

Journal on Postsecondary Education and Disability
Volume 15, Number 1, Fall 2001

The Psychosocial Development of College Students With and Without Learning Disabilities

James J. Costello
Emporia State University

R. William English
The Florida State University

Abstract

This study was designed to explore the psychosocial development of college students with and without learning disabilities. The construct of psychosocial development was measured by the Student Developmental Task and Lifestyle Inventory (SDTLI; Winston and Miller, 1987). Analysis of the data revealed significant differences between students with and without learning disabilities in terms of their academic autonomy and mature interpersonal relationships. There were no differences found between the two groups within the developmental constructs of purpose, salubrious lifestyle, and intimacy. It appears that the presence of a learning disability may interfere with psychosocial development and/or that students with learning disabilities may unknowingly sacrifice psychosocial development to maintain acceptable academic standards including grade point average and academic progress.

Universities in the United States have experienced a dramatic increase in the number of students with disabilities admitted to postsecondary institutions (American Council on Education, 1996; Henderson, 1992, 1995). The primary catalyst impacting this increase was federal legislation that mandated that individuals with disabilities were to be protected from discrimination in educational settings (Scott, 1996). A sub-group within this expanding population that demonstrated the most dramatic increase has been individuals with learning disabilities (American Council on Education, 1996; Henderson, 1995). This group represents approximately one-third of the matriculated students with disabilities entering post-secondary education (Henderson, 1995).

Due to the obvious growth in numbers of students with learning disabilities, the National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities (1988) recommended a systematic program of research to examine the psychosocial and academic performance differences among individuals with learning disabilities. In 1991, Gottesman suggested that the lifelong effects of a learning disability appeared to be far greater than simply the persistence of difficulties in reading, writing, and spelling. Gottesman went on to suggest that learning disabilities have had significant impact on the education, employment, interpersonal relationships, and emotional well being of those individuals with this disorder. In 1996, Carroll and Johnson Brown suggested that college students with learning disabilities presented support needs that were psychosocial as well as academic in nature.

This study attempted to synthesize the existing literature concerning college student development and link that information to the psychosocial development of traditional college age students with learning disabilities. A theory of college student development initially proposed by Arthur Chickering in 1969, and revised in 1993 by Chickering and Reisser has been the dominant paradigm for student development research over the past thirty years (Garfield & David, 1986; Pascarella and Terenzini, 1991; Thrasher and Bloland, 1989; White & Hood, 1989), and therefore was employed in this study. At the core of Chickering and Reisser's theory are the seven vectors of college student development which were built upon two of Eric Erikson's stages of adolescent and young adult development.

The intent of this study was to compare traditional age university students with and without learning disabilities on a measure of psychosocial development that was based on the theoretical foundation as proposed by Chickering (1969) and Chickering and Reisser (1993). The specific research question employed in this study was: Is there a difference in the psychosocial development between university students who had self-identified as having learning disabilities, and their peers who had not?

Methodology

This study was descriptive in nature and was completed due to the lack of research regarding the psychosocial development of college students with learning disabilities. The design can be described as correlational since its purpose was to discover or clarify relationships through the use of correlation coefficients (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996). The study was designed to ascertain the magnitude of the relationships between the psychosocial development variables of interest.

Research Sample and Selection of Participants

The participants in this study were traditional-age, undergraduate students who attended two large public universities in the southeast region of the United States. The selected universities were chosen based on their similarity in terms of admission criteria, minority student population, and gender representation within their respective undergraduate student populations. Table 1 displays the data describing the admission criteria for the two universities that participated in the study. All of the scores reported in Table 1 represented the middle 50% of each university's admitted freshman class of 1998. Both universities were in urban settings and since both were in the same state university system, it was felt that these groups were sufficiently homogeneous for research purposes.

The universities in this study had similar eligibility policies regarding documentation of learning disabilities and provision of reasonable accommodations to students with disabilities. To be eligible for support services and reasonable

Table 1

Admission Criteria of Universities Participating in the Study

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>University A</u>	<u>University B</u>
GPA	3.6-4.1	3.1-4.0
SAT	1170-1340	1060-1260
ACT	25-29	23-27

Gender	49% Women 51% Men	53% Women 47% Men
Minorities	20.95%	21.1%

accommodations, a student at either university was required to present documentation from a licensed psychologist verifying the presence of a learning disability. When that type of documentation was not available, a copy of the student's Individual Education Plan (IEP) completed during secondary school served as verification of the presence of prior learning disability diagnosis and academic support services. There was no specific limit regarding the age of the learning disability documentation in practice or policy at either of the participating universities. No further institution or university system criteria were applied when considering eligibility for reasonable accommodations for students with learning disabilities.

Students without learning disabilities were randomly selected from a list of undergraduate students generated by their respective university registrar. Students with learning disabilities were randomly selected from a list provided by the respective university offices serving students with disabilities on the participating campuses. Any duplication in sample selection was monitored to assure assignment of individual students to the appropriate group. However, it must be noted that the participating sample was a self-directed sample (i.e., students self-selected to participate in the study); and therefore, the results of this study reflect only the information provided by students who chose to participate in the process and generalization of these results should be considered with caution.

Instrumentation

Two instruments were used to collect data relevant to this study. They were the Student Demographic Form (SDF), and the Student Developmental Task and Lifestyle Inventory (SDTLI, Winston & Miller, 1987).

The Student Demographic Form was developed by the researchers and contains demographic information central to the focus of this research. The instrument contained a total of ten questions of either a fill-in-the-blank or multiple-choice format. Specifically, information about age, gender, race, grade point average, year in college, frequency of use of university-based support services, existence of a learning disability, and student age at the initial diagnosis of the learning disability were contained in the SDF. The first seven questions were completed by all participants and the final three questions were completed only by those students who self-identified as having a learning disability.

The SDTLI developed by Winston and Miller (1987) was based on Chickering's general theoretical framework, but does not completely conform to the vector structure proposed in 1969 or 1993. This instrument has been popular in student development research and has been accepted as one of the dominant measures of psychosocial development with college age subjects (Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). The SDTLI consists of items that characterize three basic developmental tasks and three scales (Winston & Miller, 1987). The three tasks are consistent with three of the vectors contained within Chickering's theory, and the three scales explore other developmental tasks experienced by many college students (Winston & Miller, 1987). The tasks and scales are Establishing and Clarifying Purpose (PUR); Developing Mature Interpersonal Relationships (MIR); Academic Autonomy (AA); Salubrious Lifestyle (SL); Intimacy (INT); and a Response Bias scale (RB). The following

paragraphs provide a brief overview of each of the tasks, scales and subscales that constitute the SDTLI.

Establishing and clarifying purpose (PUR). This task measures the extent to which students have developed well-defined educational goals and have become active, self-directed learners. Additionally, items within this area explore the degree to which students have synthesized knowledge about themselves and the world of work into appropriate career and lifestyle plans (Winston, 1990). The PUR task is further defined by five subtasks that include: Educational involvement (EI), career planning (CP), lifestyle planning (LP), life management (LM), and cultural participation (CP).

These subtasks address the degree to which students have: well defined educational goals and plans (EI); an awareness of the world of work and an accurate understanding of one's abilities and limitations (CP); a personal direction and orientation in one's life that takes into account a diverse set of personal, ethical, family and religious issues (LP); an ability to structure their lives and manipulate their environment in ways that allow them to satisfy daily needs and meet responsibilities (LM); and are actively involved in a wide variety of activities, including cultural events and that their leisure time is spent productively (CUP) (Winston & Miller, 1987).

Developing mature interpersonal relationships (MIR). This task measures the extent to which students had developed relationships characterized by independence, frankness, and trust. Also, this task assesses the degree to which students appreciated individual differences among friends or felt pressured to conform to peer-group norms or to conceal differences of opinion (Winston & Miller, 1987). The MIR task is further defined by three subtasks that include: peer relationships (PR), tolerance (TOL), and emotional autonomy (EA). They focus on how well student's have developed relationships with peers that are based greater degrees of trust, independence, frankness, and individuality (PR); respect and acceptance of different backgrounds, beliefs, cultures, races, lifestyles, and appearances (TOL); and a freedom from the need for continuous reassurance and approval from others (EA) (Winston and Miller, 1987).

Academic autonomy (AA). The Academic Autonomy subscale measures students' capacity to deal with ambiguity and to monitor and control their own behavior in ways that allowed them to attain their educational goals. Also, this subscale examines the degree to which students fulfill their academic requirements without extensive direction from others (Winston & Miller, 1987).

Salubrious lifestyle (SL). This scale measures the degree to which a student's lifestyle is consistent with good health and wellness practices (Winston, 1990).

Intimacy (INT). The Intimacy Scale is experimental and was completed only by students who reported being involved in an intimate relationship within the previous year. It is designed to measure the extent to which students have established a self-defined intimate relationship with another person based on mutual respect, honesty, acceptance, reciprocal caring, and trust (Winston & Miller, 1987).

Response bias (RB). This scale was intended to identify students who were attempting to "fake good" or who were careless in completing the inventory. A score that was equal to or greater than five indicated a "fake good" profile and that instrument should not be included in data analysis (Winston & Miller, 1987).

The SDTLI takes approximately 25 to 35 minutes to complete and consists of 132 items (Winston & Miller, 1987). There are three sections to the instrument and the student is asked to read each question carefully and decide if the statement is true (usually true) or false (not usually true) considering their view of self. There is also a third alternative of "O" in ten of the 70

questions in section one. This option is available in those circumstances where “other” would be more appropriate than “true” or “false”. The three sections of the instrument are: (1) Education, career and lifestyle (70 items); (2) Intimate Relationships (19 items); and (3) Relationships and the academic environment (43 items).

The answer sheet for the SDTLI consists of the original and a carbon copy, and the carbon copy is used for scoring. Scoring is accomplished by counting the numbers of True and False responses in each task, subtask or scale area. Raw scores are converted to standard scores (T scores) and the converted scores are then interpreted based on class standing (i.e., Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, and Senior).

In terms of the instrument validity and reliability, total task scores are appropriate measures for most research studies (Winston, 1990). Short-term test-retest coefficients ranged from .70 to .87, with longer term coefficients of nearly one academic year ranging from .53 to .80. Cronbach alphas ranged from .90 for the Establishing and Clarifying Purpose (PUR) Task to .45 for the Career Planning (CP) subtask. All tasks and scales were .70 or higher. These data suggest that the tasks and scales are sufficiently homogeneous for research with groups of college age students (Winston, 1990).

A variety of approaches were taken to estimate the validity of the various scales and subtasks of the SDTLI (Winston & Miller, 1987). Construct validity was based on the conceptualizations of psychosocial development proposed by Chickering (1969) and the test developer’s observations of college students. Concurrent validity was addressed by correlating the tasks and subtasks of the SDTLI with selected scales from the Career Development Inventory (Super, Thompson, Lindeman, Jordaan, & Myers, 1981), Mines-Jensen Interpersonal Relationship Inventory (Hood & Mines, 1986), Omnibus Personality Inventory (Heist & Yonge, 1968), and the Iowa Developing Autonomy Inventory Scales (Jackson & Hood, 1986). Positive and statistically significant correlations were found ranging from .27 to .70.

Winston (1990) reported that the sub-tasks were correlated more highly with the tasks to which they were assigned than to any other task and to the sub-tasks grouped under that task. Because of the lack of compelling validity data for the INT Scale, it was suggested that users exercise caution when interpreting results to individual students (Winston & Miller, 1987).

Data Collection Procedures

Research packets were mailed to students with and without learning disabilities attending the institutions participating in this study, between November of 1998 and March of 1999. Each research packet contained a cover letter, endorsement letters from university administrators responsible for disability services, Informed Consent Form, campus-based support resource list, and a Student Developmental Task and Lifestyle Inventory. Follow-up mailings were completed at two and four week intervals after the initial mailing.

Participants were requested to complete and return the Informed Consent Form and Student Developmental Task and Lifestyle Inventory and the Student Demographic Form to the researcher (first author). The completed SDTLI answer sheets were collected and scored by the researcher using the suggested scoring process in the manual (Winston & Miller, 1987). The information obtained from the Student Demographic Form was tabulated by the primary researcher and calculated in terms of the presented descriptive data in Table 2. A preliminary analysis of the response bias scale of the SDTLI and self-reported age of the student was carried out and determinations made as to their inclusion in the study. If the response bias scale was two

or greater, that packet was not used. If the self-reported age of the student was less than 17 or greater than 24, that packet was also not included in the final analysis.

A total of 498 research packets were mailed to randomly selected students with and without learning disabilities who attended the universities participating in this study. A total of 252 (50.6%) of these packets were returned. Following a review of the data, 42 research packets were eliminated from the final analysis due to incomplete elements within the packet. Therefore, 210 (42%) completed research packets were used in the final data analysis. Within the 210 completed packets, there was nearly an equal representation of freshmen ($n=51$; 24%), sophomores ($n=54$; 26%), juniors ($n=52$; 25%), and seniors ($n=53$; 25%). This balance was also present in terms of students with learning disabilities ($n=104$; 49.5%) and their peers without learning disabilities ($n=106$; 50.5%).

Limitations

This study was limited by the psychometric properties of the research instrument, the age range of the sample, the subject's honesty in self-report, personal characteristics of volunteer subjects, and the level of language development within each individual in the sample. Also, the

Table 2

Descriptive Data of Scores on the SDTLI

Variable	<u>Students with LD</u>		<u>Students without LD</u>	
	<i>M</i> ($n=104$)	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i> ($n=106$)	<i>SD</i>
<u>PUR</u>	41.20	10.11	42.73	9.54
EI	10.51	2.84	10.46	2.83
CP	11.03	3.24	11.72	4.04
LP	6.36	3.98	7.00	2.21
LM	9.72	3.03	10.65	2.71
CP	2.98	1.78	2.83	1.33
<u>MIR</u>	19.66	5.18	21.25	4.61
PR	8.37	2.73	8.37	2.73
TOL	6.02	1.64	6.22	1.46
EA	5.36	1.95	5.69	2.02
<u>INT</u>	11.01	5.71	11.75	5.36
<u>SL</u>	5.08	1.88	5.21	1.74
<u>AA</u>	4.98	2.45	6.12	2.26
<u>RB</u>	0.42	0.68	0.27	0.47

Note. PUR – purpose; EI – educational involvement; CP – career planning; LP – lifestyle planning; LM – life management; CP – cultural participation; MIR – mature interpersonal relationships; PR – peer relationships; TOL – tolerance; EA – emotional autonomy; INT – intimacy; SL – salubrious lifestyle; AA – academic autonomy; RB – response bias.

Student Developmental Task and Lifestyle Inventory had no normative data regarding a population of college students with learning disabilities

Data Analysis and Results

For the purposes of this study, the level of significance was established at $p=.05$, the hypotheses were analyzed using a two-tailed test of significance, and a medium effect size at the .5 level of .30 was used. Therefore, a minimum sample size of 168 subjects, two groups of 84 each, was necessary to establish the necessary statistical power for reasonable generalization of the findings obtained from this study (Cohen & Cohen, 1975; Olejnik, 1984). The actual sample size of 210 well exceeded the minimum standard of 168 to establish the statistical power.

A review of the descriptive data obtained in this study (see table 3) suggested that students with learning disabilities were slightly older (21.3, $SD=3.54$ vs. 20.7, $SD=1.94$) and had earned more college credits (63.40, $SD=38.27$ vs. 59.86, $SD=35.78$) than their peers without learning disabilities. Also, students with learning disabilities reported a cumulative Grade Point Average that was slightly less than their peers without learning disabilities (2.92, $SD= 0.50$ vs 3.12, $SD=0.47$). Finally, students with learning disabilities reported that they accessed campus-based support services

Table 3

Descriptive Data of Research Sample

Variable	<u>Students with LD</u>		<u>Students without LD</u>	
	<i>M</i> (n=104)	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i> (n=106)	<i>SD</i>
<u>Demographics</u>				
Age	21.28	3.54	20.74	1.94
Credits	63.40	38.27	59.86	35.78
GPA	2.92	0.50	3.12	0.47
Age at LD-ID	14.93	6.84		
<u>Support Services</u>				
Career	1.24	2.18	1.15	1.54
Counseling	1.35	3.08	0.36	1.35
Health	2.60	6.03	2.08	3.59
OSD	4.50	9.91		
<u>Ethnicity</u>				
African-American	6	5.08	8	7.5
American-Indian	1	1.0	1	0.9
Asian-American	2	1.9	2	1.9
Caucasian	85	81.7	81	76.4
International	3	2.9	3	2.8
Latin-American	4	3.8	8	7.5
Mexican-American	1	1.0		

Other	2	1.9	3	2.8
<u>Gender</u>				
Female	57	54.8	71	67.0
Male	47	45.2	35	33.0
<u>Identification Point</u>				
Elementary School	36	34.6		
Middle School	4	3.8		
High School	9	8.7		
College	55	52.9		

Note: Support services represents the mean number of visits to the campus-based career center, counseling center, student health center, and office for students with disabilities (OSD). Also, the final component of this table presents frequency data describing when learning disabilities were identified (Identification Point).

such as career guidance (1.24, $SD=2.18$ vs. 1.15, $SD=1.54$), personal counseling (1.35, $SD=3.08$ vs. 0.36, $SD=1.35$), and health services (2.60, $SD=6.03$ vs. 2.08, $SD=3.59$) more often than their peers without learning disabilities.

In Table 2 further differences were noted between the two groups on the tasks, sub-tasks, and scales of the SDTLI. Students with learning disabilities tended to score lower on these measures with the exception of the peer relationship scale where the two groups demonstrated equal scores. Also, students with learning disabilities scored slightly higher on the Response Bias scale of the instrument, but these scores were well within the acceptable range according to Winston and Miller (1987). With the exception of the Educational Involvement (EI) and Cultural Participation (CUP) sub-tasks, students with learning disabilities again scored lower than their peers without learning disabilities.

Demographic data from the total sample (Table 3) revealed that participants were predominantly caucasian (79%, $n=166$) and female (60%, $n=128$). Surprisingly, the majority of students with learning disabilities reported their disabilities were first diagnosed either in elementary school (34%, $n=36$) or in college (53%, $n=55$).

Two steps were taken to estimate the reliability of the self-report data and justify further analysis for group differences. First, the coefficient alpha (Cronbach, 1970) was calculated to examine the internal consistency of the sample responses on the SDTLI. The coefficient alpha obtained for the total inventory on this research sample was .77 ($n=210$), which compared favorably to the coefficients of .50 to .90 ($n=954$) obtained during the development of the SDTLI (Winston and Miller, 1987).

Secondly, the self-report data was compared to actual data managed by the university registrar and the Office for Students with Disabilities. These correlations were all positive and statistically significant at the .01 level. They were .99 for credits earned, .95 for grade point average, and .96 for visits to the Office for Students with Disabilities. Based on the results of these reliability estimates, it was determined that these data demonstrated adequate internal consistency on the SDTLI and a very high degree of relationship between self-report and actual data.

The primary research question of this study was to determine if there was a difference in the psychosocial development between university students who had self-identified as having

learning disabilities, and those students who had not as measured by the SDTLI. To answer this question a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was calculated and two constructs within the domain of psychosocial development were found to be different (Table 4). Students with learning disabilities scored significantly lower on the academic autonomy (AA) scale ($F=12.334, p=.001$) and mature interpersonal relationships (MIR) scale ($F=5.533, p=.020$).

Table 4

Multivariate Analysis of Variance between groups

<u>Variable</u>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
AA	1	12.344	.001**
MIR	1	5.533	.020*
PUR	1	1.265	.262
INT	1	.928	.337
SL	1	.273	.602

Note. * $p<.05$. ** $p<.01$. AA – academic autonomy; MIR – mature interpersonal relationships; PUR – purpose; INT – intimacy SL – salubrious lifestyle;; RB – response bias.

Although these scores were found to be statistically significant, there was not a functional or practical difference in terms of psychosocial development when comparing these two groups. Normative data as reported in the SDTLI Manual (Winston & Miller, 1987) suggest that students with learning disabilities fall approximately at a t-score of 50 and their peers without learning disabilities are at a t-score of 53 on the MIR scale; and students with learning disabilities fall at a t-score of 49 and their peers without learning disabilities are at a t-score of 53. Both of these differences are less than one-half a standard deviation and therefore are more alike than different in practical or functional explanations of their psychosocial development.

Discussion

Results indicate that college students with and without learning disabilities were found to score more alike than different on the selected measure of psychosocial development. Even though there were statistical differences found on two variables, the practical or functional differences might be considered minimal in terms of student development. There may be multiple reasons for this similarity, but this study appears to indicate that college students with and without learning disabilities are not as different as some may believe in the area of psychosocial development. Perhaps a global explanation of the similarities is the commonality within the university environment as virtually all college students share the value of earning a diploma, living a balanced life, and sustaining close personal and intimate relationships (Chickering & Reisser, 1993).

An additional hypothesis regarding the results is that they reflect the sample in this study where the majority of students with learning disabilities (53%) were first diagnosed after they were in college. Although these students may have experienced some degree of academic struggle, they were not likely to be segregated from their peers at a younger age and therefore

confronted the same psychosocial developmental tasks. It may be important for other researchers to replicate this study or utilize a similar methodology to examine the significance of time of diagnosis in college students, and perhaps explore if there is a difference in the severity of those disabilities that were diagnosed earlier in life versus those individuals diagnosed in college.

Despite similarities, the developmental tasks of academic autonomy and developing mature interpersonal relationships were found to be statistically different between the two groups of interest where students with learning disabilities were found to score lower on the selected measure. These results, although minor in functional terms, do suggest that many college students with learning disabilities may have less developed skills in their utilization of effective study plans, self-satisfaction with academic performance, self-discipline, and interdependence. This finding is consistent with that of prior research (Barbaro, 1982; Cox, 1977; Hughes & Osgood, 1990; Ness & Price, 1990; Putnam, 1984; Smith, 1988) where students with learning disabilities were categorized as highly dependent and that interfered with development of personal autonomy. Therefore, along with facilitating reasonable accommodations in classroom settings, university-based disability service providers may want to consider other experiences for students with learning disabilities that are targeting their developmental needs to foster interdependent relationships and academic autonomy.

Prior research has suggested that there is a relationship between the constructs of developing mature interpersonal relationships and academic autonomy (Chickering & Reisser, 1993). Therefore, if students with learning disabilities continue to be less skilled in developing those mature interpersonal relationships, one may assume that their ability to seek and access essential support relationships would also be reduced. In contrast, more socially skilled students may have less difficulty accessing and developing those critical social relationships.

Data from the findings of this study indicate that students with learning disabilities tend to develop more dependent and less mature relationships than peers without learning disabilities. Such narrowly focused relationships may be used to survive the critical situations they are exposed to during their educational experience, such as test preparation, but curtail their positive developmental progress. If academic success defined by passing grades and academic advancement is perceived as a higher priority than personal development, critical developmental tasks may be denied or avoided to achieve the more short term and tangible rewards of acceptable grade point average, test scores, and advancement to the next grade level. It is clear that for some students with learning disabilities to close the gap in achieving age appropriate, mature, interpersonal relationships, interventions and a broad base of support is essential (Mangrum & Strichart (1985). Current research in the area of college student development has demonstrated the value of mature interpersonal relationships in terms of life beyond the college campus (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). Therefore, facilitating these developmental experiences for students with learning disabilities may positively influence their overall development and post-college opportunities.

Nationwide there now appears to be such a strong focus on standardized test scores and academic performance to obtain admission to postsecondary settings, that the broader human component may often take a serious step back in terms of priority. If this is the case, students with learning disabilities appear to be maintaining successful academic records with some cost to maximizing their adult developmental opportunities. It is perhaps these developmental gaps that complicate career and interpersonal struggles later in life (Brown, 1982; Dalke, 1988; Polloway, Smith, and Patton, 1988; Silver, 1988). Students with learning disabilities, post-secondary disability service providers, and school administrators are encouraged to examine their measures

of student success. Grades alone may be an insufficient outcome index of academic readiness and assumed personal development. It may be this small difference in psychosocial development that negatively impacts the employment outcomes of students with learning disabilities after college.

Since students with learning disabilities are arriving at college and demonstrating measurable deficits in some aspects of psychosocial development, disability service personnel have an opportunity to facilitate and foster the developmental needs of these students. It is important for that professional audience to include the developmental needs of their students to increase their competitive position following graduation. Parents, students, disability service providers, faculty mentors, and administrators need to place a priority on both academic and interpersonal support.

Student disability service offices on university campuses at times appear to be an island in the sea of university priorities. They advocate for change and individual support for students with disabilities. Often they are the only resource where a student with a disability can truly feel safe and ask for help. It is, therefore, the responsibility of the post-secondary disability service providers to be aware of the developmental lag between some students with and without learning disabilities and when possible to increase the developmental tasks and experiences to foster competitive developmental standing during and after college graduation.

References

- American Council on Education (1996). *The American freshman : National norms for fall 1996*. University of California at Los Angeles, Higher Education Research Institute.
- Barbaro, F. (1982). The learning disabled college student: Some considerations in setting objectives. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 15*, 599-603.
- Brown, D. (1982). Rehabilitating the learning disabled adult. *American Rehabilitation, 7*, 230-251.
- Carroll, A., & Johnson Brown, C. E. (1996). Disability support services in higher education: An extension of the rehabilitation process. *Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling, 27* (3), 54-59.
- Chickering, A. (1969). *Education and identity*. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.
- Chickering, A., & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and identity, (2nd Ed)*. San Francisco: Josey Bass.
- Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1975). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cox, S. (1977). The learning disabled adult. *Academic Therapy, 13*, 79-86.
- Cronbach, L.J. (1970). *Essentials of psychological testing (3rd ed.)*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Dalke, C. (1988). Woodcock-Johnson psycho-educational test battery profiles: A comparative study of college freshman with and without learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21*(9), 567-590.
- Gall, M., D., Borg, W., R., & Gall, J., P. (1996). Correlational research designs. *Educational research: An introduction. (6thed.)* (pp. 409-462) New York: Longman.
- Garfield, N., J., & David, L., B. (1986). Arthur Chickering: Bridging theory and practice in student development. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 64*, 483-491.

- Gottesman, R., L. (1991). Prognosis: The adult with a learning disability. *Seminars in Neurology* 11(1), 64-74.
- Heist, P. & Yonge, G. (1968). *Omnibus personality inventory*. New York: Psychological Corporation.
- Henderson, C. (1992). *College freshman with disabilities: A statistical profile*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education, HEATH Resource Center. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 354792)
- Henderson, C. (1995). *College freshman with disabilities: A triennial statistical profile*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education, HEATH Resource Center. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 387971)
- Hood, A. B., & Mines, R.A. (1986). Freeing interpersonal relationships. In A.B. Hood (Ed.). *The Iowa Student Developmental Inventories* (pp. 5-1 5-12). Iowa City: Hitech Press.
- Hughes, C., A., & Osgood Smith, J. (1990). Cognitive academic performance of college students with learning disabilities: A synthesis of the literature. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 13,(1), 66-79.
- Jackson, L.M., & Hood, A.B. (1986). Iowa developing autonomy inventory. In A.B. Hood (Ed.), *The Iowa student development inventories* (pp. 3-1 - 3-8). Iowa City: Hitech Press.
- Mangrum, C., T., & Strichart, S., S. (1985). *Peterson's Guide to Colleges with Programs for Learning Disabled Students*. Princeton, N.J.: Peterson's Guides.
- National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities (NJCLD). (1988). [Letter to NJCLD member organizations], p. 1.
- Ness, U., & Price, L., A. (1990). Meeting the psychosocial needs of adolescents and adults with LD. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 26(1), 16-21.
- Olejnik, S. F. (1984). Planning educational research: Determining the necessary sample size. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 53, 40-48.
- Pascarella, E., T., & Terenzini, P., T., (1991). *How college affects students*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Polloway, E., A., Smith, J., D., Patton, J., R. (1988). Learning disabilities: An adult development perspective. *Learning Disabilities Quarterly*, 11, 265-272.
- Putnam, M., L. (1984). Postsecondary education for learning disabled students: A review of the literature. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 25, 68-75.
- Scott, S. (1996). Using collaboration to enhance services for college students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, 12,(1), 10-21.
- Silver, L., B. (1988). A review of the federal government's interagency committee on learning disabilities report to the U.S. Congress. *Learning Disabilities Focus*, 3, 73-80.
- Smith, J., O. (1988). Social and vocational problems of adults with learning disabilities: A review of the literature. *Learning Disabilities Research*, 3, 46-58.
- Super, D.E., Thompson, A.S., Lindeman, R.H., Jordaan, J.P., & Meyers, R.A. (1981). *The career development inventory* (College and University Form). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist Press.
- Thrasher, F., & Bloland, P. (1989). Student development studies: A review of published empirical research, 1973-1987. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 67, 547-554.
- White, D., B., & Hood, A., B. (1989). An assessment of the validity of Chickering's theory of student development. *Journal of College Student Development*, 30, 354-361.

Winston, R.B. (1990). The student developmental task and lifestyle inventory: An approach to measuring students' psychosocial development. *Journal of College Student Development*, 31, 108-120.

Winston, R.B., & Miller, T.K. (1987). *Student Developmental Task and Lifestyle Inventory Manual*. Athens, Georgia: Student Development Associates, Inc.

About the Authors

James J. Costello, Ph.D. is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Counselor Education and Rehabilitation Programs at Emporia State University in Emporia, Kansas. This article is a product of his doctoral dissertation and represents an initial inquiry into the psychosocial development of college students with disabilities.

R. William English, Ph.D. is a Professor in the Department of Human Services and Studies at the Florida State University. Dr. English has been a researcher, educator, key-note speaker, and advocate for people with severe disabilities. He served as the mentor and dissertation advisor within this research project.