questionnaire was administered to entering freshmen
in the College Discovery Program and a comparison group of regularly
matriculated freshmen at five community colleges of The City
University of New York (Bronx, Queensborough, Manhattan, Kings-
borough, and New York City). Toward the end of the first semester,
the Experiences questionnaires were mailed to all members of the
College Discovery class and the comparison group, and over 80
percent of the questionnaires were returned.

There were 149 items in the College Discovery form and 121 items in the regular student form. Only those items common to both groups were retained for the analyses. The remaining 100 items were factor analyzed in order to yield more parsimonious dimensions. Eight centroids were extracted, and they were subjected to Varimax rotation, yielding eight factors. Only those items with loadings of .25 or higher were retained for each factor. Internal consistency reliabilities (Coefficient Alpha) were determined for the groups of items corresponding to the factor-analytically derived clusters. The reliability coefficients of the clusters ranged from .86 to .58.

The mnemonic labels of the eight clusters and their reliabilities are presented in Table 1. They encompass the following areas: student preparedness, non-academic activities, progressive teaching, dedicated instructors, adequate facilities, social interaction, good student traits, and student activities.

As the next step in the analyses, the item loadings of each cluster were weighted to form modified factor scores, so that each subject had two sets of scores for each of the eight clusters---one was a set of Expectations scores and the other was a set of Experiences scores.

Finally, a number of subjects were removed from further analyses--those who had prior college experience, were more than

twenty years old, and were members of the following ethnic groups:
Other Spanish-speaking (i.e., Cuban, Dominican, etc.), Foreign-born
black (i.e., Jamaican, Haitian, etc.), Foreign-born white (i.e.,
Italian, German, etc.), and Asian (i.e., Chinese). It has been
found that the ethnic groups listed above have particular
acculturation and language problems and come from family back-
grounds other than those of the three major ethnic groups included
in the study: the USA-born blacks, Puerto Ricans (USA- or PR-born),
and USA-born whites.

Predictor Variables. Each Expectations and Experiences cluster
was used as a unique and independent predictor of college performance
in a series of multiple regression analyses. There were eight
separate regression equations for the Expectations clusters and
eight separate equations for the Experiences clusters. In the
regression analyses, each Expectations score was partialled out of
its parallel Experiences score, so that the Experiences scores
provided a measure of residual gain.

Criterion Variables. The college performance criteria were:
first semester grade point average (GPA), first semester credits
earned (completed with a passing grade), first year cumulative GPA,
and first year cumulative credits earned. GPA was derived from a
grading scheme whereby each letter grade was equated to a numerical
grade value as follows: A = 4.00, B = 3.00, C = 2.00, D = 1.00 and
F = 0.00.

Control Variables. Several demographic variables were
introduced into the prediction equations prior to adding each
Expectations or Experiences cluster and, thus, their effects were
partialled out of the Expectations and Experiences scores. The
control variables were forced into the multiple regression equations
in a fixed stepwise sequence as follows: high school diploma track,
high school average, community college, ethnic group, sex, and
condition (special student or regular matriculant).

High school average was the only quantifiable variable in the
set. The nominal or qualitative variables were added to the
regression equations by using a dummy variable coding scheme
recommended by Cohen (1969), where 1 is assigned to the categorical
variable of interest and 0 is assigned to all others, as shown
below:

High school diploma track:

    Academic, Commercial and Technical (1)

        vs General and Vocational (0)

Community college:

    Bronx (1) vs Queensborough, Manhattan, Kingsborough

        and New York City (0)

    Queensborough (1) vs All Others (0)

    Manhattan (1) vs All Others (0)

    Kingsborough (1) vs All Others (0)

Ethnicity:

    Black (1) vs Puerto Rican and White (0)

    Puerto Rican (1) vs All Others (0)

Sex:

    Male (1) vs Female (0)

Condition:

    Special Student (1) vs Regular Matriculant (0)

Statistical Analyses. The data were adapted to the Biomedical
O3R computer program (Multiple Regression with Case Combinations)
utilizing the IBM 360-40 facilities at the Baruch College Computer
Center. After all the demographic control variables had been
included, each Expectations cluster was added to a separate
regression equation so that it was possible to determine its unique
contribution to prediction. A parallel operation was performed with
the eight Experiences clusters. However, each Experiences cluster
was always preceded by its matching Expectations cluster acting as
a co-variate.

The performance measures of first semester GPA and first
semester credits earned were regressed onto demographic
characteristics and Expectations clusters for a sample of 545
subjects. Because of losses due to first semester attrition, the
regression equations for first year criteria were based on a
sample of 481 subjects.

Only those subjects who completed both an Expectations and an Experiences Questionnaire were included in the Experiences analyses. Thus, the sample utilized for the Experiences equations was reduced to 461 subjects for the first semester criteria and 419 subjects for the first year criteria.

Results

Demographic Characteristics. Table 2 presents the increments in multiple correlation squared (R^2) and partial correlations with criteria for all demographic variables. R^2 increment is the proportion of criterion variance accounted for by the predictor. The partial correlations with criteria were computed for each demographic characteristic with all other descriptive variables held constant.

The authors adopted a stringent criterion for determining significance. In order for an R^2 increment of a single predictor variable to be considered meaningful, it had to account for at least 1.0 percent of the variance in the criterion and reach the 1% level of statistical significance.

The first variable to enter the regression equations was high school diploma track. The increment in R^2 ranged from 3.1% to 10.4%, reaching the .001 level of significance for all four performance criteria. The data indicate that students in the

academic, commercial or technical diploma tracks achieved a better

performance than students in the general or vocational tracks.

Diploma track showed a stronger relationship to first semester

credits passed and first year cumulative credits passed, with

partial correlations reaching .21 and .22, respectively. The

strong relationship shown with credits earned may be an artifact

of diploma type. Since students with general or vocational diplomas

are usually deficient in high school academic units, their college

advisors would have recommended a reduced credit load together with

non-credit or remedial courses to make up their high school

deficiencies. Since general and vocational diploma students took

fewer credit courses, they also earned fewer credits. On the

average, general and vocational track students had completed three

fewer college credits than the academic-commercial-technical group

after the first semester, and five fewer credits at the end of the

first year. Nevertheless, there remains a strong relationship of

diploma track to grades for those credits that were attempted.

As each succeeding variable is added to the regression

equations, it acts as a co-variate for the variables that follow.

Thus, with diploma track held constant, we can now consider the

contributions of high school average. High school average accounted

for the largest proportion of variance in the criteria, ranging

from 12.2% and 15.4% for first semester credits earned and first

year cumulative credits earned, to 21.7% and 23.6% for first

semester GPA and first year cumulative GPA. All R^2 increments

were significant at the .001 level. The partial correlations

with criteria ranged from .22 to .29. High school average showed

the strongest relationship to grade point average, its performance

counterpart on the college level. Zero-order correlations for first

semester and first year GPA were .48 and .52, respectively.

Although students with lower high school averages tended to

take less college credits and, thus, earn less credits, the

relationship was not always that clear because credit assignments

depended upon the community college policies with regard to normal

courseload. For example, students at one college were required to

take a high credit load regardless of academic performance in high

school.

With diploma track and high school average partialled out,

only Community College B showed a significant relationship to all

four criteria, accounting for 1.1% to 2.4% of the criterion

variance. School B had lower GPAs and fewer credits completed

than School E, the community college "reference group". It should

be noted that School E had liberal grading practices, while School

B imposed reduced credit loads and intensive remediation, where

necessary, and maintained high academic standards. Further,

School D showed a significant increment in R^2 for first year

cumulative credits earned (1.3%, p<.01); their students completed more credits than those in School E. Community College D required that all students, including those in special programs, maintain a high credit courseload.

With the preceding descriptive variables held constant, ethnicity was entered at this point and made a highly significant contribution to the prediction of the criterion measures. The black group showed increments in R^2 ranging from 1.5% to 2.1%, reaching the .001 level of significance for first semester GPA, and first year cumulative GPA and credits earned. The Puerto Rican group showed highly significant increments in R^2 on all four criteria, ranging from 1.7% to 2.3%. Both blacks and Puerto Ricans were lower on all performance measures than the white population which served as a reference group. It should be mentioned that most of the special program students were black and Puerto Rican while the great majority of the regular matriculants were white.

Sex did not add significantly to the prediction of the criteria. There were no substantive differences between males and females on any of the measures.

With all the major descriptive variables held constant, that is, after partialling out the effects of diploma track, high school average, community college, ethnicity and sex, the variable which differentiated special students and regular matriculants still made

a significant contribution to the prediction of three criteria.
Condition accounted for 2.5% and 1.5% of the variance in first
semester GPA and first year cumulative GPA, both at the .001
significance level. In addition, condition explained 1.4% of the
variance in first year cumulative credits earned ($p < .01$). On all
three measures, special program students did not perform as well
as the regular matriculants.

In summary, the demographic characteristics accounted for
33.9% of the total variance in first semester GPA and 27.4% of the
variance in first semester credits completed. Further, the
descriptive variables explained 36.9% of the variance in first
year cumulative GPA and 35.6% of the variance in first year
cumulative credits completed.

Student Expectations. We have explored the contributions of
the traditional predictors of college performance and found that
even after controlling for academic preparation in high school,
college attended, and personal characteristics such as ethnicity
and sex, there remains a residual difference between special
program students and regular matriculants. With condition held
constant, we will now investigate the contributions of Expectations
as non-intellective correlates of college success for students in
general.

Table 3 presents percent increments in R^2 and partial correla-
tions with criteria for each Expectations cluster acting as a
unique predictor of first semester and first year performance.
The table includes only those clusters adding significant
criterion variance after having partialled out the effects of
demographic characteristics.

Only Cluster VII which was labelled "Good student traits in
handling academic demands of college" met the criteria for inclusion:
it accounted for at least 1.0% of the criterion variance and reached
or exceeded the .01 significance level.

Cluster VII explained 2.4% (p<.001) of the variance in first
semester GPA and 1.4% (p<.01) of the variance in first semester
credits earned. The partial correlations with criteria were .19 and
.14, respectively. Further, the increment in R^2 was 2.1% (p<.001)
for first year cumulative GPA and 1.8% (p<.001) for first year
cumulative credits earned; partial correlations with criteria
reached .18 and .17, respectively.

Cluster VII contains seven items which relate to the students'
anticipations of academic demands such as assignments over long
holidays, diligence and preparation required for exams, reading
textbooks for courses, taking notes on lectures and discussions,
spending time on study and homework, and worrying about exams.
Students who entered college with realistic expectations of the

sacrifices and personal investment in time and effort necessary to

succeed, performed better, in items of grades and coursework

completed, than those whose images of college were not congruent

with the typical demands of work, study and scholarship.

Student Experiences. College experiences were measured near

the end of the first semester, prior to final examinations and

assignment of grades. Each Experiences cluster entered the

regression equations after partialling out the effects of demographic

characteristics and the subjects' earlier responses to the parallel

Expectations cluster. By controlling for each subject's initial

scores on the Expectations clusters, we were holding constant

scale position on Expectations and actually dealing with residual

gain scores.

Table 4 shows that significant effects were found for Clusters

I, IV and VII. Cluster I was labelled "Student preparedness for

difficult academic requirements". The items in the cluster measured

how prepared students felt they had been in reading, writing,

mathematics and study skills; how often instructors gave unannounced

tests, more outside readings than textbook readings, and lecture

material over and above textbook material; how often instructors

checked assignments weekly; students' use of old tests and notes

from previous students; perceived student interest in ideas and

intellectual problems, and perceived competition in class.

Cluster I accounted for 2.2% (p<.001) of the variance in first

semester GPA and 1.4% (p<.01) of the variance in first semester

credits earned. R^2 increments in first year cumulative GPA and

cumulative credits earned were 1.7% (p<.001) and 1.1% (p<.01),

respectively. The partial correlations with all four criteria were

negative, ranging from -.13 to -.19.

Thus, the greater the perception of having been well-prepared

for the difficult academic requirements during the first semester,

the worse was the college performance. It should be noted, however,

that the students showed a nearly universal decrease in their self-

reports of the level of their academic preparation and the perceived

difficulty of the college requirements (Dispenzieri and Giniger,

1969). In contrast to their Expectations, most students found that

they were not as well-prepared and the college requirements were not

as difficult as they had anticipated. In light of this finding,

the relationship between student preparedness for difficult academic

requirements and college performance can be restated as follows:

those students who felt _less_ unprepared and perceived the requirement,

to have been _more_ demanding relative to the other members of their

class registered a significantly poorer performance than those who

perceived themselves to have been relatively _more_ unprepared and

the requirements to have been _less_ demanding. The cluster appears

to measure how realistic and insightful the students' perceptions

were with regard to recognizing the actual level of difficulty

of academic requirements and their deficiencies in those qualities

which are necessary for achieving college success.

The second Experiences cluster which made significant

contributions to R^2 was Cluster IV, labelled "Dedicated college

instructors". It consisted of 12 items concerned with the extent

to which instructors were interested in their courses, could get

their lectures across, took a personal interest in their students,

were available outside of class, were more interesting than high

school instructors, took class attendance, and covered material

not found in the text. The cluster accounted for 2.9% ($p<.001$)

of the variance in first semester GPA and 2.2% ($p<.001$) of the

variance in first year cumulative GPA; the partial correlations

with criteria were .22 and .19, respectively. R^2 increments for

the other criteria were at a somewhat lower level: 1.5% ($p<.01$)

for first semester credits completed and 1.3% ($p<.01$) for first

year cumulative credits completed; partial correlations were

.15 and .14, respectively.

It appears that the greater the perception of instructor

dedication, the better was the student performance. However, we

must take into consideration the fact that the students' awareness

of how they were performing during the first semester may have

colored their perceptions of the dedication and ability of their

instructors. The students who were doing relatively well might have
attributed some of their success to their instructors' efforts,
while those students who were performing poorly might have
rationalized their poor performance and blamed their own inadequacies
on their instructors. Thus, the causal sequence of the findings
could be revised as follows: the better the student's performance,
especially with respect to grades, the greater his perception of
instructor dedication.

The final Experiences variable included in Table 4 was
Cluster VII, "Good student traits in handling the academic demands
of college". Cluster VII added significantly to the prediction of
all four criteria, over and above the variance already accounted
for by the students' Expectations. The increments in R^2 were 1.2%
(p<.01) for first semester GPA and 1.1% (p<.01) for first semester
credits earned; the partial correlations were .14 and .13,
respectively. Cluster VII accounted for a somewhat greater
proportion of the variance in the first year performance criteria:
R^2 increments for GPA and credits earned were 1.7% (p<.001) and
2.1% (p<.001), respectively; the partial correlations were .17 and
.19. The more that students were required to work on assignments
over long holidays and the more they applied themselves in handling
their demanding college work, the better was their performance.

Discussion

High school average and diploma track were the strongest
predictors of college performance. However, the correlations were
based upon the combined populations of special program students and
regular matriculants. It should be recalled that the special
students were below the academic level of the community college
regular matriculants who, in most instances, did not possess the
high school averages and academic units required for entrance
into one of the senior colleges of the City University. The mean
high school average for special program students was 74 while the
mean for regular matriculants was 80. If the condition variable
had been partialled out of the regression equations prior to the
inclusion of high school average as a predictor, the correlations
with the criteria would have been reduced because of the loss of
between-group variance. For more clear-cut results, it would have
been preferable to run separate analyses for special program
students and regular matriculants in order to elicit the unique
contributions of the predictors within each group.

Although high school average may be one of the best predictors
of college success, the elimination of academic requirements via
an open admissions policy will introduce enormous error variance
that will reduce its effectiveness. Further, with the influx of
students with "modified" or watered-down high school courses, the
potential for prediction will be further reduced. The extreme

variance in the range and quality of the measures will certainly

rule out the usefulness of traditional academic predictors.

The residual differences between the special students and

regular matriculants which were present after adjusting for all

other descriptive variables may be due to an enduring educational

disability in the special students stemming from a multiplicity

of factors, such as poor home and community environment, weak

academic background, and financial deprivation. The remedial

efforts of the compensatory program for the special students may

not have been sufficient or appropriate enough for this population.

Perhaps much more should have been done earlier in their

educational careers if current efforts were to be successful.

Julian Stanley (1970) has dealt with these issues and provided

an excellent review of the problems involved in college programs

for educationally disadvantaged students.

The Expectations-Experiences measures indicated that students

who were prepared to work hard in college performed well. Further,

those students who perceived themselves to be academically less

prepared than they had anticipated and who perceived their

instructors to be dedicated and able, worked harder in applying

themselves to their college assignments and performed well.

It appears that those clusters which most related to the nature

of the college demands and measured the student's insight into

his own deficiencies were most strongly related to college success.

The results suggest that guidance counselors both in high school and college have a critical role in presenting a more accurate picture of college life--with special reference to the academic demands made upon the student, if successful performance is to be achieved.

It is our hope that the information based upon the expectations and experiences of college students would be used by educational administrators to identify students who, on the basis of the present findings, are particularly prone to failure, and remedial, counseling and other supportive services could be mobilized swiftly to prevent them from dropping out.

Finally, as more and more non-traditional students enter colleges, the measures could be utilized to ascertain the students' perceptions of the college environment and their self-perceptions in relationship to college. Aspects of their beliefs which have been shown to be dysfunctional could be corrected on this basis.

REFERENCES

Cohen, J.   Multiple Regression as a general data-analytic system.

   Psychological Bulletin, 70, 6, 421-443.

Dispenzieri, A. & Giniger, S.   A comparison of the expectations

   and experiences of special program students and regular

   matriculants in the community colleges of the City University

   of New York.   New York: City University Research and

   Evaluation Unit, March 13, 1969.

Katzell, M.E. Expectations and dropout in schools of nursing.

   Journal of Applied Psychology, 1968, 52 (2), 154-157.

Safer, S.A.   An investigation into the content of incoming

   Freshman students' expectancies about the college experience.

   (Doctoral dissertation, The American University) Ann Arbor,

   Mich.:   University Microfilms, 1965.   No. 65-9943.

Stanley, J.C.   Predicting college success of educationally

   disadvantaged students.   Baltimore, Md.:   Johns Hopkins

   University, Center for the Study of Social Organization of

   Schools, September, 1970.

Weitz, J.   Job expectancy and survival.   The Journal of Applied

   Psychology, 1956, 40 (4), 245-247.

Youngberg, C.F.   An experiemental study of "job satisfaction" and

   turnover in relation to job expectations and self expectations.

   (Doctoral dissertation, New York University) Ann Arbor, Mich.:

   University Microfilms, 1963.   No. 64-6516.

TABLE 1

Internal Consistency Reliabilities of
Expectations-Experiences Clusters

Cluster	Mnemonic Label	Coefficient Alpha
I	Student Preparedness for Difficult Academic Requirements	.86
II	Influence of Student Body on Non-Academic College Activities	.78
III	Progressive Teaching Practices	.66
IV	Dedicated College Instructors	.77
V	Adequacy of College Facilities	.79
VI	Student Emphasis on Social Interaction	.60
VII	Good Student Traits in Handling Academic Demands of College	.67
VIII	Participation in Student Activities and Influence on Academic Matters	.58

TABLE 2

Percent Increment in R^2 and Partial Correlation with First Semester and
First Year Criteria for Each Demographic Characteristic Forced into
the Multiple Regression Equations in a Fixed Stepwise Sequence

	Criterion							
	First Semester				First Year			
	(N=545)				(N=481)			
	GPA		Credits		Cum. GPA		Cum. Credit	
Predictor	R^2 Incr.	Part. r	R^2 Incr.	Part. r	R^2 Incr.	Part. r	R^2 Incr.	Part. r
Diploma Track	3.1***	.05	8.8***	.21	4.9***	.09	10.4***	.22
H.S. Average	21.7***	.25	12.2***	.22	23.6***	.29	15.4***	.22
Comm. College	2.3*	—	3.2*	—	1.9*	—	4.0**	—
School A	0.3	−.15	0.0	−.06	0.3	−.15	0.1	−.05
School B	1.9***	−.22	2.4***	−.18	1.1**	−.20	2.4***	−.16
School C	0.0	−.05	0.5*	−.05	0.5*	−.10	0.2	.01
School D	0.1	−.10	0.3	.03	0.0	−.06	1.3**	.08
Ethnicity	4.1***	—	2.5**	—	4.2***	—	3.8***	—
Black	1.8***	−.12	0.8*	−.10	2.1***	−.16	1.5***	−.15
Puerto Rican	2.3***	−.05	1.7***	−.08	2.1***	−.08	2.3***	−.09
Sex	0.3	−.06	0.1	−.04	0.6*	−.09	0.7*	−.10
Condition	2.5***	−.18	0.7*	−.09	1.5***	−.15	1.4**	−.13
Total R^2	33.9		27.4		36.9		35.6	

* p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

TABLE 3

Percent Increment in R^2 and Partial Correlation with Criterion
for Each Expectations Cluster Adding Significant Variance as a
Unique Predictor of First Semester and First Year Performance
After Partialing Out the Effects of Demographic Characteristics

Criterion

	First Semester (N=545)				First Year (N=481)			
	GPA		Credits		Cum. GPA		Cum. Credits	
Expectations Cluster	R^2 Incr.	Part. r	R^2 Incr.	Part. r	R^2 Incr.	Part. r	R^2 Incr.	Part. r
I Student Preparedness								
II Non-Academic Activities								
III Progressive Teaching								
IV Dedicated Instructors								
V Adequate Facilities								
VI Social Interaction								
VII Good Student Traits	2.4***	.19	1.4**	.14	2.1***	.18	1.8***	.17
VIII Student Activities								

** p < .01; *** p < .001

TABLE 4

Percent Increment in R^2 and Partial Correlation with Criterion for
Each Experiences Cluster Adding Significant Variance as a Unique Predictor of
First Semester and First Year Performance After Partialing Out the Effects of
Demographic Characteristics and Each Expectations Cluster

	Criterion							
	First Semester				First Year			
	(N=461)				(N=419)			
	GPA		Credits		Cum. GPA		Cum. Credits	
Experiences Cluster	R^2 Incr.	Part. r	R^2 Incr.	Part. r	R^2 Incr.	Part. r	R^2 Incr.	Part. r
I Student Preparedness	2.2***	-.19	1.4**	-.14	1.7***	-.16	1.1**	-.13
II Non-Academic Activities								
III Progressive Teaching								
IV Dedicated Instructors	2.9***	.22	1.5**	.15	2.2***	.19	1.3**	.14
V Adequate Facilities								
VI Social Interaction								
VII Good Student Traits	1.2**	.14	1.1**	.13	1.7***	.17	2.1***	.19
VIII Student Activities								

** $p<.01$; *** $p<.001$