Wilderness Orientation Programs for the New Millennium
by Rick Curtis, Director, Outdoor Action Program, Princeton University

Over the past twenty years wilderness orientation programs have expanded across the country. From colleges to secondary schools and now graduate programs have turned to this successful format to integrate new students to the campus. At the same time the role of the University is changing and as we enter into the new millennium, wilderness orientation programs will have to adapt to new roles.

OA Frosh Trip Program
- 25 Years
- 9,566 participants
- 6-day trip
- 605 participants and 160 leaders
- 66 different groups in 7 states
- Largest wilderness orientation program in terms of participant*days

Current Program Goals

Each school will have different goals based on the population served, age of the participants, the size of the school, the type of school (secondary, college, professional), etc. The following are some of the goals used by other WO.[1]

General Program Goals
- Fun
- Easing the transition to school
- Transfer skills and ideas from the wilderness setting to the school setting
- Develop a positive connection with the school as a whole
- Learn about the college

Personal Growth Goals
- Increase self-confidence
- Increase self-esteem
- Assume responsibility for themselves and their choices
- Enhance communication skills
- Enhance decision making skills
- Better understand strengths and weakness in coping with stress
- Adjust and mature
- Increase personal initiative

Social Skills Goals
- Developing supportive relationships with peers
- Establish friendships with classmates
- Develop friendships with upperclass students
- Learn to work with others
- Develop trust in others

---

[1] Adapted from <u>An Assessment of Freshman Wilderness Orientation Programs in Higher Education: A Descriptive Delphi Study,</u> Martha A. O'Keefe, University of Maine, 1989.

- Gain a sense of community early on in school
- Develop acceptance of others
- Learn small group skills
- Reduce stereotyping
- Develop group problem-solving skills

Other Goals
- Teaching environmental stewardship
- Wilderness skills education
- Increased Retention rate
- Leadership development
- Faculty & staff interaction with students
- Discuss campus life issues such as substance abuse, sexual harassment, diversity, etc.
- Learning about campus resources

Wilderness Orientation Program Models

Based her study O'Keefe defined three basic models for Wilderness Orientation Programs.

	Model 1	**Model II**	**Model III**
GOALS			
Program	Develop peer identity, gain information about college, introduce students to outing club	Develop positive interaction with faculty, develop peer group identity	Improve retention, develop positive interaction with faculty
Personal Growth	Adjust and mature, enhance decision-making skills, increase personal initiative	Enhance decision-making skills	Adjust and mature
Social Skills	Establish friendships	Learn small group skills	Develop small group problem-solving skills, reduce stereotyping, establish friendships

The Changing Role of the University

Over the past twenty years, the both the operating practices and the role of the University has shifted. For much of this century through the early 60's an important operating principal for most residential Universities was *in loco parentis,* which means "in place of parents," by being a student at a residential college meant that the college administration took on a role similar to that of a parent through housing, feeding, monitoring behavior, etc. In the 70's the notion of *in loco parentis* fell out of practice. Universities took a "hands-off" approach when it came to student behavior. In recent years, in part driven by increasing liability concerns and the fear of lawsuits, the pendulum of *in loco parentis* is swinging back. Colleges are increasingly concerned about issues like binge drinking and are taking active steps to both curb problematic behavior and to educate students on how to make responsible choices. Retention of students is another issue. "Of the freshmen who enrolled in four-year colleges in the United States in the fall of 1996, 26.4 percent did not return the following fall, down from a

record high of 26.9 per cent two years earlier, according to a report on college dropout rates by ACT, Inc., which administers standardized tests."[2]

They expect to share in decision-making; many of them are a lot more savvy than their parents were as college students. Colleges go back to *in loco parentis* with these kids. The end of the generational cold war, however, can open a new period for colleges, one we can call *cum parentibus,* in which parents and their children work together on ways for young people to complete the last stage of adolescence.[3]

When a student violates alcohol rules at the University of Delaware, Radford University, and several other institutions, administrators are now calling or writing home. …Some college officials wonder whether the new federal law increases the legal risks for them. For example, if a college decided not to tell parents about a student's alcohol violations, and the student was later killed or injured in an alcohol-related incident, would the college face a greater liability if the parents sued?

"Not only do we have to consider what's in the best interest of the students, but now we have to ask ourselves whether we have a legal duty to notify parents," says Gus Kravas, vice-provost for student affairs at Washington State University, where students rioted last spring to protest strict alcohol rules.[4]

For more than a quarter of a century, higher education has trumpeted the disappearance of *in loco parentis.* Although it is true that the campus rebellions of the 1960s led to the lifting of many restrictions on student behavior, as well as to the elimination of many course requirements in foreign languages, mathematics, and science, the changes did not lead to a reduction in the services provided to students. Indeed, they led to precisely the opposite: Student and academic services grew at a striking pace.

From 1975 to 1986, spending on student services increased by 39 per cent in constant dollars, the largest increase in eight categories of expenditures -- including research and student aid. The second-highest rate of increase was 34 per cent for academic support, much of which -- tutoring and remediation, for example -- is also focused on students. The rate of increase tapered off after 1986, because of general cutbacks in administrative budgets.

Undoubtedly, much of this growth was triggered by competition for students. Worried about declining numbers of college-age students, administrators emphasized the quality of campus life by investing in student services. And, as the cost of college rose, students and their parents demanded more -- more financial-aid counseling, more career advising, more psychological and health care -- in exchange for their investment. As the academic achievement of students from many public high schools declined, colleges provided additional tutoring and remedial help. And as students from increasingly diverse backgrounds were admitted, even more student-services personnel were hired to deal with tensions among various groups and to provide a broader range of extracurricular activities.[5]

---

[2] Colleges Struggle to Keep Would-Be Dropouts Enrolled, LEO REISBERG, Chronicle of Higher Education, http://chronicle.com/colloquy/99/retention/background.htm

[3] The Chronicle of Higher Education, May 20, 1992, The Cold War Is Over Between the Generations, Claire L. Gaudiani

[4] Chronicle of Higher Education, December 4, 1998, When a Student Drinks Illegally, Should Colleges Call Mom and Dad? LEO REISBERG

[5] The Chronicle of Higher Education, October 6, 1995, The Faculty's Role in Fostering Student Learning, Ursula Wagener and Marvin Lazerson

The legacy of *in loco parentis,* the once-pervasive legal theory that colleges have responsibilities and rights similar to those of a parent, persists. Courts moved away from the theory during the student-rights movement of the late 1960's and early 1970's. Some legal experts, however, think that student plaintiffs have won recent cases by appealing to a juror's sense that such a relationship should exist.

Other factors are spurring suits, the lawyers say: Universities are usually rich defendants; students are often in debt. Injured students without health insurance sometimes feel they need to sue to recoup medical expenses.

Some university lawyers say these factors have created a "feeding frenzy" of litigation on campuses….He notes another paradox. If colleges decide to regulate student behavior more tightly, the courts will have more reason to find colleges liable when accidents occur.[6]

Among those student-affairs officers, a common lament is that students seem to be going through an extended adolescence. Says Phillip E. Jones, associate vice-president for academic affairs and dean of students at the University of Iowa: "The behavior is such that it encourages the *in loco parentis* relationship that students two decades ago fought to change."[7]

Our society is far more complex than it was forty years ago. As a result, students coming out of high school have much less clearer paths than their parents did. Many students aren't sure of where they are going or even what college is supposed to be for them. As a result, the maturation process in our culture has been extended into the college years. With the dissolution of families and communities, society has become more dependent upon colleges to continue the maturation process for students. In addition the philosophy of "consumer protection" that has developed elsewhere in society has also come to colleges and universities. Students and parents expect certain things these days, some appropriate and some not. And there is the increase in lawsuits driving universities to adopt policies to reduce liability. Again, some of this is justified and other things are either frivolous or are individuals ducking their own responsibility and trying to find someone else to blame.

Some colleges have taken up this responsibility while others have been slow to. This trend points to an important role that college outdoor programs can play in supporting the mission of the college. The potential for personal growth and development through small group wilderness experiences has been documented. College outdoor program participants can learn and grow in a variety of ways making them better students and better members of the college community. Additionally, the process of training college wilderness leaders provides some students with even more leadership development skills that also impact their lives in the classroom and dormitory.[8] [9]

I think that it is time to give a new name to college students who are between the ages of 18 and 21. The term "adolescents" does not do them justice, yet calling them "young adults" suggests a level of maturity that many do not possess. Instead, I suggest calling them "post-adolescent pre-adults" or PAPAS, for short.

 As awkward as that terminology may be, it describes the legal relationship that seems to be evolving between institutions of higher education and traditional-age college students. Having

---

[6] The Chronicle of Higher Education, August 17, 1994, Lawsuit 'Feeding Frenzy', Ben Gose
[7] The Chronicle of Higher Education, June 30, 1993, The Post-Baby Boomers Arrive on Campus, Mary Crystal Cage
[8] The Chronicle of Higher Education, June 30, 1993, The Post-Baby Boomers Arrive on Campus, Mary Crystal Cage
[9] The Chronicle of Higher Education, July 29, Today's College Students Need Both Freedom and Structure, Gary Pavela

moved from strict control over student conduct to treating students as adults subject to much less control, institutions now are being pressed to take more responsibility for students' behavior.

For many years, colleges and universities treated students as adolescents and governed them with a heavy hand. Many students were required to live in college housing and observe strict curfews. Male and female students ordinarily were not allowed in each other's rooms.

Important changes began in the 1940's. The enrollment of returning GI's after World War II and the expansion of adult-education programs thereafter brought students to campuses who would not accept being treated like adolescents. Also, the civil-rights movement in the 50's and 60's, the campus rebellions of the 60's and 70's, and the lowering of the age of majority to 18 eventually helped college students of all ages acquire levels of personal autonomy that previous generations had never known.

The consumer-protection movement in the late 1970's and 1980's accelerated the momentum for more student rights. Higher-education officials saw students as "customers" seeking "services." Federal and state governments adopted legislation protecting students' privacy and requiring that "consumer information" about financial aid and other services be made available to them.

Colleges own and manage property, and the courts can hold them responsible for foreseeable events on that property, even during activities planned and sponsored by students.

This concept was articulated by the Delaware Supreme Court last year in a lawsuit known as Furek v. The University of Delaware. In that case, which involved a hazing incident at a fraternity, the court observed: "The university is not an insurer of the safety of its students nor a policeman of student morality, nonetheless, it has a duty to regulate and supervise foreseeable dangerous activities occurring on its property. That duty extends to the negligent or intentional activities of third persons. ... The likelihood of injury during fraternity activities occurring on university campuses is greater than the utility of university inaction."

Students need freedom and structure if they are to develop their characters. We've done a good job, on the whole, in offering the freedom. Now, if we really want to help our "post-adolescent pre-adults," we need to pay renewed attention to providing the structure as well.[10]

One of the challenges of the millennium for college outdoor programs is to find ways that we can be seen as furthering the goals and objectives of the college. These are all valuable contributions to campus life:

- Retention
- Leadership development
- Teaching personal responsibility
- Enhancing communication and listening skills
- Building an ethic of service
- Developing a conservation ethic
- Developing a healthy life style
- Building life-long recreation skills
- Providing substance-free social option
- Connecting outdoor education to the curriculum

---

[10] The Chronicle of Higher Education, July 29, Today's College Students Need Both Freedom and Structure, Gary Pavela

- Peer education program
- Diversity and Multiculturalism
- Learning about dorm living
- Becoming part of a diverse community
- Learning about Pluralistic Ignorance
- Education on responsible use of alcohol

Shrinking Budgets

The "big spending" days of the eighties are over. Decreases in federal funding and declining enrollment in college have created new problems for colleges and universities. Schools now compete more than ever to both attract and keep students. Schools across the country have undergone major "belt-tightening" on budgets. All of this while costs continue to rise. In this new climate, wilderness orientation programs have to be able to show how the contribute to life on campus.

What Lies Ahead?

As we look ahead to 2000 and beyond, it is clear that WO programs can and should have new impacts on incoming students. I propose an expanded version of O'Keefe's goal areas to reflect the new directions WO programs should move in. With these new goal areas, individual colleges will focus on those which are most appropriate for their campus. Some examples are included in each area.

	GOALS
Academic	• Develop positive interaction with faculty • Connect wilderness orientation to academic curriculum
Connection to College	• Develop peer identity • Gain information about college
Environmental Stewardship	• Learn Leave No Trace practices • Develop an conservation ethic
Personal Growth	• Adjust and mature • Enhance decision-making skills • Increase personal initiative
Service	• Develop a service orientation
Social Skills	• Establish friendships • Learn small group skills • Reduce stereotyping • Develop small group problem-solving skills
University	• Retention • Community & Civility • Diversity education • Alcohol education • Sexual Harassment • Hazing • Violence

"The Academy" = Academic

Whatever institution you are a part of, one mantra runs pretty much universally throughout higher education: academic training is the primary mission of the institution. From the word go, that relegates most WO programs to the second tier of "student support services." However, WO programs can provide unique connections to "the academic side of the house." This will become a more important justification for WO programs as we move into the new millennium.

Faculty Connections

Faculty participation in WO programs is limited. In part this is due to increased demands on faulty and the changes that took place in the original swing away from *in loco parentis.* Thirty years ago faculty served much more as adult mentors, directly relating to students. This has changed and encouraging faculty to take time away from their research, teaching, and personal life to participate in a WO program is increasingly difficult without strong support from the university administration. What is clear is that programs that involve faculty create a unique "out-of-classroom" experience for students where faculty are seen as "partners in education" rather than as "lecturer/grader." This is a positive step, which could encourage more investment in learning from students. Evaluating the effects of faculty involvement is a key area for future research.

Academic Initiatives

WO programs also provide a unique environment for a variety of academic experiences. Whether it is exposing students to writing, natural history, biology, geology, history, or other topics, the setting of a WO and the supportive small group environment are conducive to exploring short-term academic topics. This can serve as an introduction to the academic rigor expected at a university, an exploration of a particular academic topic, or a survey of potential courses of study.

Most college outdoor programs are not part of the academic curriculum. Students may commit considerable time to the program and receive no academic credit for it. Colleges are increasingly viewing experiential learning models including service learning as an approach to integrate into the curriculum. Outdoor programs can also provide unique educational opportunities that connect to the student's academic life. Cooperative programming with departments like Biology, Geology, Teacher Education, etc. can create courses that link outdoor activities and training into mainstream classroom activities.

Freshmen Seminar Program at Princeton

The Freshman Seminar Program offers first-year students the opportunity to work in a small-group setting with a professor on a topic of special interest. Seminars are limited in size to 15 students, who are selected on the basis of a short essay application. Each seminar is hosted by a residential college and the seminar, in turn, contributes to the intellectual and cultural life of the college. Class discussions often continue over meals or in other informal settings at the college. The seminars, in conjunction with the colleges, frequently sponsor special events, such as film series, guest lectures, or cultural excursions to museums or the theater.

Freshman seminars count as regular courses, and most fulfill a distribution requirement. Each year, a number of the seminars also satisfy the University writing requirement. Unless specifically indicated in the course description, freshman seminars do not assume prior knowledge or advanced placement in the subject. The seminars depend for their success on the expertise of the professor and on the hard work and enthusiasm of all the participants. Emphasis is on discussion, papers, and in-class presentations rather than on quizzes or exams.

Outdoor Action is currently working with the Dean of the College's Office to create a series of Freshmen Seminars that include a outdoor component. Proposals for next year include:

Winter Ecology: This course would be would be taught by a professor in the Ecology and Evolutionary Biology department. The course would involve regular class work on Winter Ecology using the textbook Winter Ecology

by Dr. James Half Penny as well as other sources. Outdoor Action would provide a series of trainings on winter camping, hypothermia and cross-country skiing skills in February and early March as preparation for the class field trip, a 4-7 day Field Study in Yellowstone National Park with the Yellowstone Institute. Participants would stay in heated cabins in the Lamar Valley in Yellowstone and travel each day to different areas of the park studying wildlife winter conditions. Most of each day would be spent on cross-country skis.

Wilderness Literature: This course would study the writings on natural history and conservation including Thoreau, Muir, Leopold and other contemporary writers and would be taught by a professor in the English Department. Outdoor Action would provide a series of trainings on basic outdoor skills and several day trips to give students the skills to be comfortable in an outdoor setting. Over Fall Break participants would take part in a 4-5 day Outdoor Action Trip backpacking trip with opportunities for reading, and writing on the topic. An overnight solo camping experience, under supervision of the Outdoor Action Leaders would be part of the trip.

Nature & Spirituality: This course would study the spiritual aspects of nature through the study of a number of works of literature and would be taught by a professor in the Religion Department. Outdoor Action would provide a series of trainings on basic outdoor skills and several day trips to give students the skills to be comfortable in an outdoor setting. Over Fall Break participants would take part in a 4-5 day Outdoor Action Trip backpacking trip with opportunities for reading, and writing on the topic.

Diversity & Inclusion

Perhaps no other single issue is as difficult to get a handle on. What do we mean by diversity? Is it having a diverse group of participants? A diverse leadership staff? A program that is seen as open and accessible to all students? How do we define diversity:

- Gender
- Race
- Class
- Ability
- Sexual orientation
- Spirituality

If you approach the issue of diversity/inclusion you must do so by carefully examining the core values of your program that lie underneath this goal. Diversity simply for the sake of diversity, or that "it's something we should do" is hollow and, moreover, self-serving. It may be based on "white-man's burden" rather than a fundamental belief that the experience that we offer is a positive experience of personal growth that can be of benefit to all communities.

Reasons for Inclusion
- Client-base is diverse – providing role models and increased support to your client base.
- Core values of the program are based on personal growth and development. Therefore the experience should be available/accessible/attractive to the entire client community or as mush as possible (for example providing certain activities for people with differing abilities may be beyond the scope of the paraprofessional operation of most college outdoor programs).
- Cross-cultural interaction is seen as a core value of the program. We must realize that, for many< outdoor education is, in fact, a cross-cultural experience for them. We must provide the necessary support and resources for people to make the leap across a cross-cultural boundary. At the same time, we must be willing to make our own leaps across into other cultures to understand and appreciate them.

Roads to Inclusion
- Accessibility
  - Economic – fee structure, financial aid
  - Equipment
  - Activity levels
  - Programs for Differently-abled
- Outreach
  - Communication
  - Marketing
  - Cooperative Programming
- Cross-cultural Immersion

Service

Leadership is service. Teaching students leaders that they are in a service role is important to their development as responsible members of their college community and to society at large. Being a contributing member of a community means being in service to others. One of the challenges for college outdoor programs for the new millennium is to develop community service activities that include outdoor and experiential education.

Environmental Stewardship

Programs typically teach students the techniques for Leave No Trace camping in the outdoors. Our highly industrialized society consumes the vast quantity of the earth's resources and generates the greatest levels of pollutants. College students will graduate into a world that must carefully examine fundamental changes in the way we use and misuse finite resources as well as the value of protecting wilderness land. WO trips serve as a micro-society where individual behavior does have a direct effect on the surrounding environment. With carefully thought-out curriculum, these lessons can be extended back onto campus to support concern for the environment on campus and beyond. By creating concerned citizens the University prepares the next generation to deal with the complex problems they will need to face.

Leadership Training & Development

The major focus of wilderness orientation programs is the impact that these experiences have on incoming students. An often-overlooked population is the upperclass students, who, in the vast majority of programs serve as the trip leaders. In most schools these students receive training in group dynamics and facilitation, outdoor leadership, wilderness skills, and first aid. Leading a group in the wilderness and facilitating positive group interaction and personal development is a significant responsibility. Student leaders grow immensely through this process and their leadership and interpersonal skills are also utilized in the dormitories and in other campus activities.

Other Populations

Brown Outdoor Leadership Training (BOLT)
The BOLT program at Brown University has taken a different approach to wilderness orientation. Rather than focus on incoming students, BOLT works with upperclass students

> "BOLT is a program uniquely designed to bring together sophomores and provide them with a shared outdoor experience followed by a year of continued group activities. For many Brown students, the sophomore year is a difficult period of transition from the camaraderie of the first

year to the increasing independence of the next several years. As sophomores assume greater responsibility for the direction of their college experiences, they often struggle with significant personal and academic questions. The beginning of the year is a good time for sophomores to reflect on their first year experience, assess their strengths and weaknesses, and formulate new personal and academic goals.

The year-round aspect of the program gives sophomores an opportunity for continued reflection and reassessment of themselves and their personal development at Brown. This process of self-reflection and evaluation is a preliminary step in learning how to function more efficiently and to take initiative in a group setting. Brown1s unique curriculum tends to attract students who are self-starters. Nevertheless, even the most individualistic of students needs to be able to function within a group structure."[11]

Programs for Graduating Seniors
There are a number of other ways in which the WO model can be used to enhance the lives of students. Another area for development is to think about how such an experience might be crafted at the end of senior year, to help outgoing students with their next major life transition, from sixteen years of the school environment to the workplace.

Programs for Graduate Students
Wilderness orientation programs are also effective as a tool for bringing entering graduate students into a university community. Such programs already exist at a number of medical schools including Cornell Medical School, Harvard Medical School and in other advanced degree programs such as Stanford Business School. These program help to build bonds among the new students in the program. In some settings, other issues may be appropriate to develop in the context of these trips, such as teaching and advising techniques which many schools are now training their graduate students in. There is a large percentage of international graduate students enrolled in advanced degree programs in the U.S. Wilderness orientation programs can also help these students to make new friends and contacts and adjust to being in a foreign country.

How Do We Accomplish This?

- Small group
- Building community
- Interdependence
- Challenges of outdoors = challenges of college
- Metaphors
- Building Self-esteem
- Teaching/modeling judgment & decision-making

Why Wilderness Orientation?

- Leaders are typically unpaid and may be seen less as "the arm of the institution" than RA's.
- The remote location allows for students to focus on both the group and the goals of the trip without distractions.

---

[11] BOLT Web Page http://www.brown.edu/Student_Services/BOLT/

Effect of the OA Frosh Trip[12]

The Frosh Trip had a positive effect on the Frosh Group with regard to their anxiety, social fit and party scores and in their general adaptation to Princeton. As stated above, the self-anxiety score decreased after the trip indicating that the trip is effective at alleviating some anxiety associated with coming to college. This decreasing anxiety could be a result of the change in social fit scores after the trip. Before going into the trip, the participants in the Frosh Group think that they are not going fit in as well as the typical student, but after the trip this measure is reversed and Frosh think that they are going to fit in better than the typical student. Even though the change in the self-other discrepancy is small, the significance is in the fact that discrepancy is negative before the trip and then positive afterwards. This is strong evidence that the Frosh Trip is effective in helping freshmen adapt to Princeton.

Further evidence that the Frosh Trip is effective in helping freshmen fit into Princeton social scene can be found in the change of party scores as a result of the trip. The Frosh Group comes to Princeton with a huge self-other discrepancy in regard to their attitudes towards partying and drinking. After the trip, this discrepancy is significantly reduced and the Post-Trip discrepancy level is maintained until April. What's even more interesting is that the large decrease in the self-other discrepancy is caused by a decrease in the perception of others and not an increase in the individual's behavior.

Prentice and Miller (1993) demonstrated that when males are confronted with a self-other discrepancy they will change their behavior to be in line with the perceived norm. If the norm is a level of drinking above what the individual is comfortable with (as the case is) than the individual will increase their amount of drinking to be more in line with the norm. The Frosh Trip, however, is causing the opposite to happen. Freshmen come into the Trip thinking that everyone else is going to party much more than they are. After the trip, they have acted to decrease this discrepancy, but not by moving their behavior in the direction of the norm. Instead, the Frosh Trip helps freshmen to realize that their misperceptions are wrong and to bring their perceptions of others more in line with their behavior. By bringing their perception of the typical student in line with their behavior, freshmen are correcting a norm that would have influenced them to drink more than they were comfortable with. In effect, the Frosh Trip is reducing alcohol use by correcting freshmen's misperception of the alcohol norm on campus.

The proposed mechanism responsible for the changes in the self-other discrepancy on social fit and party scores is the same, so it will be discussed jointly. The Frosh Trip is an environment where students are exposed to the concept of pluralistic ignorance. They may not know what it's called and the leaders have not been trained in exposing it, but through the natural course of a trip misperceived norms are corrected. Discussions on Frosh Trips have a wide variety, but it is almost certain that at some point the group will discuss people's anxiety about fitting into the social scene and alcohol use on campus. If students feel comfortable enough, they will let down their false exterior and voice their true opinions. As in Schroeder and Prentice (in press) the illusion of universality surrounding the misperceived norms will be broken, and freshmen will see that they are less different from the other freshmen than they originally thought.

Comparing the self-other discrepancies on party and social fit scores for all three groups at the Pre-Trip and Follow-up time periods allow for (a) the adaptation of the Frosh Group to be compared to that of the control groups, and (b) the Frosh Trip's influence on this adaptation to be investigated. The fact that the change in the self-other discrepancy on social fit from the Pre-Trip to the Follow-up for the Frosh and Wait-List Groups was not statistically different points to self-selection as the cause of the decrease in the self-other discrepancy on social fit. If these score had been different, then the trip could be labeled as the cause, but since the change in

---

[12] Wardwell, Brian The Effects of the Outdoor Action Frosh Trip on Freshmen's Adaptation to Princeton University, senior thesis in Psychology, Princeton University, 1999.

both groups was statistically the same, this conclusion is invalid. There is evidence, however, that would allow one to speculate that the Frosh Trip did have an effect in changing social fit scores regardless of self-selection. The follow-up social fit score for the Frosh Group is positive, whereas, the Wait-List's social fit score is negative. This means that in April, the Frosh Group thinks that they fit in better than the typical student, whereas the Wait-List Group thinks they fit in worse than the typical student. Further and closer experimentation is required to show what effect the Frosh Trip has on changing social fit.

The Frosh Trip's effect on attitudes toward drinking is much clearer than its effect on social fit. The Frosh Group's change in self-other discrepancy from September to April, is both significantly different that the Wait-List and (No pre-orientation activity) NPRO Groups and much more negative. A large negative score on this measure means that there was a large decrease in the self-other discrepancy from September to April. It should be noted that part of the reason that the Frosh Group has such a large decrease in their self-other discrepancy is because their initial expectations show a huge self-other discrepancy. This, however, doesn't discount the fact that the Frosh Trip brought the participant's perceptions more in line with reality; correcting for a gross misperception of the partying and drinking norm.

Secondly, students who do not participate in any pre-registration orientation program are at a high risk of not fitting in socially and misperceiving the drinking norm on campus. The NPRO Group entered Princeton with a large self-other discrepancy on social fit and this discrepancy had increased by April. This is worrying because neither the Frosh Group nor the Wait-List group had in increase in the self-other discrepancy on social fit. The NPRO group not only thinks they are not going to fit in as well as the typical student in September, but by April they think they fit even less well. In party scores also, the NPRO Group had the largest self-other discrepancy in April. These results indicate that students who do not want to participate in pre-registration orientation programs have a high tendency to misperceive social norms. In this case, the misperception of the norms lead to a sense of not fitting in and a belief that their attitudes toward alcohol are deviant to a large degree. The mal-adaptation experienced by the NPRO Group would suggest that all freshmen should participate in some type of pre-registration orientation program in order to correct for any misperceptions of norms they may be experiencing.

Table 1
Frosh Group's Ratings of Own and Typical Student's (Other) Social Fit

Measure	Self	Other	Self-Other Discrepancy
Frosh Pre-Trip			
M	5.09	5.18	-.09
SD	.79	.49	.80
Frosh Post-Trip			
M	5.17	5.13	.04
SD	.80	.53	.84
Frosh Follow-up			
M	5.06	5.03	.03
SD	.90	.62	.91

Table 2
Frosh Group's Ratings of Own and Typical Student's (Other) Desire to Party

Measure	Self	Other	Self-Other Discrepancy
Frosh Pre-Trip			

M	1.75	4.26	-2.51
SD	.99	.77	1.16
Frosh Post-Trip			
M	1.82	2.48	-.66
SD	.90	.80	.95
Frosh Follow-up			
M	2.42	2.86	-.44
SD	.86	.54	.98

Resources

1. Astin, A.W. (1993). What matters in college? Four critical revisited. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
2. Bauch, T.M. (1995)). Risk management practices of university based adventure programs. James Madison University. Harrisburg, VA.
3. Bertolami, C. (1981). Effects of wilderness programs on self-esteem and locus of control orientation of young adults. Summary of thesis. (ERIC document reproduction service No. ED 266 928.
4. Booth-Butterfield, S., McCroskey, J. C. & Payne, S. K. (1989). The impact of communication apprehensions on college student retention and success. Communication Quarterly, 37, 100-107.
5. Cross, P.K., (1997). The freshman year: working out the puzzle of a college education. Paper presented at the Annual Conference on the Freshman Year Experience, Columbia, SC.
6. Collison, M. (1989). University of Puget Sound freshman orientation mixes outdoor fun with academic work and helps boost graduation rate. Chronicle for Higher Education. Sept. 13, p. 37-39.
7. Curtis, R, Building a Wilderness Orientation Program – http://www.princeton.edu/~oa/.princeton.edu/~oa/ft/
8. Curtis, R, (1978) The Outdoor Action Frosh Trip: Experimental Study of a Growth Experience, unpublished independent work, Princeton University.
9. Curtis, R. (1992). Training college outdoor program leaders. In Celebrating our Future: Proceedings of the International Conference of the Association for Experiential Education, (pp. 99-106).
10. Curtis, R. (1994). Running a frosh wilderness orientation program. In Experiential Education: A Critical Resource for the 21st Century. Proceedings Manual of the Annual International Conference of the Association for Experiential Education, (pp. 59-75).
11. Curtis, R. (1994). Training college wilderness leaders. In Experiential Education: A Critical Resource for the 21st Century. Proceedings Manual of the Annual International Conference of the Association for Experiential Education, (pp. 250-260).
12. Cuseo, J.B. (1991). The freshman orientation seminar: a research-based rationale for its value, delivery, and content. Monograph for The Freshman Year Experience, (series No. 4).
13. Cuseo, J. (1997). Freshman orientation seminar at community colleges: A research-based rationale for its value, content, and delivery (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 411 005)
14. Davis-Berman, J. & Berman, D. (1996). Using the wilderness to facilitate adjustment to college: an updated description of wilderness orientation programs. Journal of Experiential Education, 19(1), 22-28.
15. Davis-Berman, J. & Berman, D. (1995). Wilderness new student orientation programs: American Colleges and Universities (on-line). Available: http://www.princeton.edu/~oa/ft/berman.html.
16. Dunphy, L., Miller, T., Nelson, J., & Woodruff, T. (1987). Exemplary retention strategies for the freshman year. In McGinty Stodt, M. & Klepper, W. (Eds.), Increasing retention: Academic and student affairs (pp. 39-60). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
17. Duran, R. L., Hawken, L. & Kelley, L. (1991). The relationship of interpersonal communication variables to academic success and persistence in college. Communication Quarterly, 39, 297-308.
18. Ewert, A.W. (1977). The effects of outdoor adventure activities upon self-concept. Unpublished masters thesis, Eastern Washington University, Cheney, Washington.

19. Ford, P., & Blanchard, J. (1993). Leadership and Administration of Outdoor Pursuits (2nd ed.). Venture Publishing Co.

20. Gachette, Y. (1998, November). Institutional data: A prescription for retention. In, Student Personnel Professional Conference. Conference conducted by Buffalo State College Student Personnel Program, Buffalo, New York.

21. Gardener, J.N. & Hansen, D.A. (1993). Perspectives on the future of orientation. In Upcraft, M.L., Mullendore, R.H., Barefoot, B.O., & Fidler, D.S. (Eds.), Designing successful transitions: A guide for orienting students for college. (Monograph series no. 13). National Orientation Directors Association.

22. Gass, M. A. (1990). The longitudinal effects of an adventure orientation program on the retention of students. Journal of College Student Development, 31, 33-38.

23. Gass, M. A. (1987) The effects of a wilderness orientation program on college students. Journal of Experiential Education, 10(1), 30-33.

24. Gass, M. A., Kerr, P. J. & Garvey, D. (1986). Student orientation in wilderness settings. In Kraft, R.J. & Sakofs, M. (Eds.), Experiential Education in schools, (p. 320-330). Boulder, CO: Association for Experiential Education.

25. Gass, M. A. (1985). Programming the transfer of learning in education. Journal of Experiential Education, 8(3), 18-24.

26. Gass, M. (1983). The value of wilderness orientation programs at colleges and universities in the United States. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 242-471).

27. Geraghty, M. (1996, July 19). Data show more students quitting college before sophomore year. The Chronicle of Higher Education, A35.

28. Kelly, C. (1996). An orientation curriculum for Terra Community College. (Report No. JC 960 677). Heidelberg College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 401 949).

29. Kerr, P.J., & Gass, M. A. (1987). A group development model for adventure education. Journal of Experiential Education, 10(3), 39-46.

30. Lee, W. (1997). Transitioning from high school to college: Surviving a clash of educational cultures. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Albuquerque, NM.

31. McGowan, M.L. (1997). Thinking outside the box: the role of in spiritual and ethical development. Journal of Experiential Education, 10(3). 39-46.

32. Klingman, B. (1991). The Call of the Wild: Investigating the relationship between adventure education, character development, and the college curriculum. UMI dissertation information service. (microfilm No. 3 2511 00004 9624).

33. McNutt, R. (1990). Developing a college outing program. Unpublished masters thesis, University of California at Chico.

34. McNutt, R. (1992). Developing a college outing program. Proceedings of the 1991 International Conference on Outdoor Recreation. (October, 17-19, Moscow, ID): see RC 019 109.

35. Metcalf, J.A. (1976). Adventure programming. Unpublished manuscript. Northern Illinois University.

36. Miles, J.C. & Priest, S. (1990). Adventure Education. State College, PA: Venture Publishing Co.

37. O'Keefe, M. (1989). Freshman wilderness orientation programs: Model programs across the country. In Life Beyond Walls: Proceedings of the 1988 National Conference on Outdoor Recreation,(pp. 165-179).

38. Potter, T. (1997). Human dimensions of expeditions: Deeply rooted, branching out. In Deeply Rooted, Branching Out, 1972-1997. Annual AEE International Conference Proceedings, (pp. 2-7).

39. Porter, W. (1975). The development of the wilderness experience program. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 200 366), RC 021-603.

40. Raiola, E. (1984). Outdoor adventure activities for new student orientation programs. (University microfilms no. 242-446).

41. Robinson, L.F. (1989). The effect of freshman transition-to-college/orientation courses on student retention. College Student Journal, 23(3), 225-229.

42. Smith, R. (1997), The Effects of Outdoor Experiential Orientation Programs, BA Thesis New College of the University of South Florida.
43. Stremba, B. (1989). Passages: Helping college students matriculate through outdoor adventure. In Life Beyond Walls: Proceedings of the 1988 National Conference on Outdoor Recreation, (pp.199-208).
44. Simmons, G.A. (1995). The role of academic departments in outdoor recreation programs, Humboldt State University, Arcata, California.
45. Strogner, J. (1978(. The effects of a wilderness experience on self-concept and academic performance, Doctoral Dissertation. Virginia State University.
46. Tinto, V. (1996). Reconstructing the first year of college. Planning for Higher Education, 25, 1-6.
47. Upcraft, M.L., Mullendore, R.H., Barefoot, B.O., & Fidler, D.S (1993). Monograph of the National Resource Center for the Freshman Year Experience, 13.
48. Wardwell, Brian The Effects of the Outdoor Action Frosh Trip on Freshmen's Adaptation to Princeton University, senior thesis in Psychology, Princeton University, 1999.