

## 1174 ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1967

classified according to the proportion of high CL students in the program (See Table 8) by splitting them into a low group where less than 30% of the students were high in CL or interpersonal maturity (9 bottom programs) and a high group with 30% or more of the students high in CL or interpersonal maturity (top 12 programs). Each program was then considered as being either structured or flexible and as enrolling predominantly low or predominantly high CL students. According to this classification, there were 4 programs in the Structured-Low CL category; 7 programs in the Structured-High CL category; 5 programs in the Flexibility-Low CL category; and 5 programs in the Flexibility-High CL category. It should be emphasized that this use of a median split classification was very general and therefore, the descriptions of structured-flexibility and low-high CL should be accordingly regarded as general, and relative to the present sample of 21 programs. (See Appendix 13)

On the basis of a conceptual systems change model (Hunt, 1966), greater effectiveness was expected for structured approaches in the programs with predominantly low CL students and for flexible approaches in programs with predominantly high conceptual level students since both these combinations are considered to be "matched". Low CL students, because of their relatively concrete orientation, should function best and be more likely to change when the program approach is clearly structured, well organized, and the students know what to expect. By contrast, high CL students who are more inquiring and more independent, should function best and be more likely to change in a reflective environment which is more flexibly attuned to their independent orientation. Therefore, the Structured-Low CL group and the Flexible-High CL group were generally considered to be "matched" while the other two groups were considered to be "mismatched".