Annotated Bibliography of Recent Research Related to Academic Advising

Almaraz, J., Bassett, J., & Sawyerr, O. (2010). Transitioning into a major: The effectiveness of an academic intervention course. *Journal of Education for Business, 35*, 343–48.

Almaraz, Bassett, and Sawyerr investigated the effectiveness of a college-concurrent preparation course aimed at encouraging management and human resources (MHR) majors at a large public institution to take advantage of professional development opportunities afforded them by their institution. The course was piloted in the 2005-2006 academic year and made a requirement for all incoming MHR majors starting with academic year 2007.

The authors described the design of the course as "both functional and introspective" (p. 344). Targeted functional outcomes included knowledge and understanding of policies and procedures related to the MHR curriculum, exploration and use of the campus career center, and appreciation and participation in cocurricular activities. Students enrolled in the course received information about academic policies and procedures in the MHR Department and the university. Leaders of various student clubs gave presentations to course enrollees, and students were required to spend an hour researching the offerings of the career center and to attend activities of their own choosing sponsored by the career center. As for the introspective or developmental perspective, students in the class were required to participate in career review activities designed to help them explore and articulate their competencies, including transferrable skills, and to formulate career development plans.

To assess the success of the course and possible mediating effects of college preparedness and first-generation status, the researchers used a pre- and post-course research design. The four-part instrument, administered at the beginning and end of the course, entailed a) a 12-question objective test to measure students' knowledge of the MHR curriculum; b) a 15-item section to survey students about their use of various career-center services and participation in center activities; c) a 10-item Likert assessment to gather students' views on the necessity of certain skills and competencies for employability followed by another Likert assessment to measure students' reported level of participation in cocurricular activities that could help them develop these skills; and d) a demographic survey that included information about students' gender, race-ethnicity, number of hours worked, parents' college attendance record, and students' self-assessment of their preparedness for college. The researchers employed paired-sample *t* tests to determine the significance of differences on pre- and post-measures.

The first hypothesis was that postassessment means would be higher for knowledge of the MHR curriculum, career center utilization, value attributed to cocurricular activities, and level of participation in cocurricular activities. This hypothesis was supported in part. Posttests showed a significant increase in knowledge of the MHR curriculum, greater utilization of the career center, and increased cocurricular participation by the end of the course. However, students did not appear to value cocurricular participation any more at the end of the course than they did at the beginning. The second hypothesis, which was confirmed, predicted that students' perceived level of preparedness would increase from pre- to post-test.

The third hypothesis had two parts. First, Almaraz et al. expected to find significant differences in participants' pre- and post-test scores on the three outcomes (knowledge of curriculum, utilization of the career center, and use and valuation of cocurricular activities) according to level of preparedness. They expected students who reported higher levels of preparedness to score higher on the outcomes measures (H3a). They hypothesized that first-generation students would have lower outcomes scores (H3b). H3a was partially supported. Even prior to the course, students who perceived themselves as more prepared reported engaging in more cocurricular activities. By contrast, they found no significant differences between more- and less-prepared students with respect to curricular knowledge, use of the career center, or value ascribed to cocurricular activities, although by the end of the course, more-prepared students appeared to value cocurricular activities to a somewhat greater degree than their less-prepared peers. As for college-generational status (H3b), even prior to the course, respondents whose parents attended college reported taking greater advantage of cocurricular activities than did first-generation students, but the authors found no significant differences between first-generation and other students on the pre- or post-outcome measures.

The authors concluded that the results confirmed the effectiveness of integrating college-concurrent courses into the major curriculum regardless of student-perceived preparedness and college-generational status. However, they observed that longitudinal research should be conducted to assess the effects of the course on graduation rates and persistence and that measures other than self-reported data are needed to expand on the results.

Babcock, R. D. (2011). Interpreted writing center tutorials with college-level deaf students. *Linguistics and Education, 22*(2), 95–117.

The number of deaf students attending mainstream universities is increasing. This population may use a writing tutoring center; however, research on writing tutoring practices, particularly concerning students with sensory and physical disabilities, is scant and often anecdotal. Using a mixed-method design involving 19 observations of tutoring sessions, 36 semistructured interviews, document analysis, and examination of the tutoring centers' layout at two midwestern colleges, Babcock addressed three multifaceted research questions involving the tutoring of deaf and nondeaf university students in writing (p. 98):

1. What is the content of the sessions between deaf tutees and hearing tutors, and does it differ from tutorials between hearing tutors and hearing students?
2. What are the specific tutoring activities? What are the participants' roles and behaviors? What are the tutoring techniques?
3. What other factors are involved?

Participants ($n = 16$) included three deaf tutees, three hearing tutees, three hearing tutors, three interpreters, and four administrators. Demographic information on participants' age, gender, race, educational background, and auditory status can be found in two tables (p. 99). Academic major of the tutors and tutees and the positions and institutions of the administrators were also provided. Additional demographic details included the language used in the tutoring sessions (standard English, nonstandard English, contact sign comprised of a mixture of America Sign Languagae and English, or English signing), the courses for which each tutee sought writing help (literature, history, freshman writing, acting, and biology), and the types of writing assignments or skills (literature paper, essay questions, study skills, essays, presentations, summarizing, and paraphrasing) with which tutees received assistance.

Tutors and tutees met weekly for standing tutoring sessions. The researcher observed two to five sessions with each of the six tutees. All of the tutoring sessions were video recorded and transcribed verbatim with the exception of sessions with one of the tutees who preferred instead to be audio recorded. Interviews with key stakeholders were conducted soon after each tutoring session so that the researcher could expand on any "questionable or confusing" aspects of the sessions. Interviews with hearing participants were audio taped and transcribed. Interviews with deaf participants were audio or video recorded and transcribed depending on participants' preferences. Each participant was interviewed at least once and follow-up interviews were conducted by e-mail, phone, or post. Document analysis included looking at tutor preparation materials, writing center publicity, tutor log entries, discarded written notes used in tutoring sessions, and the texts on which tutors and tutees worked.

Babcock's first research question concerned content of tutoring sessions. Overall, content in hearing/deaf and hearing/hearing tutoring sessions was similar: Most of the appointment centered around the tutees' own writing. All tutees addressed what the author called "lower-order" or "local" concerns such as grammar, spelling, and punctuation, although for two of the hearing tutees these were of minor concern. Deaf tutees worked on mechanical correctness extensively as did the one hearing speaker of nonstandard English.

The attention given to reading comprehension of source material and course textbooks was more pronounced in sessions with deaf tutees. Even though reading comprehension is not a typical focus of writing tutorials, deaf tutees in this study sometimes struggled with vocabulary in their class materials and had difficulty paraphrasing information into their own words. Upon looking up unknown words in the dictionary, they often encountered more unfamiliar words in the definitions. Only one hearing tutee required assistance with reading, which may have been a result of both the course for which she sought help, literature, and the fact that she had a learning disability. In this case, however, the tutee had less trouble with comprehension and paraphrasing than she did with finding evidence in the source texts to support her arguments.

As for the second research question dealing with tutoring activities, roles and behaviors of the participants, and tutoring techniques, the key issues that emerge included negotiation of the session focus, directiveness, and making corrections. Tutors and

tutees exhibited different styles in determining the session focus. Two hearing tutees took a tacit approach, assuming without discussion that they would deal with the drafts they were writing. Two others, one hearing and one deaf, waited for the tutor to inquire about the agenda. While none of the hearing participants made their priorities known explicitly, two deaf participants did so, which Babcock noted could reflect the value that Deaf culture often places on direct communication styles.

Some believe that tutors should not tell tutees what to do but should instead use questions to guide tutees to their own answers and solutions. With deaf and hearing tutees in this study, tutors were directive when dealing with issues of form, particularly organization and mechanics, but "maintained the writing center orthodoxy of not taking over the content of the writing and not adding their own materials and opinions" (p. 111). While both techniques were effective at times, nondirectiveness proved to be a source of frustration for some tutees, resulting in a game of "guess what the tutor knows" (p. 105) or in the tutees' misunderstanding tutors' communicative intentions. The directiveness-nondirectiveness dichotomy is widely debated in the literature with some maintaining that nondirectiveness may be inappropriate with English-as-a-second-language students and students with learning disabilities. It may also be inappropriate at times with deaf tutees.

Babcock concluded from her observations that a balance of directive versus nondirective techniques is needed. Tutors should adapt to their tutees' learning styles and background. One of the deaf tutees, for instance, valued her tutor's honesty in pointing out weak areas and the clear feedback she received. The direct feedback, which violated conventional practice, enabled this tutee to recognize her struggles with selecting the correct tense, which she subsequently monitored in her writing. Deaf students, like nonnative speakers and students who speak nonstandard varieties of English, may be unfamiliar with conventions of academic discourse. Nondirectiveness, the author observed, can result in the withholding of linguistic and cultural information students need for successful academic writing.

Writing experts commonly advocate reading aloud to detect errors in one's writing on the belief that writers will hear errors that they do not see on the page when reading silently. In the sessions with deaf students, tutors emphasized rules of grammar over what "sounds right." However, in one instance a tutor said, "I'm gonna read [aloud]. You tell me how it sounds. OK?" which confused the interpreter who understood the directive literally, believing that the tutor had forgotten that deaf students do not know what English sounds like. Another tutor asked a deaf tutee, "How would these sound if you took these 'ands' out and made two independent sentences?" It was not clear to the researcher whether the tutee's response of "I don't know" was literal (i.e., that she could not know how it would sound) or whether the tutee failed to understand the tutor's true communicative intent—a polite directive to remove the word *and*. In any case, the terms related to sound or hearing must be used carefully with deaf tutees.

Tutors sometimes read tutees' texts aloud to themselves quietly to facilitate their own comprehension. Interpreters sometimes transliterated or signed as the tutor read and other times directed the tutee to follow along. These procedures, Babcock advised, must be negotiated between tutors, tutees, and interpreters as tutees expressed different preferences. Notable, however, is that while tutees sometimes used sign language to read their own writings, none of them voiced their reading aloud. One hearing speaker of nonstandard English commented that although his paper sounded fine he detected errors upon looking at the page, calling the read-aloud practice into question not only for deaf tutees but for some hearing students as well.

In a third research question, Babcock asked about other factors, in addition to session content and activities, that should be considered in tutoring writing to deaf tutees. Salient factors emerging from the study included learning styles and characteristics of the participants; position of the interpreter, tutor, and tutee; culture; and displays of affect.

Concerning learning style, two of the deaf tutees preferred learning through oral explanations interpreted into manual language while a third preferred to learn by reading. One of the former expressed a desire to read more, improve her vocabulary, and better comprehend the written word, while the other who most preferred oral explanations said she preferred to read books with visual images or texts that could evoke mental pictures.

As can be expected, some special communication issues arose in tutoring sessions with deaf tutees. For instance, disambiguating between tutees' and interpreters' word choice proved difficult. To improve clarity, the tutee would finger spell his or her own word choice rather than leave it up to the interpreter to come up with a sign to represent English concepts. One tutee, in fact, concerned

with precise word choice, finger spelled fairly often to ensure that her words were communicated and selected for the writing.

Deaf tutees indicated different preferences with respect to seating arrangements. One deaf tutee sat next to her tutor, the paper between them, and the interpreter on the opposite of a table facing them both; the second preferred sitting across the table from both her tutor and her interpreter; the third sat at a computer desk next to her tutor with the interpreter facing them, but not directly opposite. The tutor-tutee pair that used the computer did so in all three sessions, sometimes working together and bypassing the interpreter. Based on the variation observed, Babcock recommended accommodating tutees' preferences rather than prescribing a single seating arrangement.

Cultural issues manifested themselves saliently in an extended exchange in which a tutor asked a deaf tutee to explain what she meant when she wrote that Janet Jackson "culled from one album seven top-five singles." Apparently the tutee had borrowed an idea from a source text without having fully processed its meaning. Babcock argued that the frustrating exchange, which went on for several turns, resulted from the tutee's misunderstanding of "top-five singles." The tutee identified Janet Jackson as an actor, dancer, and hard worker but not as a singer because listening to albums was not part of her "deaf reality." Tutors should be attuned to comprehension difficulties arising from cultural differences and serve as cultural informants. Furthermore, Babcock suggested that tutors working with deaf tutees acquire some knowledge of Deaf language and culture. Interpreters might facilitate this process.

Babcock was interested in comparing displays of affect in tutoring sessions with deaf and hearing tutees, but she observed too few repetitions of the same type of display to make generalizations, with affect displays being especially rare among male participants. Of the tutees who used the most displays of affect, one hearing and one deaf, both were female and both happened to work with an older female tutor. Nevertheless, verbal and nonverbal displays of positive, mixed, and negative affect where exhibited on occasion. For instance, at the end of the final tutoring session for a term, one tutee told her tutor that she would miss her and another expressed strong gratitude to her tutor for providing her with a number of handouts. Examples of negative affect displayed on the part of tutees included defensiveness for padding an essay by one: "I need to have six pages. I was just trying to add what I could" and "I got a B" by another who reacted to a tutor's suggestion that the tutee not use words with meanings she did not know. Tutees expressed their impatience or displeasure by fidgeting in one case, eye rolling in another, and pointed looks of displeasure and annoyance. At one point, a tutor removed her glasses and sighed in frustration.

Babcock's goal in conducting the study was to raise awareness about "providing quality tutoring services to all who come into the writing center, beginning with a study of deafness and how it interacts with common tutoring practices" (p. 98). Overall, she found the sessions with deaf versus hearing tutees to be similar with the most notable differences being the presence of an interpreter and variations in session content, such as the emphasis by the deaf on lower order concerns and reading comprehension. The most salient issues concerning practice and activities involved directness and the ineffectiveness of the read-aloud technique for deaf tutees.

Throughout the presentation of results, discussion, and conclusion, Babcock drew attention to individual characteristics of each tutee and their unique needs and preferences, advocating against a one-size-fits-all approach for deaf and hearing tutees alike, but in particular for those within the Deaf culture.

Barker, M. J. (2011). Racial context, currency and connections: Black doctoral student and White advisor perspectives on cross-race advising. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 48*(4), 387–400.

Barker examined the role that race plays in advising relationships of Black doctoral students and their White advisors. Only 1.0% of individuals over the age of 18 years in the United States possess a doctoral degree, and of these 1.0%, only 3.5% are Black. Therefore, a Black student will likely work with a White advisor. Barker discussed implications for doctoral student persistence.

The student-advisor relationship is a central part of the doctoral-level education process (Gardner, 2007; Green & Macauley, 2007). Over the years, graduate programs have become more diverse (Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation, 2005), and previous research has examined aspects of the cross-race advising relationships in doctoral programs (Gasman, Gerstl-Pepin, Anderson-Thompkins, Rasheed, & Hathaway, 2004); however, the dual perspectives of the Black doctoral students and their White advisors have yet to be thoroughly explored.

The experiences of Black students differ quite drastically from that of other minority and White students (Allen et al., 2003), and those of Black doctoral students are no exception (Anderson-Thompkins, Gasman, Gerstl-Pepin, Hathaway, & Rasheed, 2004; Gasman et al., 2004; Holland, 1993; Jones, 2000; Mabokela & Green, 2000; Milner, 2004; Nettles, 1990; Rogers & Molina, 2006; Willie, Grady, & Hope, 1991; Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation, 2005). Black doctoral students in predominantly White institutions (PWI) often feel isolated, undervalued, academically vulnerable, and socially alienated. As a result, Black doctoral students often believe that they must overperform to prove themselves or they perceive their own work quality as inferior to that of their White counterparts (Bonilla, Pickron, & Tatum, 1994; Milner, 2004; Robinson, 1999).

White faculty members may not understand the unique experiences of their Black doctoral students and may have limited experience working with diverse populations. In addition, faculty members more likely select protégés similar to themselves (Thomas, Willis, & Davis, 2007), and in a cross-race setting, they may display cultural anxiety, which may inhibit them from providing feedback to their Black students.

For the purposes of this study, Barker examined the relationships of Black doctoral students and their White advisors at an American PWI in the South by posing the question: "How does race impact the advising relationship between Black doctoral student protégés and their White faculty advisor?" Using a qualitative phenomenological method (Patton, 2002), seven pairs of Black doctoral students and White faculty advisors were interviewed for 60 to 90 minutes via a standard open-ended protocol. The doctoral students had completed at least 2 years of course work. Barker used the following three methods in the analysis: Boeije's (2002) constant comparative method for dual pairs and phenomenological method; Moustakas's (1994) phenomenological reduction and bracketing to establish themes and triangulate data within and between groups and pairs; and Milner's (2004) framework of researcher racial and cultural positionality.

Three themes emerged in the data analysis.

1. For approximately one half of the students and faculty, the racial context, characterized by the racial history of the South, evoked emotion and molded the way they perceived American society, policies, and geographic regions. Both the faculty advisors and students made comparisons between the South and the non-South. Those not from the South thought that the South is more racist than did those who were raised in the South. To facilitate positive cross-race interactions, Barker recommended that faculty advisors and students have a shared understanding of the racial and cultural history as a means to promote positive cross-race interactions (per Goto, 1997).
2. Differences in the social value attributed to race, or race as currency, also emerged. Race can be categorized as leverage or as liability, and the way it is perceived may result in different views. In this study, the Black doctoral students identified their race as only a liability:

   > For most of the students, being Black meant preparing to operate in a predominantly White context, managing negative experiences, being a salient object among students and faculty, and feeling the need to outperform their White peers. Experiencing racism and having to prove oneself echoed through the experiences of the doctoral students. (p. 393)

   In contrast, White faculty members viewed being Black as having both leverage and liability. Some believed minority status serves as an asset in terms of applying for doctoral fellowships or advancing through faculty ranks. Being unable to also see the ways in which race was a liability for their doctoral student may be the result of "operating through a privileged lens" (p. 393) or being part of an environment in which interest convergence prevails (Harper, Patton, & Wooden, 2009; Landson-Billings & Tate, 1995). Interest convergence is characterized by situations in which diversity is valued only because it is rewarded and not because it is believed to exemplify desired attitudes. These findings indicate the need to increase faculty awareness of race-based experiences and to increase its understanding of the pressures faced by Black doctoral students.
3. A final construct that emerged refers to the importance of Black doctoral students establishing same-race connections. Whether with an advisor, mentor, or fellow student, Black

doctoral students need connections with others who have experienced graduate school as a Black student. The students indicated that same-race connections were very important in validating their experiences in a PWI. In addition, these students believed that their advisor needed to be sensitive to their needs and to understand the unique experiences of the Black doctoral student.

The results of this study indicate that race is an important element of the advising relationship between a Black doctoral student and White faculty advisor. Barker concludes that more professional development is needed to promote faculty use of cultural awareness advising principles. Advisors must also understand the implications of racial history and context on the advising relationship.

Brucato, B., & Neimeyer, G. J. (2011). Effectiveness of an online graduate preparation program. *Teaching of Psychology, 38*(3), 166–72.

An increasing number of undergraduate and graduate students have applied to psychology programs over the past 20 years, but the field has experienced a strikingly smaller increase in the number of psychology professors. The increased demand on current psychology faculty leaves many students navigating the graduate application process with little direction. A number of initiatives assist these students, including Internet resources, informational meetings, and undergraduate courses on careers and graduate school preparation. However, the efficiency of these programs has not been thoroughly examined.

Brucato and Neimeyer examined the effectiveness of The Virtual Advisor: Successful Strategies for Getting into Graduate School in Psychology, an online virtual advising program that was designed to assist students in the different aspects of preparing for and applying to psychology graduate programs. The Virtual Advisor consists of five modules of tools needed for successful preparation for graduate school: Exploring Careers in Psychology, Preparing for Careers in Psychology, Applying to Graduate Schools in Psychology, Interviewing for Graduate Schools in Psychology, and Putting It All Together. The authors compared the outcomes of those who completed the program to those using more conventional methods of graduate school preparation.

The researchers recruited participants for this study through chapters of Psi Chi, an international honor society for academically successful psychology majors. Following the pretest questionnaire, each student was randomly assigned to one of three groups: virtual advising, web site preparation, or control. The virtual advising group was provided with The Virtual Advisor immediately. Participants in the web site preparation group were told they would be given access to The Virtual Advisor in 3 weeks and directed to an informative web site with organized sets of links regarding different fields and careers in psychology and graduate school preparation. The control group was given access to The Virtual Advisor in 3 weeks and not provided with any additional resources. The participants in the virtual advisor and web site preparation groups were told to spend 2 to 3 hours per week over the subsequent 3 weeks utilizing the resource they were given. Following the 3-week period of the study, the researchers asked all participants to complete the posttest questionnaires. The pre- and post-test measures included the *Grad Prep Quiz* (Neimeyer, 2003), a 25-item self-report measure used to assess respondent knowledge of graduate school preparation, and the *Psychology Majors Career Information Survey* (PMCIS) (Thomas & McDaniel, 2004), a 6-item assessment of knowledge of psychology careers. The pre- and post-measures also included the *Psychology Majors Career Information Quiz* (PMCIQ) (Thomas & McDaniel, 2004), a 15-item measure of career-related knowledge and myths about psychology careers, and the *Career Decision Self-efficacy Scale–Short Form* (CDSES-SF) (Betz, Klein, & Taylor, 1996), a 25-item measure yielding five subscores on accurate self-appraisal, gathering occupational information, goal selection, making plans for the future, and problem solving. Lastly, participants were asked to complete a self-evaluation and demographic questionnaire.

Overall, 535 students were recruited for the study. After volunteer attrition, 130 were in the control group, 113 in the web site group, and 86 in the virtual advising group. Of those participating, 87.5% were female and the average age was 22 years. Ethnicity distribution closely resembled national averages. Most of the participants were seniors, followed by juniors, sophomores, and freshmen. The average GPA of participants was 3.49. Of those who participated in the study, 37.9% reported being in the process of applying to graduate school. Of the remaining respondents, 87.0% indicated intent to apply in the future.

A mixed factorial, repeated measures MANOVA revealed significant main effects for time (pretest vs. posttest) and measure. Main effects were qualified by significant interactions of time by group,

time by measure, and measure by group, which were additionally qualified by a significant three-way interaction of time by measure by group. To explore the time (pretest vs. posttest) by group interaction, the researchers conducted follow-up univariate analyses of variance (ANOVAs). They measured graduate preparation self-efficacy using differences on pre- and post-tests of a *Grad Prep Quiz* efficacy subscale and the PMCIS. A repeated measures ANOVA on the *Grad Prep Quiz* self-efficacy measure revealed a significant main effect for time, $F(1,305) = 444.48$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .593$, and group, $F(92,305) = 13.74$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .083$. Qualifying these results was a significant interaction between time by group, $F(92,305) = 48.41$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .241$. Bonferroni-adjusted post hoc tests indicated that the groups were equivalent on graduate preparation self-efficacy at the time of pretest, but on the posttest, the virtual advisor group scored significantly higher ($M = 36.20$) ($p < .001$) on graduation preparation self-efficacy than both the web site ($M = 32.50$) and the control ($M = 26.76$) groups, while the web site group scored significantly higher than the control group ($p < .001$). One-tailed paired *t* tests indicated a significant change on the pre- and post-tests for the virtual advisor, $t(64) = -11.99$, $p < .001$, and the web site, $t(112) = -12.45$, $p \leq .001$, groups but not the control group. Results from the PMCIS were similar.

In regard to graduate preparation knowledge, the authors conducted a repeated measures ANOVA on the PMCIQ results and found no significant main effects for group or pre- and post-tests. However, the significant effect found for the interaction of time by group shows that participants scored significantly higher on the measure of graduate preparation knowledge after completing the Virtual Advisor: $F(2, 305) = 3.62$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .023$. Bonferroni-adjusted post hoc tests revealed all three groups were equivalent on the pretest. Because post hoc tests were inconclusive, a one-tailed paired *t* test was used to investigate whether the virtual advisor group had a significant increase in PMCIQ scores after completing the Virtual Advisor. The results were significant for this group, $t(64) = -1.85$, $p < .05$) but not for the other groups.

To look at career decision self-efficacy, the authors conducted another repeated-measures ANOVA on the CDSES-SF, which revealed a significant main effect for time, $F(1, 305) = 27.56$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .083$, but not for group, $F(2, 305) = 0.89$, $p = .413$, $\eta^2 = .006$. These effects were qualified by a significant interaction for time by group, $F(2, 305) = 9.63$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .059$. Bonferroni-adjusted post hoc tests indicated that all three groups were equivalent on the pretest, but on the posttest, the virtual advisor ($M = 103.43$) and the web site ($M = 102.61$) groups both scored significantly higher ($p < .05$) than the control group ($M = 97.42$). The virtual advisor and the web site groups were not significantly different. One-tailed paired *t* tests confirmed a significant improvement in pre- and post-test scores for the virtual advisor, $t(64) = -3.48$, $p < .001$, and the web site, $t(112) = -5.71$, $p < .001$, groups but not for the control group.

The results support the contention that The Virtual Advisor is an effective program for increasing graduate school preparation and decision-making self-efficacy as well as career knowledge among psychology students. Participants in the web site group experienced similar increases in self-efficacy, but not in career knowledge. Participants in the control group did not experience increases in either efficacy or knowledge.

The study suggests value in use of virtual advising programs, but the small effect size indicates that gains in graduate preparation self-efficacy and graduate preparation knowledge through virtual advising did not generally surpass, in any major way, gains from employment of web sites. Those in both the virtual advising and web site groups experienced increases in measurement scores indicating that a number of different resources may help undergraduates by supplementing their knowledge and sense of self-efficacy.

The authors cite a number of limitations. They used only self-report measures of self-efficacy and knowledge. While students indicated feeling more prepared, the authors did not employ direct measures of graduate readiness. Also, this study was characterized by high participant attrition especially in the virtual advising and web site groups. Such reductions in participation may provide insight into the amount of time students are willing to dedicate in preparing with these resources within a specific amount of time. If web sites and virtual advisor tools are implemented, undergraduates may be unwilling to use them to achieve maximum effect. Finally, the authors recruited participants from Psi Chi honors chapters and so generalizability of results to all college students may be limited.

Nevertheless, the current study provides encouragement for the employment of virtual advising programs to help students without access to face-to-face resources and to alleviate faculty burden. By examining the effects of unconventional methods of preparation, stakeholders may supplement existing methods of mentoring and advising to ben-

efit both students and overloaded faculty members.

Corts, D. P., & Stoner, A. (2011). The college motives scale: Classifying motives for entering college. *Education, 131*(4), 775–81.

In Study 1 of this article, the authors introduce the *College Motivation Scale* (CMS) (Corts & Stoner, 2011) designed to assess an individual's motives for seeking a college education. The study measures five influences that relate to pursing a college degree: career and financial, social opportunity, intellectual, self-discovery, and norms and obligations. In Study 2, the authors explore these five factors as they relate to choice of major, learning versus grade orientation, and type of institution.

Past research suggests that six general motivations inspire students to enroll in college: career interests, financial security, norms and family expectations, intellectual curiosity, social opportunities, and self-discovery (Boatwright, Ching, & Parr, 1992; Croake, Keller, & Caitlin, 1973; Waugh, 2002). However, no psychometrically strong instrument has been published that measures these factors. Previous questionnaires measured each factor as a single item as a means to determine the strength of each as a motivator or they focused extensively on only one motivation. Corts and Stoner formulated a measure to reliably measure students' motivations for enrolling in college. Such a measure could assist those in higher education in understanding retention, success, and social phenomena of college students and help researchers examine the differences in motivation between sexes, races, and other demographic factors.

In Study 1, based on an online survey, 406 undergraduates participated (76% female; 24% male). Students were asked to list three to five reasons they decided to go to college. By grouping these responses, the researchers arrived at a response categorization structure similar to that of prior research: career requirements, financial security, social opportunities, intellectual curiosity, self-discovery, and normative/expectation. They then used 10 items in a Likert scale: 1-5 (*strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*).

Corts and Stoner conducted factor analysis with varimax rotation to reduce the number of items in the scale. Results revealed five primary factors: social, intellectual curiosity, career/financial, self-discovery, and expectations/obligation. The resulting scale was reduced so that no factor was associated with more than five items and a factor loading of less than .4. Internal consistency α coefficients were acceptable, ranging from .88 (social) to .72 (normative/expectation).

In Study 2, Corts and Stoner examined the five factors of the CMS as they relate to field of study, grade versus learning orientation, and type of institution attended. They expected to find that intellectual curiosity is associated with learning orientation while career/financial is associated with grade orientation. For this study, a total of 119 students from four types of institutions (community college, liberal arts college or university, master's-level institution, and research university) completed the CMS and the LOGO measure of learning or grade orientation (Eison, 1981). The authors also collected information regarding major, age, and type of institution.

A series of analyses of variance (ANOVAs) revealed three significant differences in regard to field of study: a) business majors scored higher on the career/financial factor than social science, humanities, and biological science majors; b) humanities and social science majors scored higher on the self-discovery factor than did preprofessional and business majors; c) humanities, physical, and social science majors scored higher on the intellectual factor than business majors. Additionally, students attending liberal arts colleges ranked higher on self-discovery than those at research universities or community colleges. Correlational analyses revealed that those scoring high in the career/financial factor also scored high in grade orientation, but not learning orientation. Furthermore, students scoring high in the intellectual factor scored higher in learning orientation, but not grade orientation. These findings suggest that business majors attend college for the sake of gaining a high-paying job and focus mainly on grades. Conversely, humanities and social science majors attend college for self-discovery and focus more on learning.

Motivation for attending college relates to important student outcomes such as retention (Coll & Stewart, 2008). The CMS could be used as a measure in future research related to retention and student success. The authors also suggest that future research could utilize the CMS to investigate the extent to which social motivation might influence academic outcomes.

Eells, G. T., & Rockland-Miller, H.S. (2011). Assessing and responding to disturbed and disturbing students: Understanding the role of administrative teams in institutions of higher education. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 25*(1), 8–23.

Institutions of higher education (IHEs) are giving increased attention to developing prevention, assessment, and response plans for dealing with safety issues such as campus violence and suicide ideation. The plans necessitate protecting the rights and privacy of the individual students involved while legally and ethically ensuring the safety of the wider campus community. In response to campus safety concerns, numerous universities have formed campus assessment teams variously called "campus assessment (team)," "student behavior consultation team," "alert team," and "college concerns team" (see p. 12 for other common names). Yet, these teams differ in terms of structure and membership, mission, operating procedures, and documentation practices. Eells and Rockland-Miller first discussed legal considerations for developing and using assessment teams. Then they provided an overview of different approaches that have been taken to date and highlighted questions and decisions university leadership must make with respect to an assessment team. A case vignette follows and the article concludes with recommendations for implementation of an assessment team.

With respect to legal and ethical concerns related to the prevention, assessment, and response to campus safety issues, Eells and Rockland-Miller cautioned against universal policies that may overstep legal and ethical boundaries such as automatic dismissal of students exhibiting disturbing behaviors. They emphasized the need for case-by-case assessments and corresponding actions. They refer the reader to rulings and guidance offered by the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) (as described by Pearthree, 2005). Per the OCR, assessments about a student as a possible safety threat to the university community must be individualized and administered using current medical knowledge and objective evidence (Pearthree, 2005). Universities must recognize the difference between a "significant risk" with a "high probability of substantial harm" versus "speculative, or remote risk." In addition to considering OCR recommendations, IHE policymakers must understand disability law, legislation related to privacy and confidentiality such as the Family Educational Right to Privacy Act and Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, and their legal liability in cases of student suicide and student violence leading to harm or death of other members of the university community.

University personnel must consider a number of factors in developing their administrative team, including the entity's name, which is key for communicating the team's purpose to the campus community. Following Dickerson (2010), Eells and Rockland-Miller recommended choosing an accurate, noninflammatory, and nonstigmatizing name. Specifically, they suggest that the phrase "threat assessment" not be included in a team name both due to its negative connotation and to the fact that this term refers to a well-defined process that the university team may or may not practice.

As for mission and purpose, three somewhat overlapping, but distinct, trends predominate. The first provides a mechanism for university administrators to assess behaviors and provide support to disturbed students; the second emphasizes crisis management; and the third addresses behavioral intervention as well as threat assessment. Eells and Rockland-Miller described two behavioral intervention models that have influenced the mission and purpose of campus assessment teams: the assessment-intervention of student problems (AISP) model (Delworth, 1989) and the college and university behavioral intervention team (CUBIT) model advocated by the National Behavioral Intervention Team Association (NaBITA).

The differences in the two models' orientation, in Eell and Rockland-Miller's estimation, highlight the competing tensions between attending to individual student's rights and supporting students of concern (AISP model) and assuring the safety of the entire university community (CUBIT/NaBITA model). The diagnostic labels *disturbing*, referring to students who violate the university's code of conduct but who have no apparent mental health conditions, *disturbed*, referring to students with mental health concerns who do not violate the institution's code of conduct, and *disturbing* and *disturbed*, describing those students who both have mental health issues and who violate the campus code of conduct emerged in the AISP Model. The development of the assessment team, its processes for directing students to resources, and specific interventions for "students of concern" (p. 13) characterizes the AISP model. Later updates to this model (Dunkle, Silverstein, & Warner, 2008) address policies governing team operations such as selecting members, educating the campus with respect to identifying and reporting problems, tracking trends, and evaluating the team. The CUBIT/NaBITA model is more oriented toward threat assessment, safety prevention, and training the entire university community to be prepared than toward interventions with troubled students. Some aims include, for example, "fostering a comprehensive reporting culture within the institution" and

"integrating campus risk management programs and risk mitigation strategies" (p. 14).

IHE leadership must determine the responsibilities of its assessment team including how often it meets, how it will communicate its mission to the university community at large, and how it will direct the gathering of information and management of cases. Responsibilities also include providing training for academic and student support personnel, identifying policy, and documenting observations and interventions with students of concern.

Institution administrations must give further consideration to team membership, which will depend, in part, on the team's mission and the nature and size of the institution and student population. However, a survey by Keehan (2009) revealed some patterns: 100% of the IHEs surveyed had a representative from the university's judicial board/student conduct office; 93% included a counseling service representative on their team; 87% included a campus safety and a student affairs representative; 67% included a residence life and a health services representative; and a little more than 25% included a representative from academic affairs.

Procedures for case review and documentation, such as mission and team membership, vary. In response to a report, team members from various units monitor and most often gather data on the students of concern prior to meeting. During the meeting, they discuss information and develop an action plan. They typically document the process using either homegrown or predesigned software packages; two mentioned by the authors are StarRES and Maxient (p. 17). Typically, they document date of discussion, student identifying information, reason for concern, units involved, interventions considered and implemented, and follow-up responses, but opinions vary about whether the team's deliberations and actions should be documented.

Eells and Rockland-Miller identified a number of disposition and referral options, but emphasized that they be employed according to the specifics of a particular situation. The least intrusive action involves simply monitoring the situation. In other cases, the student may be referred to one or more support services for assistance in resolving the problem. Plans of action may involve faculty members, student affairs personnel, academic advisors, the ombudsperson, and judicial affairs and residence life representatives, among others. In some situations, the assessment team may involve the student's family, but the authors caution that this can have a negative impact if the student comes from a family with a history of disruption or abuse. At the same time, families can be of invaluable support to the student. Sometimes a temporary separation through a health or personal leave may be recommended for the student, or if a serious threat has been raised, the student may be barred from campus.

The final topics the authors discussed before presenting the case vignette and recommendations are communications with the campus and threat assessment. Per the authors, the assessment team should be responsible for educating the campus community about its purpose and effective referral methods to the team. However, the authors advocated for "developing messages to create a caring and supportive culture rather than one that focuses on reporting per se" (p. 19). They advocated raising awareness of student mental health issues and communicating that every member (students, faculty members, staff, administrators) of the institution bears responsibility to notice and respond to problems.

Eells and Rockland-Miller noted that some institutions include threat assessment as part of the assessment team's responsibilities, while others leave that to law enforcement. They observe that teams that involve themselves with threat assessment should include the campus police in the process.

The case vignette tells the story of John Doe, who was investigated following some harassment complaints. When campus police interviewed him, John became agitated and appeared incoherent. After a mental health examination, he was hospitalized. Initially, John's mother was angry about the university's intervention and attributed the difficulties to cultural differences. Upon discussion, the assessment team uncovered more incidents in different campus settings including events that had previously gone unreported. Finally, the university representative was able to convince the mother about the nature of John's problem, and John was eventually diagnosed and treated for a major mood disorder. The vignette highlights the importance of reporting and supporting disturbed and disturbing students as a campus-wide and, in this case, also a familial effort. Without a team in place the student's behaviors may have continued to be viewed as isolated cases and the student might not have received support and treatment, possibly compounding the negative consequences of John's future behavior.

The authors provided 16 specific recommenda-

tions (p. 21), many of which, such as identifying team members, developing a mission, communicating with the campus at large, they had embedded in the preceding discussion of team development. Other recommendations, discussed in less detail, include studying different team models and selecting one most appropriate for a specific institution and attending team dynamics at typical stages in group development.

Hibbard, D. R., & Davies, K. L. (2011). Perfectionism and psychological adjustment among college students: Does educational context matter? *North American Journal of Psychology, 13*(2), 187–200.

Perfectionism or "striving for flawlessness" (Flett & Hewitt, 2002, p. 5) among college students has not been investigated thoroughly. Hibbard and Davies suggested that a better understanding of how perfectionism affects college students can help parents, teachers, counselors, and other higher educational professionals assist students with adjustment issues associated with perfectionism. To compare degrees of perfectionism and resulting adjustment patterns across two different institutional contexts, the authors administered a series of batteries to 125 students from a selective private university and to 106 students from a large public institution. Specifically, they hypothesized that students attending the private university would exhibit greater degrees of perfectionism than those attending the public university and that at both institutions perfectionism would be associated with maladaptive adjustment such as excessive concerns about making mistakes. Although making no specific predictions, the researchers also expressed interest in exploring whether institutional context interacted with psychological factors to result in social outcomes of perfectionism such as low self-esteem or loneliness.

The questionnaire administered in this study consisted of a demographic section and five batteries measuring, in order, self-esteem (*Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale*) (Rosenberg, 1965); perfectionism (*Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale*) (Frost, Marten, Lahart, & Rosenblate, 1990); depression (*Beck Depression Inventory*) (Beck, Ward, Mendelson, Mock, & Erbaugh, 1961); eating disorders (*Eating Attitudes Test*) (Garner & Garfinkel, 1979); and loneliness (*UCLA Loneliness Scale*) (Russell, Peplau, & Cutrona, 1980). Reliability indicators and sample questions for each scale are provided in the methodology section.

The hypothesis that students at the private institution would manifest greater degrees of perfectionism was supported only on some dimensions of perfectionism. Students at the private institution showed higher levels of concern over mistakes and set higher personal standards than their counterparts at the public institution. These differences were statistically significant. Students at the private institution likewise reported higher levels of parental expectations and doubts about their own actions, but these differences were not statistically significant. On the dimensions of parental criticism and organization (i.e., organization rated as important), by contrast, students at the public institution had higher (but not statistically different) means than the participants at the private school.

The second hypothesis, that patterns of relationships between the dimensions of perfectionism and the psychological outcomes of low self-esteem, depression, loneliness, and eating disorders would be similar across institution types, was generally supported. For example, among students in both settings, concerns about mistakes, parental criticism, and doubts about actions were moderately associated with self-esteem, depression, and eating disorders. However, results were more varied for the outcome of loneliness, with positive correlations between concern over mistakes and parental criticism with loneliness showing significance only in the public setting while doubts about actions were positively correlated with loneliness at both types of institutions.

Although no specific predications were made about the interaction effect, the authors tested whether university type and perfectionism interact to influence the degree to which students experience social adjustment outcomes. Institution type and perfectionism showed an interaction effect only on the variable of loneliness. Students with high degrees of perfectionism at the public institution were significantly lonelier than students at the same institution with low degrees of perfectionism. This same effect was not evident at the private institution.

In their discussion, Hibbard and Davies questioned why students at the private institution showed higher levels of perfectionism than their public-institution peers on the dimensions of concern for making mistakes, doubts about actions, and higher personal expectations or standards but not on the other dimensions. They speculated that students who chose to attend the private college always had high personal expectations and that this influenced their choice of institution. The academic rigor and comparisons to high achieving peers may have heightened private-institution students' preoc-

cupation with mistakes and led to self-doubt about their abilities or actions. The authors cautioned, however, that the study did not measure causal relationships and that longitudinal studies were needed to assess whether the academic setting increases maladaptive reactions to perfectionism.

The second major finding, that patterns of association between certain dimensions of perfectionism and maladaptive adjustment were similar among students at both institutions, suggested to the authors that similar interventions might be applicable across institution type. However, the authors acknowledged that the finding is exploratory and in need of replication. Students with perfectionistic tendencies at public institutions may experience more loneliness than their contemporaries at private universities presenting, in this case, a need for contextualized intervention.

Some limitations noted by the authors included the potential nonrepresentativeness of the samples, which consisted mostly of Caucasian/White participants at both institutions with females outnumbering males in both settings. Furthermore, the institutions were not typical representations of the institution types under study. Additionally, while the authors tested for relationships of the different academic settings with dimensions of perfectionism and adjustment outcomes, they did not design the study to examine the direction of any relationships. Hibbard and Davies called for further research, in particular longitudinal studies investigating whether students' level of perfectionism changes once they enter college, whether the influence of perfectionism on adjustment varies over time, and whether educational context makes a difference for adjustment outcomes.

Lindbeck, R., & Fodrey, B. (2010). Using technology in undergraduate admission: A student perspective. *Journal of College Admission, 208*, 10–17.

Technology plays a key role in recruiting college students. A study by Noel-Levitz (2009) found that nearly 90% of prospective university students indicated they would be disappointed or not attend an institution if its web site did not meet their expectations. In addition to the now-prevalent recruiting technologies—e-mail and university web sites—some admissions offices may utilize newer tools such as instant or text messaging, blogs, Wikis, and so forth to recruit and inform students. Lindbeck and Fodrey surveyed 746 freshmen (9,997 were invited to participate via e-mail) at two midwestern state universities about the technologies they encountered and utilized during university selection and admissions processes. Participants were asked to indicate whether they used 10 technologies during the admissions process—cell phones, text messaging, social media, virtual communities, instant messaging, e-mail, blogs, audio content/podcasts, video content/vodcasts, and school web sites—and to rate how useful (1 = *not useful*; 2 = *somewhat useful*; 3 = *very useful*) they perceived each to be for six communicative functions: notification of critical application information and deadlines, building relationships with admissions counselors, notification of acceptance, information (Q&A), virtual tours of campus, and to find out "what's happening" (p. 13) on campus.

Of the 10 technologies, e-mail and school web site, and to a somewhat lesser extent, cell phones dominated as the most used technology. For instance, nearly 90% of the participants reported receiving e-mail notifications of application information and deadlines and using school web sites for this same information. Similarly, over 80% reported that they had gathered information and forms via e-mail and the school's web site. These two communicative functions declined to around 50% for cell phones However, at a 35% rate of experience, cell phones were the most common means of building a relationship with a counselor. Among the top 20 most frequent experiences with technology during the admissions process (a chart of these can be found on page 14), social networking was used for solely three functions: information and forms, experienced by 32% of the participants; notification of application and information deadlines, experienced by 27% of the participants; and building a relationship with a counselor, experienced by 24% of the participants. Thirty percent of respondents indicated that they used video content to take a virtual campus tour and 20% used it to discover the happenings on campus. Audio content only surfaced once among the top 20 most common experiences with 16% of the respondents using it to build relationships with counselors. Likewise, blogs only made it to the top 20 list of the useful technology once—for learning about campus happenings—as reported by 23% of the participants. Text or instant messaging and virtual communities were not among the top 20 experiences with technology during the admissions process.

After presenting results for the employment of technologies, Lindbeck and Fodrey reported on the usefulness of all experienced technologies for the six communicative functions. For notification of acceptance, respondents rated school web site,

e-mail, and cell phones with mean scores over 2 (3 being the maximum level of usefulness). They gave school web site the highest mean score of usefulness at 2.7. However, they did not rate text messaging, social networking, virtual communities, instant imaging, or podcasts/audio and video content with mean scores of usefulness over 1.8. Results indicate that students did not use blogs to learn about their acceptance status.

For notification of application information and deadlines, students gave school web site and e-mail the highest scores on usefulness with means of 2.8 and 2.7, respectively. They found social networking somewhat useful (M = 2.0). They rated the remaining seven technologies with means lower than 2.0, indicating they were not particularly useful for learning about information and deadlines.

The rating pattern with respect to building a relationship with a counselor deviated from the patterns for the other communication-information functions. Students indicated that they did not use web sites, blogs, or video content for building relationships, while they did employ e-mail (M = 2.5) as well as audio content (M = 2.0). They reported utilizing cell phones, social networking, virtual communities, and instant and text messaging with less usefulness (M < 2.0).

According to results, students only found web sites and video content particularly useful in experiencing campus tours at a distance. They scored these technologies with means of 2.6 and 2.4, respectively. They gave similar usefulness rankings to learn about campus happenings, scoring school web sites, video content, and blogs with respective means of 2.6, 2.2, and 2.1.

To obtain information and forms, students utilized nine technologies. They considered the school web site the most useful with a score of 2.8, followed by e-mail at 2.6, social networking at 2.2, and cell phones at 2.1. The remaining technologies were scored at 1.9 or below. They did not use blogs to obtain information and forms.

In Lindbeck and Fodrey's view, the results present two opportunities for improvement. First, they suggested that efforts be put toward increasing the usefulness of newer (Web 2.0) technologies. They added that innovation does not require "turn[ing] our back on existing traditional and existing practices" (p. 17); that is, the school web site and e-mail, which were perceived as somewhat or very useful for many functions, can continue to be improved.

In regard to further research, the authors recognized the limitations of the sample set. They suggested replication with larger and more diverse samples as well as research into how the Millennial generation understands the admissions process. Finally, they called for more detailed examination of students' interactions with these technologies during admissions.

Mehta, S. S., Newbold, J. J., & O'Rourke, M.A. (2011). Why do first generation students fail? *College Student Journal, 45*(1), 20–35.

In this study, Mehta, Newbold, and O'Rourke explored the reasons that first-generation college students (FGSs) fail and recommended several initiatives to increase their success. The authors defined FGSs as those who come from a home in which no parent or guardian graduated from college. Because FGSs comprise up to 50% of the college population, more information about the needs, attitudes, behaviors, and perceptions of them is needed to aid in developing programs to promote their success.

Ultimately, FGSs have lower graduation rates (Chen & Carroll, 2005; Ishitani, 2003, 2006; Warburton, Burarin, & Nunez, 2001) and struggle with what Lundberg, Schreiner, Hovaguimian, and Slavin Miller (2007) conceptualized as a lack of "cultural capital" in relation to higher education. In other words, FGSs lack knowledge of traditions, norms, and the overall college-going process. FGSs have less on-campus involvement and engagement with other students (Astin, 1984; 1993; Dennis, Phinney, & Cuateco, 2005; Lohfink & Paulsen, 2005; Lundberg et al., 2007; Pascarella, Pierson, Wolnaik, & Terenzini, 2004; Pike & Kuh, 2005; Terenzini, Springer, Yeager, Pascarella, & Nora, 1996). They spend more hours working per week with greater financial responsibilities than continuing-generation students (CGSs) (Inman & Mayes, 1999; Nunez & Cuccaro-Alamin, 1998). Their parents, family, and social systems may provide less support and encouragement (Billson & Terry, 1982; Choy, 2001; Rodrigquez, 2003; Terenzini et al., 1996; York-Anderson & Bowman, 1991). FGSs often feel less academically prepared than their peers (Rodriquez, 2003) and may experience more stress with fewer coping resources.

Stress management and active coping strategies predict academic success (Leong, Bonz, & Zachar, 1997). *Active responses* deal with stress directly whereas *reactive responses* involve avoidance or escapism. Lack of active coping interferes with student performance and may contribute to poorer adjustment to college (Shields, 2001). The researchers hypothesized that FGSs use fewer active coping responses than their CGS counter-

parts. They also examined possible differences between FGC and CGS students in terms of financial resources, hours spent working, college social and on-campus involvement, reported stress level, and self-reported time pressure.

Participants completed a 7-point Likert-style questionnaire that contained three to four items on eight constructs: attitudes, opinions, and reason for attending college; level of college involvement and participation; attitudes about work; social life and relationships; general opinions about school; time management; attitude about stress; and coping style. Exploratory factor analysis was performed on these constructs utilizing principal components of varimax rotation. Factors with eigenvalues greater than 1 were retained. A minimum factor loading of .30 was used as a guideline for including items in a factor. Factors with Cronbach's α less than .70 were not used in the analysis.

Mehta et al. used a stratified sample to account for year in school and type of major such that the sample represented the student body of the midsized southwestern state university where the study was conducted. The sample was comprised of 425 students: 41% male, 71% White, 14% African American, 12% Hispanic, and 3% other. Freshmen and seniors each comprised 23% of the sample followed by juniors at 20%, sophomores at 19%, and others at 15%.

The results of the study reveal that FGSs have lower family incomes and different sources of college funding than CGSs. FGSs received less financial support from parents (p = 0.008) and used more grants (p = .000) and loans (p = .025). FGSs also reported significantly higher amounts of financial stress than CGSs (p = .024). FGSs had a significantly higher rate of undertaking certain reactive forms of coping. Lastly, FGSs reported significantly less social (p = .01) and academic satisfaction (p = .09) as well as lower GPAs (p = .019).

The authors proposed four interventions to better address the needs of incoming FGSs: living-learning, FGS-specific, and transfer programs tailored to FGSs as well as academic-related interaction with fellow students and faculty members. In living-learning situations, students reside in the same dorm, take courses together, and participate in structured student-support programming such as planned faculty interaction (Kurotsuchi, Daver, Vogt, & Brown, 2007). Such programs help fill the cultural capital void and promote FGS success (Kurotsuchi et al., 2007). However, most FGSs are not able to participate and so the authors suggested that FGS programs be utilized to facilitate the academic and social integration of these students. Similar to the programming found in living-learning communities, FGS programs include orientations and other formal and informal activities, such as mentoring, tutoring, and meeting with academic advisors, to promote active coping (Ishyama, 2007). In a third intervention, Mehta et al. suggested that specific transfer programs be targeted for FGSs. They also suggested that efforts be directed to relationship building between FGSs and their faculty members and peers. These connections support increased academic and social engagement. In particular, the authors note the benefit to FGSs of participation in course-related discussion groups with peers (Lundberg, 2003).

Mehta et al. further recommended longitudinal research utilizing large samples across many universities to further explore needs of and best practices for FGSs. They suggested also looking at FGS overall life satisfaction as a variable in future research to help determine factors that promote FGS satisfaction and success. Finally, they recommend exploring the differences between FGSs who have successfully negotiated college to those who drop out, calling for the development of a "model of first-generation student development at college" (p. 32).

Persky, K. R., & Oliver D. E. (2011). Veterans coming home to the community college: Linking research to practice. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 35*, 111–20.

With the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq coming to a close, more and more veterans will be utilizing their Montgomery G. I. Bill and attending college. While in office, George W. Bush signed into law the Post 9-11 G. I. Bill, which is the most significant change since the G. I. Bill was initiated (Bush, 2008).

Due to the current influx of student-veterans, Persky and Oliver explored three research questions: a) What do veterans perceive their needs to be at the community college? b) what programs and services are currently in place at the community college to address the needs of veterans? and c) what recommendations can be made for improving the veterans' community college experience? The results from this study provide a platform to help community colleges understand the needs of student-veterans.

The authors utilized a mixed-method design with qualitative research being the primary approach and quantitative research embedded within a secondary part of the project (Creswell, 2009).

In the primary portion of the study, they utilized six qualitative-data gathering approaches: interviews, observations, field notes, document reviews, a focus group, and a preinterview demographic questionnaire. They selected the institution and participants through purposeful sampling of five different groups: administrators, faculty members, staff, students who are armed services veterans, and former students who served in the military. Once the authors reviewed the initial results, they generated and issued a second 11-question Checkbox survey to roughly 1,100 student-veterans. From the results of the second survey ($N = 60$), five themes surfaced: streamlining of credits; programs and services; faculty, advisor, and counselor training; difficulties encountered by veterans; and components that promote a student-veteran friendly campus.

The authors identified multiple needs emerging from the first research question (what do veterans perceive their needs to be at the community college?). Student-veteran respondents first noted credit streamlining to facilitate acceptance of military experience and credit toward degree completion. For the community college to implement a smooth, streamlined process that eliminates the stress and frustration student-veterans can face in the current systems, specific counselors need to be trained as student-veteran credit-transfer specialists. Limited transfer of student-veteran credits also needs to be addressed.

Through the survey, programs and services specific to student-veterans also emerged as a need. Student-veterans require a sense of belonging and camaraderie, and specific programs and services can facilitate their academic and social integration. For example, a student-veteran center makes an ideal on-campus support. In fact, a one-stop approach arose as the single most helpful service for student-veterans. Other recommended programs and services include orientation programs specifically for student-veterans, a first-semester student-veterans' learning community, academic transition programs such as academic success workshops and those that address veterans' issues (such as seminars on post-traumatic stress disorder), and job placement. The authors suggested that administrators seek grant funding for such programs through resources such as Veterans Upward Bound and Troops to Teachers.

Regarding the second research question, the study revealed that programs and services for veterans currently in place at the community college are in a state of change and uncertainty. The college under study sought to adjust its approach to student-veteran services but was without a solid direction.

Finally, in making recommendations for improving the student-veterans' community college experience, respondents expressed a sense of urgency to accept the suggestions made in the previous portions of the survey. In addition, results indicate that veteran-specific counseling should replace generalized counseling. Sensitivity training for faculty and staff would promote recognition of the positive aspects of military experience (Sachs, 2008). In today's classrooms, student-veterans may encounter insensitivity, unsuitable teaching, and misunderstanding of their learning styles. Student-veterans can feel like outcasts when negative comments are made toward them. Anti-military bias from faculty members, staff, and fellow students contributes to student-veteran attrition.

In the interview process, community college staff characterized student-veterans as the forgotten minority and reported the need for sensitivity training. To help follow through with this training, the authors noted that the institution should keep track of retention and graduation. Student-veterans reported the need to be accepted for who they are: serious adult learners. The authors suggest that "sincerity, affirmation, and helpfulness contribute to the validation of students and are key elements in creating a veteran friendly campus" (p. 117).

The authors concluded with three implications in relation to the needs of student-veterans. First, community colleges prepared to meet the needs of student-veterans will benefit from the increased enrollment and completion rates of these students. They also point out that students will unlikely need any additional financial aid as the Post 911 Montgomery G. I. Bill will cover costs. Second, ongoing legislation recognizing student-veterans as a protected class means that community colleges should be proactive in dealing with the needs of student-veterans. Third, community colleges can utilize existing programs and services for minority groups as a guide in developing student-veterans' programs and services. The authors noted that results of this study cannot be generalized to all community colleges due to the uniqueness of each institution across the country. However, they contended that their study provides detailed information on how community colleges can prepare to meet the needs of incoming student-veterans.

Prevatt, F., Li, H., Welles, T., Festa-Dreher, D., Yelland, S., & Lee, J. (2011). The Academic Success Inventory for College Students: Scale development

and practical implications for use with students. *Journal of College Admission, 211*, 26–31.

Success in college has often been predicted by two variables—high school academic performance and scores on standardized achievement tests. However, other variables, such as extracurricular activities, parent models, peer pressure, and self-confidence, may mediate a student's success. Thus far, researchers have not developed a single, validated, global assessment instrument to measure the different aspects of academic success in college. Instead, individual instruments have been developed to measure each of the different constructs, which is time-consuming and expensive to administer. With this need in mind, the authors developed the *Academic Success Inventory for College Students* (ASICS).

The ASICS is a 50-item comprehensive questionnaire useful to help identify college students who may be at risk for poor academic progress. It is divided into 10 subscales: general academic skills, internal motivation/confidence, perceived instructor efficacy, concentration, external motivation/future, socializing, career decidedness, lack of anxiety, personal adjustment, and external motivation/current.

Development of the ASICS was based on a pilot study of 315 undergraduates and a follow-up sample of 930 students. The researchers used exploratory factor analysis to determine the 10 subscales that explained 64% of the variance. Internal consistency of the subscales was measured using Cronbach's α: general academic skills = .93; internal motivation/confidence = .86; perception of instructor efficacy = .92; concentration = .87; external motivation/future = .88; socializing = .84; career decidedness = .87; lack of anxiety = .77; personal adjustment = .86; external motivation/current = .62.

Discriminant validity was tested by comparing scores of students in the university honors program ($n = 265$) with those of students on academic probation ($n = 346$). Significant differences were found on all subscales except external motivation/current such that students in the honors program had scores indicating more positive functioning than students on probation. Subscales most predictive of GPA were personal adjustment, general academic skills, internal motivation/confidence, socialization, and concentration.

Ability measures, such as high school GPA and college entrance exams, are not adequate predictors of college performance. Therefore, particularly in the case of students with prior college experience, the ASICS may prove a useful addition to the admission process. The ASICS may also be helpful in assisting first-year college students to identify potential areas of difficulty by comparing scores and responses to those of honors and probation students.

The authors discovered the highest correlations between the personal adjustment and socializing subscales such that students reporting personal difficulties also reported high rates of drinking and partying that interfered with their studies. They also found small negative correlations between anxiety and general academic skills, external motivation/future, and career decidedness, suggesting that a small amount of anxiety about current performance and later jobs may be a good situation.

Students can access and complete the ASICS online in about 10 minutes. Academic advisors can then score printed responses via scoring instructions available from fprevatt@fsu.edu. The ability of the ASICS to predict GPA may make it particularly useful for advisors identifying at-risk students and providing early intervention in the areas identified in the subscales.

For example, students receiving low scores on the general academic-skills subscale may develop organizational skills using planners, calendars, course goal planning, and the like. They should also determine the source of any lack of effort in classes (e.g., motivation or personal problems, etc.). Finally, students may find that attending a study skills class or workshop aids them in summarizing main ideas of text and creating personal study aids.

Students receiving low scores on the internal motivation/confidence subscale may benefit from counseling to identify motivations that bring intrinsic rewards instead of extrinsic rewards and to work on confidence issues. The student may also keep a list of activities on which he or she performs well as well as strengths and successes that can aid in making self-affirming statements on a regular basis.

Accumulating low scores on the perceived efficacy of the instructor subscale may lead a student to use college-based evaluation tools to select instructors whose teaching approach best matches their learning style. If a student consistently expresses a negative perception of instructors, she or he may wish to consider changing majors or institutions to choose the most suitable educational path. The student, with the possible assistance of qualified counselors, may also need to address the possibility that her or his own interpersonal skills or behaviors

contribute to the dissatisfying situation.

If a student receives low scores on the concentration subscale, the student may need to be tested for a possible attention problem. Additionally, the student may need to sit in the front of the class, record the lectures, or utilize a note taker. He or she may also need to schedule breaks into designated study times.

Students showing poor scores on external motivation/current and future subscales may wish to identify short- and long-term outcomes of academic success and the activities associated with attaining each. She or he may benefit from setting short-term goals each day, recognizing that such efforts generally culminate into long-term goals.

Students receiving low scores on the socializing subscale can pursue counseling on issues such as drug or alcohol use. Concerned personnel [e.g., advisors] might suggest that students with specific problems consider stopping out of college to handle difficult situations and make plans for returning when they can make a firm commitment to academic work.

Low scores on the career decidedness subscale may indicate a need to enroll in a course on career development, utilize the college's career counseling services, or explore opportunities to solidify major and career choices. Low scores on the anxiety subscale should lead a student to explore alternative ways of releasing stress, such as exercising or meditation.

Students receiving low scores on the personal adjustment subscale would benefit from counseling focusing on their psychological concerns.

The ASICS can be administered to one student or to a group of students with the benefit of identifying areas of potential difficulty. It is a tool designed for use with individuals who have some college experience; the items are not suited for those who have never attended a postsecondary institution. Because it offers a global assessment measure yielding information related to 10 areas associated with student success, the ASICS can help college personnel identify specific areas of concern for each student, avoiding a one-size-fits-all approach and can be used by advisors to individualize and tailor interventions and referrals.

Schulz, S. A., & Lucido, J. (2011). Who we are: An in-depth look at the educational backgrounds, career paths and development needs of chief admission officers and enrollment managers. *Journal of College Admission, 211*, 14–20.

Via semistructured interviews, Schulz and Lucido investigated the professional preparation, career paths, and professional development concerns of 19 chief enrollment managers and 32 chief admissions officers at a selection of public and private institutions of higher education that varied by geographic location and Carnegie classification. Of the 32 chief admissions officers, 16 worked at institutions that did not have an enrollment manager, whereas the other 17 worked at institutions with an enrollment manager.

The authors identified participants using the *College and University Professional Association for Human Resources* (CUPA-HR) annual salary-survey HR position definitions. Schulz and Lucido summarized the definitions as follows (p. 15):

> Chief Admission Officer—responsible for the admission of undergraduates. May also be responsible for recruitment and selection and for the admission of graduate and professional students or for scholarship administration or similar functions.
>
> Chief Enrollment Officer— responsible for the development of marketing plans for recruitment and retention of students. Also coordinates institutional efforts in admission, financial aid, records and registration, and advising.

Concerning education, participants' most common undergraduate majors, in order of frequency, were English, history, psychology, and business, and the most common master's degrees were earned in education/higher education administration, college student personnel/counseling, and business administration. All but one of the enrollment managers had earned at least a master's degree. The 16 chief admissions officers working at institutions without enrollment managers all held master's degrees. However, by contrast only slightly more than one half of the 17 admissions officers at institutions with enrollment managers held master's degrees.

Only seven participants—five enrollment managers and two chief admissions offers (these at institutions without enrollment managers)—held doctoral degrees, although the majority of participants recognized the value of holding a doctorate for career advancement, as a status factor, for establishing credibility among subordinates, and for proving their capability, especially to the faculty, for data-driven decision making. Some participants also indicated that a doctorate could provide them with theoretical and practical knowledge to be more effective in their positions and some felt a

doctorate would grant them personal gratification. Lack of time, family commitments, and a desire for work-life balance prevented various participants from seeking a doctorate. Others, not living near a major research institution, experienced a lack of access. Still others felt that existing doctoral programs would not provide adequate training for a "nuanced field like enrollment management" (p. 16) that employs concepts from multiple fields such as various social sciences, business, economics, and law. A small minority of participants indicated a lack of interest in a doctorate either because they were happy in their current positions or because they entered their positions at a time when doctoral degrees were less common and their advancement was achieved through experience and relationships with colleagues.

The majority of participants reported entering admissions or enrollment management professions through recruitment efforts of senior institutional leaders, colleagues, or friends. A good number of these participants had made initial connections with admissions staff while working as student interns or serving as campus tour guides. Some participants began in other positions at their institutions and then gravitated to admissions. While not necessarily anticipating a career in admissions or enrollment management initially, nearly 25% of the participants indicated that connections they made while students led them to consider careers in enrollment and admissions. In the words of Schulz and Lucido (p. 19), "Whether actively recruited or not, relationships with people and institutions were at the heart of many forays into enrollment management." A much smaller number of participants arrived at a career in enrollment management because they were unable to find jobs in their original field of study.

With respect to building a career in admissions and enrollment management, Schulz and Lucido, borrowing Gouldner's (1957) terminology, found that most participants took either a *cosmopolitan* or a *local* approach to career building. Those who took a cosmopolitan approach tended to bounce back and forth between institutions in a series of positions in enrollment-related areas such as admissions, financial aid, research, registrar, and student affairs. A smaller number of participants took a more local approach, developing extensive knowledge of institutional culture, people, and processes and advancing through the ranks at a single institution, often their undergraduate alma mater (18 of 33 chief admissions officers). Some participants used their local knowledge to advance despite gaps in their credentials. A small number of participants took neither a local nor cosmopolitan approach, employing other strategies such as getting to know a high-ranking administrator or networking with a professional association, government agency, or vendor that associated with the institution where they wanted to work.

When asked how they felt they came to be prepared for their current position, many administrators attributed credit to their degrees in business, finance, and economics. Related essential skills identified by participants included understanding of business principles, personnel management, adaptability to change, and ability to understand financial and statistical data and budgets. Holders of liberal arts degrees felt their schooling prepared them to be analytical, think strategically, make decisions, and act as effective communicators. The few holders of doctoral degrees said their advanced education helped them understand the complexities of their institutional environment and gave them venues for discussing challenges, sharing best practices, and learning from colleagues in the classroom.

While education was often mentioned as preparing participants for their current positions, hands-on experience was mentioned with even greater frequency, especially in settings where personnel took an integrative approach to enrollment management or those in which professionals "wear many hats" (p.18), gaining experience in multiple areas such as recruitment, financial aid, intuitional research, and marketing. Mentors, some local and some met through a professional association, were identified as key to several participants' preparation. In addition to providing mentors, professional associations offer a venue for learning about enrollment trends and for sharing strategies for improving enrollment. Apart from external factors, some participants mentioned that personal traits such as curiosity, motivation, and work ethic contributed to their preparation.

While participants mentioned factors that prepared them for the job, they also mentioned aspects of the job for which they felt unready, including campus politics within and across units. Some felt initially ill-equipped for the breadth of expertise and knowledge required in their positions, especially when enrollment management efforts involved multiple units. Some reported initial lack of sufficient knowledge of budget, statistical methods, and marketing skills.

As for continued professional development, participants wanted to develop their political skills, learn more about relationship building with other

campus professionals and faculty members and to become better personnel managers. Participants recognized the complexity of enrollment management and felt that professional development should include helping them understand all of the components and factors that affect enrollment management, including a knowledge of government regulations pertaining to financial aid. They also mentioned need for communication and marketing skills, including Web 2.0 marketing techniques, along with data-driven evaluation and decision-making abilities.

The authors concluded the study with a summary of the main points. Lack of relevant educational and credentialing opportunities may prevent admissions officers and enrollment managers from reaching their fullest potential in their positions. Respondents reported a number of gaps in preparation, particularly with respect to institutional politics, personnel management, strategic decision making, and understanding enrollment management in its broader institutional context as well as in the "larger realms of higher education and American society" (p. 20). The finding that "serendipity captures the wide array of reasons, motivations and connections" brought respondents to their current careers led the authors to call for more effective means of recruiting and training enrollment managers and admissions professionals and giving them opportunities to earn advanced degrees that will serve them in their careers.

Starling, P. V., & Miller, G. (2011). Negative thought patterns of undecided community college students: Implications for counselors and advisors. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 35*(10), 756–72.

With the number of students entering community college dramatically on the rise, the 1,195 community colleges in the United States enrolled over 6.2 million students as of 2008 (Inside Higher Ed, 2008; Santora, 2009) and so more knowledge about the thought patterns of community college students is warranted. More specifically, almost one third of community college students are uncertain about their major (Gelso & Sims, 1968), a situation linked to lack of decisiveness (Gordon, 1984) and knowledge (Andrews, 1988) as well as anxiety and frustration (Kimes & Troth, 1974; Multon, Heppner, Gysber, Zook, & Ellis-Kalton, 2001; O'Hare & Tamburri, 1986; Weissman, Bulakowski, & Jumisko, 1998). Chickering's theory of identity development (1969) offers a seven-step progression in the development of identity and purpose in college students: managing emotions; moving through autonomy toward interdependence; developing purpose, competence, integrity, and mature interpersonal relationships; and establishing identity. Starling and Miller offered this model to counselors and academic advisors for use with students experiencing career uncertainty and negative thought patterns.

In this article, Starling and Miller asked, "What factors impact a select group of incoming community college freshmen who are indecisive about choosing a field of major interest?" They seek to understand the negative thought processes of incoming community college freshmen to provide effective strategies to facilitate student growth and success. Prior research on this topic focused solely on freshmen attending 4-year colleges, resulting in limited generalizability to the community college population.

The current study involved 60 incoming community-college freshmen who ranged in age from 18 to 44 years with a mean of 20.5 years ($SD = 4.1$). Of these participants, 43 were female (71.7%). Their ethnicities were African American (33%), Hispanic (28%), Asian (10%), White (3%), and unidentified (25%). To measure students' negative thinking patterns, the authors utilized the *Career Thinking Inventory* (CTI) (Sampson, Peterson, Lenz, Reardon, & Saunders, 1996, 1998). This 48-item instrument is used to measure dysfunctional thinking related to decision making and career problem solving. In addition to an overall score, the measure yields decision making confusion (DMC), commitment anxiety (CA), and external conflict (EC) subscale scores.

The authors found that community college students who have not yet decided on a major displayed significantly higher anxiety about career choices than the national norms for college students. The results of a one-sample t test showed that the participants' total scores on the CTI were significantly higher than the normative college sample, $t\,(59) = 8.73$, $p < .001$. Participant subscale scores on anxiety were also significantly higher: DMC, $t\,(59) = 5.08$, $p < .001$; CA, $t\,(59) = 8.31$, $p < .001$; EC, $t\,(59) = 9.16$, $p < .001$. No significant differences were found in relation to ethnicity or gender and CTI scores.

Based on their findings, the authors recommend that college advisors, counselors, and professionals build ways to increase undecided community-college students' understanding of the curriculum, their awareness of the importance of maintaining a certain GPA, and their coping and anxiety man-

agement skills. They recommend offering more support, guidance, and direction as well as use of the holistic learning approach proposed by Love and Love (1995), which involves an integrated academic, social, and emotional approach with college students. The authors referred to recommendations by Slowinkis and Hammock (2003) who suggested that warm, knowledgeable advisors with good multitasking and communication skills can facilitate the undecided student's problem solving. The authors also pointed to the recommendations of Fries-Britt (2008) for integrated personal and academic counseling; she also encouraged advisors to stay motivated and remain alert to the constantly changing academic and personal needs of the diverse population of college students. Last, the authors recommended that advisors keep track of the progress of undecided freshmen.

The limitations of the study include use of only one assessment instrument, small sample size with women overrepresented, and the timing of administration (on the participants' first day during Freshman Orientation when they were most anxious). The article also shows some writing and organizational problems, but the results may be valuable to advisors who work with this population.

The authors recommended that future researchers investigate high school preparation, family background, financial situation, and other variables that may contribute to students' attitudes and thoughts about college. Future studies could also look at how negative thinking affects students over the course of their community college experience. Starling and Miller concluded by advocating for "a new academic advising and counseling integrative collaborative approach" (p. 770).

The bibliography is compiled by Jessie Carduner and Karen Mottarella. The University of Central Florida–Palm Bay Campus Psychology Research Team assisted in locating articles. Briana Ortega, Cassie Norsworthy, Emily Edwards, and Bryan Henderson also assisted in co-authoring certain entries.