

D. Differential Impact of Summer Programs.

An observer of different Upward Bound programs is quickly struck by the variety and approach among programs. However, it is not simply a question of which kind of program among these different approaches is better than others, since the effectiveness of a particular approach will depend upon the kind of students in the program.

Evaluation procedures frequently attempt to identify the "best" programs without considering the variety of students in these programs. In the present view, the issue is not "Which program is best?", but rather "Which programs are more effective with certain kinds of students?" Some earlier work investigating the differential effectiveness of educational environments upon culturally disadvantaged students found that a highly structured classroom environment was most effective for students of low Conceptual Level while a more flexible classroom environment was most effective for students of high Conceptual Level (Hunt, 1966).

In order to investigate such differential program effectiveness, therefore, the 21 target programs were classified according to (1) predominant type of student (low vs. high Conceptual Level or interpersonal maturity), and (2) type of program approach (structured vs. flexible). The use of the structure-flexible dimension as the major program characteristic was justified not only by the theoretical basis of its earlier importance (Hunt, 1966), but also because program flexibility--autonomy was found to be one of the most important dimensions along which the 21 programs varied. Because of the high relationship between flexibility and autonomy ($r = .80$), these two dimensions were combined to provide an index of program flexibility. Programs were divided by splitting them into a low group with scores averaging 50 or below (bottom 11 programs) and a high group with flexibility--autonomy scores greater than 50 (top 10 programs). Next, the programs were independently