2022

Exploring the Role of Intrusive Advising in Community College Students' Persistence

Carolyn Jordan
Walden University

Walden University

College of Education

This is to certify that the doctoral study by

Carolyn D. Jordan

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. Kelly Hall, Committee Chairperson, Education Faculty
Dr. Nichole Karpel, Committee Member, Education Faculty
Dr. Laura Siaya, University Reviewer, Education Faculty

Chief Academic Officer and Provost
Sue Subocz, Ph.D.

Walden University
2022

Abstract

Exploring the Role of Intrusive Advising in Community College Students' Persistence

by

Carolyn D. Jordan

MS, College of St. Scholastica, 2011

BS, University of Phoenix, 2006

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Walden University

December 2022

Abstract

The role of intrusive advising in the persistence of community college students has not been well-studied even though intrusive advising has been touted as a practice to improve retention in U.S. community colleges. Student retention is important for sustaining community colleges that serve as open admissions institutions because they are increasingly dependent on tuition revenue, especially in an era of reduced state and federal funding. Retaining students also helps improve the educational attainment in the geographic area the community college serves. The purpose of this basic qualitative inquiry was to explore the role of intrusive advising on retaining students. Bandura's triadic reciprocal causation model and Tinto's model of student integration were used to conceptually frame the study. The research questions guiding the basic qualitative inquiry focused on students' experiences with intrusive advising and how intrusive advising influences students' persistence in college. The study involved semi-structured interviews with a purposeful sample of eight student participants who had experience with intrusive advising. Inductive thematic analysis yield 10 axial categories and five themes: environmental experiences and support; internal and external factors; feeling valued as a student; growth; and, impact of intrusive advising. Discrepant cases were included in the results. The findings overall revealed that intrusive advising had a positive impact on students' decision to persist. The results of study may effect social change by informing the practice of academic advising, informing advising policy, advancing the study of advising as teaching, and adding to the literature about intrusive advising as a practice to improve persistence among community college students.

Exploring the Role of Intrusive Advising in Community College Students' Persistence

by

Carolyn D. Jordan

MS, College of St. Scholastica, 2011

BS, University of Phoenix, 2006

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Walden University

December 2022

Dedication

I dedicate this dissertation to my God, my Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, who has been my strength and my encourager throughout this journey. I also dedicate this work to my husband, Wendell, who has supported and encouraged me to keep going. To my children, Kayla, Alisha, and J, who have kept me on my toes and made sure I prioritized my time. This doctoral journey was more eventful because of you. To my father, Clifford and in memory of my mother, Claudie.

Acknowledgements

I want to acknowledge my family and everyone who supported me during this doctoral journey. A special thank you to Dr. Kelly Hall for your inspiration, encouragement, and insights. You helped me tremendously and thank you for your scholarly advice and friendly guidance.

Table of Contents

iii

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Intrusive advising is a proactive, intervention-oriented approach to academic advising that allows advisors to provide support and intervention tools to students who are at risk or experiencing academic obstacles (He & Hutson, 2016; Thomas, 2017). Intrusive advising has been touted as a promising retention practice; however, most studies about intrusive advising have been conducted at 4-year institutions with student housing (Kalinowski Ohrt, 2016; Kraft-Terry & Kau, 2019; Rodgers et al., 2014; Rowh, 2018; Schneider et al., 2017; Schwebel et al., 2012; Zhang et al., 2017). A search of the literature revealed only four studies published within the past 5 years about intrusive advising in community colleges, supporting intrusive advising as well as providing mixed results on student academic outcomes (Donaldson et al., 2016; Frame & Cummins-Sebree, 2017; Rios, 2019; Thomas, 2017). More studies about intrusive advising at community colleges are needed to support the positive connections between intrusive advising and student retention (Abelman & Molina, 2000; Backhus, 1989; Earl, 1988; Ryan, 2013; Smith, 2007; Varney, 2013), especially among a general population of community college students. As open admissions institutions, community colleges impact the educational attainment and resultant social capital of the geographic areas they serve (Kolenovic et al., 2013; Ma et al., 2019; Pruett & Absher, 2015; Turner, 2016; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics [BLS], 2017). Sustaining community colleges requires persistence of students in an era of reduced state and federal funding (Kolenovic et al., 2013; Mertes & Jankoviac, 2016).

Chapter 1 is comprised of several sections that introduce this qualitative study. The Background section summarizes research literature related to retention at community colleges as a persistent problem and intrusive advising as an understudied practice to improve retention. The problem of the study is defined with evidence provided that the problem is current and relevant to college teaching and learning and contributes to the scant research on community college student retention practices. The purpose of the study was to explore the role of intrusive advising on retaining students at community colleges. The research questions guiding this study are identified, and terms central to the study are defined. A description of the conceptual framework used for the study is also explained as are study assumptions and limitations.

Background

An open admissions commuter college in the southeast United States (hereafter referred to as Study College) has struggled with retention of its full-time and part-time student populations. Study College is approved to award bachelor's degrees in seven programs, associate degrees in 13 programs, and certificates in four programs. Study College is typical in that it has agreements with two local technical colleges, a local level one trauma hospital, and other state university system colleges to offer programs to help prepare graduates for the workforce with certificate and bachelor degree credentials (Cohen et al., 2014; Dougherty et al., 2017). Study College has a large percentage (60%) of first-generation students, and 74% receive the Pell grant, 33% are enrolled in at least one learning support course, 92% are African American, and 3% are Hispanic. Even though Study College has a large percentage of African American students, it is not

designated as an Historically Black College because it does not meet the criteria set by the U. S. Department of Education (1991). Study College was established in 1974, 10 years beyond the eligibility date required by the U.S. Department of Education (1991). The college implemented an intrusive advising program to help improve its retention rate. This study sought to understand the role intrusive advising plays in students' decision to persist.

This section provides summary background information to clarify this study's context and explain why this study is important and timely. Three subsections summarize literature related to the study topic and include retention, academic advising, and advising as teaching. Greater depth of literature related to these topics is presented in Chapter 2.

Retention

As the job market demands more educated employees, underprepared and first-generation students are turning to community colleges to gain access to education (Boatman & Long, 2018; Center for Community College Student Engagement [CCCSE], 2016). In 2017, the National Student Clearinghouse Research Center estimated that approximately 2.6 million first-time students are enrolled in colleges and universities, and the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2016) approximated that 40% of first-time students attended community colleges. The liberal admissions policies of community colleges allow a greater number of diverse, underrepresented, first-generation, and socioeconomically challenged students, as well as a high proportion of students who lack adequate academic preparation to gain access to higher education (DeAngelo & Franke, 2016; Pruett & Absher, 2015; Shapiro et al., 2015). Low income,

urban, first- generation, minority, and underprepared students are more prevalent in community colleges and are at a much higher risk of leaving college prematurely (Elfman, 2015; Pruett & Absher, 2015). Students residing in urban areas usually experience harsher economic hardships (U. S. Census Bureau, 2014), and students whose family income are in the lower percentiles are more likely to leave school without completing a diploma program, a degree, or obtaining a certification (Ma & Baum, 2016). The challenge exists in retaining these students as many lack basic skills to persist in higher education course work (DeAngelo & Franke, 2016; Pruett & Absher, 2015; Tierney & Sablan, 2014).

Community colleges across the nation struggle to retain diverse, first-generation, underrepresented, and underprepared students, and are utilizing various academic advising strategies, including intrusive advising, to improve retention (Donaldson et al., 2016; Kolenovic et al., 2013; Pruett & Absher, 2015; Shapiro et al., 2015; Turner & Thompson, 2014). NCES (2018) estimated the average retention rate at community colleges has hovered around 60.0% since 2012 despite many community colleges restructuring their academic advising models (Harrell & Reglin, 2018). The average retention rate at traditional four-year schools is approximately 80.0% (NCES, 2018). The existing retention models, usually applicable to four-year institutions with student housing, often do not align with community colleges' missions to provide access to higher education (Donaldson et al., 2016; Yu, 2015). The intervention strategies that are geared toward 4-year institutions have been shown to have little impact on community

college retention (Yu, 2015). Finding solutions to address complex student issues that impacts retention remains challenging for community colleges.

Academic Advising

Academic advising has emerged as a practice to improve student persistence and retention (Harrell & Reglin, 2018; Kolenovic et al., 2013; Tinto, 1975, 1993). Effective academic advising plays a critical role in student retention (Kolenovic et al., 2013), and many colleges have shifted their approach to academic advising as a means to improve retention (CCCSE, 2016). Though some colleges employ the traditional one-to-one approach to advising, many others are employing other approaches such as prescriptive, group, and proactive or intrusive advising (Donaldson et al., 2016). However, traditional advising has done little to inform removal of barriers often associated with personal, behavioral, and environmental factors experienced by urban community college students (Heller & Cassady, 2017). Students who receive more intensive advising sessions have better outcomes (CCCSE, 2018). Community colleges are focusing more attention and resources on academic advising programs, and intrusive advising is being utilized by community colleges to provide a more holistic approach to student persistence (Donaldson et al., 2016; Turner & Thompson, 2014).

Intrusive advising, a proactive, intervention-oriented approach to academic advising, allows advisors to provide support and intervention tools to students who are at risk or experiencing academic obstacles (He & Hutson, 2016; Thomas, 2017). For example, if a student is not participating in class or at risk of failing a course, academic advisors can reach out to those students to offer additional support services to help the

student get back on track. Intrusive advising interventions are usually triggered by an early alert system that allows faculty or other staff members to refer a student for academic intervention. Intrusive advising has been linked to improved retention among at-risk students and students taking developmental courses at community colleges (He & Hutson, 2016; Thomas, 2017). Moreover, research suggests that intrusive advising can help mitigate the challenges posed by the risk factors presented by many community college students to help improve student retention (Donaldson et al., 2016; Kolenovic et al., 2013; Turner & Thompson, 2014).

Advising as Teaching

As more students arrive at community colleges ill-prepared for college level work, academic advisors play a pivotal role in college student success and support higher education's mission (van den Wijngaard, 2019, para. 7). Teaching and learning can inform the practice of academic advising to provide more effective advising sessions and improve outcomes (Hemwall & Trachte, 1999; Lowenstein, 2020; Rose, 2020; van den Wijngaard, 2019). Academic advising is akin to teaching and learning (Drake et al., 2013), and academic advisors are teaching students through academic advising by facilitating students' understanding of the entire curriculum (McGill, 2016; Rose, 2020). However, there is a lack of literature on academic advisors' accounts of connecting and teaching (McGill, 2016), and institutional stakeholders often overlook the pedagogical potential of academic advising (Drake et al., 2013).

Gap in Research About Practice

Four studies were found published within the past 5 years about intrusive advising in community colleges. For example, Frame and Cummins-Sebree (2017) focused on whether intrusive advising emails can reduce failing grades and withdrawals from psychology class. Thomas (2017) also addressed students in developmental courses, and Rios (2019) showed a relationship between intrusive advising and first semester retention, but the interventions had little impact on other educational outcomes. Finally, Donaldson et al. (2016) studied perceptions and attitudes toward intrusive advising and not its role in persistence. But there is a gap in the literature about practice. Approximately 8% of research on college student retention focused on community colleges, and intrusive advising as a retention strategy has not been well studied at community colleges (Donaldson et al., 2016). The lack of understanding about the role of intrusive advising in students' decisions to persist presents a gap in practice that needs further examination.

<div align="center">

Problem Statement

</div>

Intrusive advising's influence in persistence among the general population of community college students needs further examination. More community colleges are utilizing intrusive advising to improve retention (CCCSE, 2016); however, the overall first year retention rate has not dramatically improved since 2009. According to NCES (2018), the average overall retention rate at community colleges hovers around 60.0%, whereas, the average retention rate at traditional 4-year schools is approximately 80.0%. At the time of this study, the overall retention rate for first year students pursuing an

associate's degree was 48.9% and has remained relatively static since 2009 (National Student Clearinghouse Research Center, 2019). Approximately 24% of students entering the associate's degree program at the study site for this study graduate within 3 years. Keeping students enrolled provides a needed source of revenue for community colleges (Mertes & Jankoviac, 2016) and helps students improve their economic status (BLS, 2017; Turner, 2016). As the job market demands more educated employees, underprepared and first-generation students are turning to community colleges to gain access to education (Boatman & Long, 2018; CCCSE, 2016).

College teaching and learning strategies can help identify these students and initiate intrusive advising interventions to help improve student outcomes. But intrusive advising has not been well studied at community colleges for addressing the problem of retention. A search of the literature found four current studies about intrusive advising in community colleges (Donaldson et al., 2016; Frame & Cummins-Sebree, 2017; Rios, 2019; Thomas, 2017). More studies are needed about intrusive advising at community colleges because intrusive advising has the potential to improve problematic retention in the United States (Donaldson et al., 2016). This basic qualitative inquiry will add to the scant research on intrusive advising conducted at community colleges.

Purpose of the Study

The lack of understanding about the role of intrusive advising in students' decisions to persist presented a gap in practice that needed further examination. Therefore, the purpose of this basic qualitative inquiry was to explore the role of intrusive advising in retaining students at a small, urban community college in the southeastern

United States. The results can help inform academic advising practice and policy and this research will add to the literature on intrusive advising conducted at community colleges.

Research Questions

Two research questions were used to guide this study and fulfill the study's purpose.

1. How do students who have experienced intrusive advising at a small, urban community college, describe their advising and college experiences?

2. How do students who have experienced intrusive advising at a small, urban community college, describe the role of intrusive advising on their persistence decisions?

Conceptual Framework

The objective of this basic qualitative inquiry was to explore the role of intrusive advising on student retention at community colleges. This study was based on Bandura's (1977, 1986, 1997) triadic reciprocal causation model, which explains human action as a result of the interdependent interactions of one's personal factors, behaviors, and environment. Another part of the conceptual framework was Tinto's (1975) model of integration and student retention, which advances that student retention is precipitated on the students' ability to integrate academically and socially with the institution. Through the integration of Bandura's triadic reciprocal causation model and Tinto's model of integration and student retention, a concrete framework of behavioral, personal, and environmental factors was applied to this study in analysis of the role of intrusive advising on retaining students at community colleges in the United States. The integrated

framework provided a context for examining precipitants associated with the goal of this study. This framework is examined more thoroughly in Chapter 2.

Nature of the Study

This basic qualitative inquiry involved conducting interviews with students at Study College, a small urban community college. The qualitative approach provides researchers with various strategies to study complex phenomena, such as intrusive advising interventions, and to gain a deeper understanding of the phenomena from the human perspective, such as reasons for persistence or decisions to drop out (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Creswell, 2014; Lodico et al., 2010). Basic qualitative design is constructivist in nature and is appropriate when understanding the meaning of a phenomenon, which is the purpose of the study (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). This study focused on gaining a deeper understanding of students' experiences with intrusive advising as it related to their decisions to persist. Hence, basic qualitative design was a suitable approach.

To answer research questions, an interview protocol was developed. The interview protocol was used to guide interviews to collect narrative data (Wells, 2011). Data were analyzed using inductive thematic analysis approach suggested by Braun and Clarke (2006). Thematic analysis is a systematic approach to identify codes and themes from narrative data, allowed the qualitative researcher to review and finalize the themes, and then document analysis (Nowell et al., 2017). An inductive approach is needed to unpack qualitative narrative data and to "capture both manifest (explicit) and latent (underlying) meaning" (Clarke & Braun, 2017, p. 298)

Definitions

Academic advising: Academic advising is an essential part of college administration and can be defined as a systematic approach of informing students about academic requirements, resources, and college cultures (Suvedi et al., 2015).

Academic integration: Academic integration involves the ability of students to interact with faculty and other students, and comply with accepted academic norms (Xu, 2017).

Academic preparedness: Academic preparedness is the state in which students are either prepared or underprepared for college level work (Mokher et al., 2018).

Advising as teaching: Model based on best teaching practices that engage students in ways that ensure positive student outcomes (Kraft-Terry & Kau, 2019).

Attrition: In higher educational settings, attrition refers to students who leave college prematurely or do not enroll for subsequent terms (Frame & Cummins-Sebree, 2017; NCES, 2018; Raisman, 2013).

Community college: A community college is a local institution that provides higher education courses to local students. Community colleges are usually commuter colleges, often have open admissions policies, and offer classes that may transfer to 4-year institutions (Chen, 2018).

Intrusive advising: Intrusive advising is a form of academic advising that provides the advisors with the ability to interact with students regarding academic performance and academic planning during the student's tenure at the institution (Donaldson et al., 2016).

Persistence: Persistence in postsecondary education describes the phenomenon of students who return to any college in subsequent years following the freshman year, typically measured as a percentage (NSCRC, 2018).

Remedial courses or learning support courses: Remedial courses or learning support are courses designed to meet the learning gap of underprepared college students (Clotfelter et al., 2015; Pruett & Absher, 2015).

Retention: Retention in education is the measurement, usually as a percentage, of students who return to the same school the following school year or the following term. It is usually a measure of first-year undergraduate students but can apply to students in their second or third years as well as term to term (NCES, 2018).

Self-efficacy: Self-efficacy is the confidence students have in their ability to perform and complete tasks (Martin et al., 2017).

Student engagement: Student engagement refers to the degree of attention, interest, and participation a student has or exhibits during the learning process (Fredin et al., 2015).

Assumptions

There were aspects of the study that were believed but could not be demonstrated to be true. One assumption was that the basic qualitative inquiry was an appropriate methodology to use for this study. Qualitative inquiry is appropriate for making meaning of complex psycho-social phenomenon such as understanding the role of intrusive advising in college students' persistence (Patton, 2015). A second assumption was that the inclusion criteria of participants were appropriate and that participants were chosen

based on their knowledge of the phenomena under study. If participants were not chosen appropriately, then the study will not yield data to best understand the phenomena (Creswell, 2012). A third assumption is that participants would be honest and forthcoming with information regarding their feelings and interactions with intrusive advising and in describing their college experiences and persistence decisions. The assumption of participants being forthcoming and honest was critical to the meaningfulness of this study. If participants were not forthcoming, no narrative data would be yielded, and no meaning could have been made about the study's phenomenon. Without honesty, results would be untrue and meaningless (Patton, 2002).

Scope and Delimitations

The scope of this study was delimited to one small urban open admissions community college in the southeastern United States whose students had received at least one intrusive advising intervention. Participants were selected from current students who have received an intrusive advising intervention. Former students that did receive intrusive advising intervention and chose not to persist or students who have not received an intrusive advising intervention were not included in the study. Results of the study will be transferable only to similar institutions and current students who are represented by participants interviewed (Lodico et al., 2010).

Frameworks related to the study that were not be used are Tinto's (1993) model of institutional departure and Tinto's (1988) model of student attrition and persistence. Tinto's model of institutional departure describes a student's path to college which contains elements of their environment and describes a mismatch of goals between the

student and the institution which contributes to early departure. Tinto's model of student

attrition and persistence explains that students have expectations and aspirations when

arriving to college, but a lack of academic and social integration can lead to early

departure decisions. I chose Tinto's model of student integration because this model

accounts for the academic and social integration needed for students to stay in school.

Tinto's model of student integration along with Bandura's triadic reciprocal causation

model was applied in the analysis of narrative data resulting from this study.

Limitations

Limitations include potential researcher bias, transferability, dependability, and

participant response bias. The first limitation was potential researcher bias. Researcher

bias is influencing results to align with preconceived hypothesis or assumptions about the

findings of the study (Polit & Beck, 2014). I took the following measures to reduce the

potential for researcher bias. I constructed interview questions objectively to ensure that

they were not leading questions that supports a personal assumption. I acknowledged that

collecting data for qualitative research amasses volumes of data that makes analysis time-

consuming. I transcribed the interviews and notes immediately following each interview

and ask the participants to member check interview transcripts to ensure their accuracy. I

considered all the data collected, re-evaluated the data, and set aside pre-existing

assumptions when analyzing data.

The second limitation is transferability. Transferability refers to the ability of the

study's findings to be applied to similar sites (Lodico et al., 2010). I collected data at only

one site. Transferability of the findings will be limited to community colleges with

similar demographics as the study site. To improve transferability of findings, I provided a detailed description of the study site and profiled participants so readers of results can decide if study findings are transferable to another setting of interest.

The third limitation is dependability of data. Dependability refers to the ability to "track the procedures and processes used to collect and interpret data" (Lodico et al., 2010, p. 275). Dependability of data may be impacted by several factors including the environment in which data will be collected and the tools used to collect the data. To improve dependability, I provided "detailed description of data collection and analysis procedures and made data available for review" (Lodico et al., 2010, p. 276). Because data were collected during time of COVID-19 pandemic, I recorded interviews conducted via teleconference.

Participant response bias is another factor that could limit the findings. Participant response bias could occur if participants respond to the interview questions based on what they think the researcher wants to hear rather than what they truly feel (McCambridge et al., 2012). To reduce participants' response bias, I carefully developed and asked open-ended questions and follow up questions; I did not lead participants to a particular response, although I did have to explain some terms to some participants, and asked non-confrontational and engaging questions during the interview.

Significance

This study about the role of intrusive advising on retaining students at community colleges is significant because it may advance knowledge in education and college teaching and learning, advance practice in the field of academic advising, and inform

academic advising policies which have implications for social change. Intrusive advising has the potential of improving retention; however, few studies have been conducted in the past 5 years on intrusive advising's role on community college retention (Donaldson et al., 2016). This study will add to that body of knowledge. In addition, this study has the potential to expand the scholarship of teaching and learning to inform advising practices designed to help retain students.

Academic advising programs should be structured in ways to provide high levels of student support and impact (Harrell & Reglin, 2018). Therefore, advisors must understand the needs of students. This study can inform academic advising from a student's perspective of their experiences with intrusive advising and the role it plays in their decision to persist. This study can inform academic advising policy and resultant retention of students. Social change could occur based on the results of this study by providing information that could contribute to developing best practices for academic advisors who in turn, influence the retention of students.

Summary

Low-income, first-generation status, and students who lack academic preparedness are reliable components in predicting student retention (DeAngelo & Franke, 2016; Elfman, 2015; Ma & Baum, 2016; Pruett & Absher, 2015). Additionally, minority students and students placed in learning support courses are at a higher risk of departing college early (Chen & Simone, 2016; Thomas, 2017). Community colleges' unique status of having a large population of students that possess all of the risk factors identified in the literature as predictors of early departure makes developing a

comprehensive retention program challenging. More community colleges have shifted their advising approach to intrusive advising, yet the retention rates at community colleges have remained relatively steady since 2009. Intrusive advising has not been well studied at community colleges and a review of the literature revealed four studies conducted within the last 5 years focused on intrusive advising at community colleges.

The research paradigm used in the study was a basic qualitative inquiry guided by two research questions that were used to develop an interview protocol. The study was limited to one urban open admission community college with participants who had experience with intrusive advising. This study has the potential to contribute to positive social change by providing data that could assist community colleges with challenging student demographics with retention strategies, add to the scant extant literature, and help establish best practices in academic advising approaches. Chapter 2 contains a more detailed review of the literature and conceptual frameworks used to frame the study.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

The role of intrusive advising has not been explored in persistence among the general population of community college students, though intrusive advising has been touted as a practice to improve retention in U.S. community colleges. Intrusive advising has the potential to positively impact retention at community colleges (Donaldson et al., 2016), especially for remedial or developmental courses (Thomas, 2017). However, other research has found mixed results regarding other academic outcomes like student grades (Frame & Cummins-Sebree, 2017; Rios, 2019). The purpose of this basic qualitative inquiry was to explore the role of intrusive advising on retaining students at a small, urban community colleges in the southeastern United States. This chapter starts with an explanation of the search strategy and key search terms used to conduct the literature review for this study. The conceptual frameworks used to frame this study will then be presented. Literature related to key concepts comprises the bulk of this Chapter 2. The chapter closes with a summary and conclusions.

Literature Search Strategy

This literature review was conducted to examine current research on barriers that impact retention and academic advising practices in postsecondary institutions that address these barriers. Guided by Bandura's (1977, 1986, 1997) triadic reciprocal causation model and Tinto's (1975) model of student integration, I explored the role of intrusive advising on retaining students at community colleges in the United States. A search for literature was conducted in Walden University's library. Databases searched included Education Source, Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), SAGE

Journals, Academic Search Complete, and ProQuest Central. Other resources used to obtain information included Google Scholar, college websites, government websites, Pedagogy in Action, and other academic associations. Key search terms used in the literature search included the following combinations of terms: *academic advising* and *community college*, *academic advising* and *retention*, *intrusive advising* and *community college*, *intrusive advising* and *retention*, *academic advising approaches* and *community college*, *academic advising approaches* and *retention*, *community college* and *retention*, *advising as teaching*, *personal attributes*, *college readiness*, *behavioral factors*, *environmental experiences*, *academic* and *social integration*, *student engagement* and *retention*, and *the scholarship of teaching* and *learning*.

Resulting from the search for current and seminal literature were numerous articles that were organized in themes related to key variables of the study. Themes presented in this Chapter 2 include advising as teaching and the scholarship of teaching and learning; academic advising, approaches, and frequency; personal attributes of college students; college readiness; behavioral factors; environmental factors; academic and social integration; and economic and social disadvantages. A summary concludes the review of the literature.

Conceptual Framework

Bandura's triadic reciprocal causation model and Tinto's student integration model were integrated to provide the conceptual framework for this study.

Bandura's Triadic Reciprocal Causation Model

Bandura triadic reciprocal model explains how (a) behavior, which consists of expectancies, environmental cues, and self-efficacy; (b) personal and cognitive factors, which consist of knowledge and skills, motivation, and affect; and (c) social environment, which consists of self-observation and self-judgment, are interdependent and can be driving forces in a student's decision to persist in college (Bandura, 1977, 1986, 1997). Bandura (1977, 1986) argued that cognitive processes play an important role in one's behavior and that one's behavior influences and is influenced by social and personal factors. Bandura (1997) further asserted that personal characteristics and other learned behaviors impact how one interacts with the environment and social stimuli. Social influences are modified by one's expectations, beliefs, and cognitive ability (Bandura, 1986). Bandura (1986) also explained that social influences provide information that causes one to react through modeling behavior and that instruction and social persuasion are products of social influences.

Learning and study strategies are behavioral responses, and instructional opportunities and institutional context are associated with environmental conditions (Heller & Cassady, 2017). For example, students attending lectures are influenced by the instruction (Bandura, 1989). Personal factors allow an individual to model actions observed and determine whether to exhibit behavior in a learning environment (Middleton et al., 2018). Further, learning must include four elements: (a) goal orientation and self-direction, (b) motivation and engagement, (c) self-efficacy, and (d) self-confidence (Conley & French, 2014). Self-reflection allows one to engage in self-

evaluation and to understand experiences, explore beliefs, and modify behavior (Turki et al., 2018). Self-observation influences one's motivation and that these self-motivating factors allow one to give attention to their own behavior (Bandura, 1986). Self-regulation allows students to set proactive goals and use effective strategies to engage more in the learning environment (Zimmerman, 2013).

The triadic reciprocal causation model was applied during data analysis to gain a better understanding of the participants' confluence of goals, values, norms, attitudes, behavior, and environmental factors that influence their persistence decisions as well as their interactions with intrusive advising. Bandura's model emphasizes how personal attributes, behaviors, and environmental factors are interdependent and can affect one's decision to depart college early. Therefore, there is a connection between this model and the research questions used to guide this study regarding how students who have experienced intrusive advising describe their advising and college experiences and how they describe the role of intrusive advising on their persistence decisions.

Current studies have also applied Bandura's triadic reciprocal causation model as a framework. Heller and Cassady (2017) used Bandura's triadic reciprocal causation model to study student behavior at both a community college and a 4-year institution to investigate the influence of variables in student performance. Using multivariant analysis of variance, discriminant analysis, and multiple regression analyses, they found environmental factors more significant in predicting student outcomes among diverse student populations at community colleges. Kinkle (2020) used Bandura's model to study student behavior in an associate degree respiratory therapy program using convenience

sampling. The researcher used binary logistic regression and found that specific personal, behavioral, and environmental factors appear to influence student outcomes. Bandura's model was beneficial to the current study in studying the behavior of students who received intrusive advising interventions. Furthermore, the model was beneficial in understanding how personal, behavioral, and environmental factors were significant to the persistence of students who received intrusive advising interventions.

Tinto's Student Integration Model

Tinto's (1975) model of student integration advances that student retention is precipitated on the students' ability to integrate academically and socially with the institution. Tinto argued that students who become both academically and socially connected to an institution are more likely to persist. Student integration, both socially and academically, causes students to modify goals and commitment toward persistence (Fong et al., 2016; Pleitz et al., 2015). Students who develop connections either with other students or faculty are more likely to persist than those students who feel isolated and unconnected (Karp et al., 2008). Academic integration occurs when students are able to connect to the academic aspects of college inside the classroom and social integration occurs when students are able to connect to the social aspects of college outside of the classroom (Karp et al., 2008).

Tinto (1975, 1993) further explained that academic and social integration does not have to occur equally but must occur in conjunction to promote persistence. Tinto (1993) later argued that premature college departure is a result of interactions between a student's personal attributes, financial resources, and family background along with

integration with the academic and social aspects of college. Tinto also advanced that academic advising plays a vital role in student integration (Donaldson et al., 2016). Academic advising is an important factor in helping students integrate academically and socially (Tinto, 1975, 1993), and intrusive advising seeks to help students integrate better with the institution. Therefore, a connection exists between Tinto's model and research questions used to guide this study regarding how students who experienced intrusive advising described their advising and college experiences and how they described the role of intrusive advising on their persistence decisions.

A plethora of researchers have used Tinto's model of student integration to frame their studies on student retention or to determine its applicability in community colleges. For example, Chrysikos et al. (2017) applied Tinto's model of student integration to study low retention rates of first-year students in a UK post- secondary institution. The authors used Pascarella and Terenzini's questionnaire to collect data that were analyzed using the structural equation modelling technique. The study found that the theory is "useful in analyzing student retention, but only accounts for a modest amount of variance in retention" (p. 97). Karp et al. (2008) applied Tinto's model of student integration at two community colleges and their findings refuted previous assumptions that the model was not applicable to community colleges. Randomly selected students were interviewed and the data analyzed thematically. Their findings showed that academic and social integration occurred in concert through the same activities for community college students. Tinto's model of student integration is still being applied to study retention at

both four year and community colleges. The framework was beneficial to my study in analyzing the role of intrusive advising in students' decision to persist.

I decided both of Tinto's model and Bandura's theory would fit this investigation because of the complex interactions between the student and institution. Physical and socio-structural environments of a college are restrictive and dictate boundaries for behavior (Bergman et al., 2019). More specifically, students assess the environment through careful deliberations based on prior learned behavior and other personal characteristics to decide whether they can adjust their behavior to interact with the imposed environment (Bergman et al., 2019). The student makes a decision based on whether they can make a connection or integrate with the institution. Using these two frameworks together provided a clearer link to the research questions and help guide the literature research.

Literature Review Related to Key Concepts

The content of this literature review includes research concentrated on personal attributes, college readiness, behavioral factors, environmental experiences, academic and social integration, economic and social disadvantages, academic advising approaches, and the scholarship of teaching and learning.

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning and Advising as Teaching

According to National Academic Advising Association "academic advising is integral to fulfilling the teaching and learning mission of higher education" (van den Wijngaard, 2019, para. 7). However, the pedagogical potential of academic advising is often overlooked by institutional stakeholders (McGill, 2016). As more students arrive at

community colleges ill prepared for college level work, academic advisors play a pivotal role in college student success. Historically, academic advising has been largely viewed as a practice of course recommendations, but recent scholarship has shown the prescriptive approach to academic advising to be counterproductive in improving retention (Heller & Cassady, 2017; McGill, 2016; Walters, 2016). Emerging research suggests that the scholarship of teaching and learning can inform the practice of academic advising to provide more effective advising sessions and improve outcomes (Hemwall & Trachte, 1999; Lowenstein, 2020; Rose, 2020; van den Wijngaard, 2019), especially when used in conjunction with intrusive advising (Walters, 2016).

Earlier researchers made connections between academic advising and teaching and noted similarities of the two disciplines (Bitterman, 1985; Crookston, 1972; Drake et al., 2013; Wade & Yoder, 1995). Crookston's (1972) seminal work introduced the phrase *advising as teaching* and illustrated that both academic advising and teaching "facilitate[s] student's rational processes, environmental and interpersonal interactions, behavioral awareness, problem solving, decision-making, and evaluation skills" (p. 12). Bitterman (1985) predicted that academic advising would evolve to become student centered and entail elements of teaching and learning. Wade and Yoder (1995) argued that both advising and teaching emphasize relationships that foster students' needs and personal growth. Other researchers have expounded on Crookston's work, although most have framed their research using developmental learning paradigm and developmental advising approach (McGill, 2016; Walters, 2016). However, McGill (2016) pointed out

that academic advisors' accounts of connecting advising and teaching is missing in the literature.

Additionally, Drake et al. (2013) proposed that academic advising is akin to teaching and learning, and as such, according to McGill (2016), academic advisors play an important role in teaching students through the advising experience. Academic advising as teaching has the propensity to facilitate student growth and improve student outcomes (Walters, 2016). According to Rose (2020), "advising as teaching places the advisor in a role that facilitates students' relationships to and understanding of the entire curriculum" (para. 2). Academic advising help students develop necessary skills to navigate the college environment and curriculum content (McGill, 2016). To be effective, researchers argue, academic advisors should have foundational knowledge and be familiar with and utilize pedagogical models such as Bloom's (1956) taxonomy of educational objectives, educational frameworks, and principles of teaching and learning (Kraft-Terry & Kau, 2019; Lowenstein, 2020; Rose, 2020; Walters, 2016). Academic advisors need foundational knowledge to support student development (Kraft-Terry & Kau, 2019).

Researchers have advocated for designing advising curriculums based on teaching and learning pedagogies (Kraft-Terry & Kau, 2019; Lowenstein, 2020; Rose, 2020; Walters, 2016). Lowenstein (2020) advanced that as with teaching, advisors should sequentially organize material to give meaning to the advisee, promote discovery and learning, and help students identify interrelationships of the college environment. Drake et al. (2013) and Walters (2016) argued that advising as teaching should be centered on

clear objectives and guided practice and contain elements of a lesson plan and syllabus. The flipped classroom, backward design, scaffolding, and transparent assignments are four teaching strategies that can be adjusted to align with academic advising (Rose, 2020).

Flipped Classroom

The flipped classroom strategy allows teachers to provide course material before class for students to review, study, or complete and then discuss the material in class to provide more robust learning opportunities (McCarthy, 2016). Though the flipped classroom strategy used with academic advising has not been well studied, this strategy could allow academic advisors to deliver information to students prior to advising appointments (Rose, 2020). This would allow students to formulate questions prior to their appointment and empower students to become more actively involved in their advising sessions (Rose, 2020). Even though this strategy could provide more time for advisor and student to work on issues during the appointment (Rose, 2020), critics of the flipped classroom strategy point out disadvantages to students and staff. These disadvantages include students, especially those in need of intrusive interventions, may lack self-directedness or motivation to do prework for appointment, or lack computer access (McCarthy, 2016). The flipped classroom strategy may also increase the workload or costs of the advising staff (McCarthy, 2016), who are often underfunded and overworked (Kraft-Terry & Kau, 2019).

Backward Design

Of the four teaching strategies mentioned by Rose (2020), only the backward

design has received attention in academic advising literature. The backward design starts

with identifying student learning objectives and then work backward to develop activities

that would contribute to the prescribed learning outcomes (Kraft-Terry & Kau, 2019;

Rose, 2020). Researchers supported developing a proactive advising curriculum using the

backward design to ensure learning objectives are met and include comprehensive

assessment plans to evaluate the curriculum (Kraft-Terry & Kau, 2019, p. 60). They also

posited that "the impact of developing an intentional advising curriculum should not be

underestimated, particularly with regard to student persistence" (p. 60). Further, other

researchers emphasized that an assessment plan is necessary to ensure desired learning

outcomes, otherwise the advising is not indicative of teaching (Banta et al., 2002). It has

been suggested academic advisors use the backward design to evaluate their performance

with academically at-risk students and design elements and objectives that contribute to

the desired outcomes (Rose, 2020). An intentionally developed proactive advising

curriculum using backward design with students who were at-risk academically was

studied and results showed an improvement in student learning, although the authors

were unable to make a connection to improved grades or retention (Kraft-Terry & Kau,

2019).

Scaffolding and Transparent Assignments

As stand-alone strategies used with academic advising, scaffolding and

transparent assignments have not been well studied in the academic advising literature,

although, several researchers justified the use of scaffolding in improving student

outcomes (Kraft-Terry & Kau, 2019; McGill, 2016; Walters, 2016). Scaffolding is a

methodical approach to incrementally build on foundational knowledge (Lewis, 2019).

Lewis further stated "the goal of scaffolding is to meet students at their ability level and

guide them to grow one step at a time" (para. 2). This concept was applied to the

academic advising setting by informing academic advisors should help students build on

"current levels of knowledge" to facilitate growth (McGill, 2016, p. 53). As an advising

strategy, scaffolding aligns well with more frequent advising sessions and encouraged by

Fosnacht et al. (2017) and Walters and Seyedian (2016). It allows the intrusive advisor to

layer information that would help student work through personal, behavioral, and

environment issues as well as help students learn adjustment skills and coping strategies

(Walters, 2016).

     Transparent assignments explain why the assignment is being given and work

well with individual and group advising (Rose, 2020). Winkelmes (2013) postulated that

the explanation should also include the benefits for engaging in the assignment, and

Winkelmes et al. (2016) found that underrepresented students populations benefitted

from this approach. As an advising tool, advisors can get students to actively participate

in the advising session that will produce more meaningful advising sessions (Rose, 2020).

Drawing from these and other teaching and learning strategies can inform the practice of

academic advising to help students meet their educational goals.

Academic Advising: Approaches and Frequency

The National Academic Advising Association (NACADA, 2006) defines academic advising as "a series of intentional interactions… that synthesizes and contextualizes students' educational experiences" and plays an integral role of a college's mission to educate and inform (para 10). The goals of academic advising are to "(a) help students understand themselves, (b) help students make decisions about educational and career goals, (c) monitor their academic progress, (d) encourage students to assess their own progress, (e) educate students about university policies, and (f) direct students to resources that can help them" (Zhang et al., 2017, pp. 12-13). In other words, academic advising as a tool is used to ensure students are on track to graduate, provide information on other resources, such as tutoring, and help students become more integrated with the college experience. Because advisors are on the front line of academic integration, it is imperative that they develop a good rapport with students to better enhance the college experience.

Many community college students are underprepared for college level work and possess other factors that are predictors of early departure. Therefore, academic advising is critical to student persistence, and several research findings indicate academic advising positively impacts student retention (Donaldson et al., 2016). However, for an academic advising program to be effective it must incorporate elements that are actually beneficial for the student and be valued by the student (Walters & Seyedian, 2016). Historically, academic advising at community colleges has been plagued with a high student/advisor ratio with one estimate of 1,600 students per one advisor (CCCSE, 2018; Community

College Research Center [CCRC], 2013). Many students, especially underachieving students, are in need of close supervision, but are usually granted only one advising session per semester (Walters & Seyedian, 2016). Another problem CCCSE (2018) identified with community college academic advising was that students were not assigned to a specific advisor, which can result in conflicting information and student dissatisfaction. Student dissatisfaction with academic advising, especially prescriptive advising, could impact student persistence (DeLaRosby, 2017). Moreover, some researchers have noted that many faculty and administrators did not place much value on academic advising (Walters & Seyedian, 2016). However, "academic advising is one of the key components in higher education institutions that directly impact student development" (He & Hutson, 2016, p. 213).

Research studies have shown that academic advising plays a critical role in college student retention (Cholewa & Ramaswami, 2015; Donaldson et al., 2016; Harrell & Reglin, 2018; Walters & Seyedian, 2016), and many colleges shifted their approach to academic advising as a tool to improve student retention (CCCSE, 2016). In order to affect student retention, academic advisors should practice student relationship management to strengthen the connection between students and institutions (Vianden, 2016). Other authors argued that academic advisors should advocate for the students to help students create meaningful academic relationships with faculty (Kimball & Campbell, 2013). Facilitating faculty-student interaction helps students feel more academically connected to the institution. However, historically academic advising has taken a passive approach in which advisors only help students choose courses for degree

completion and do not spend a lot of time with students to help them with other issues

(Tudor, 2018). Conversely, students' self-efficacy and persistence is influenced by strong

relationships with academic advisors (Vianden & Barlow, 2014). Evidence points to

quality and quantity of student interactions with advisors as being beneficial to positive

retention outcomes (DeLaRosby, 2017). Moreover, "an effective advising program is

critical to student success" (Harrell & Reglin, 2018, p. 33).

As community colleges restructure their academic advising approaches to meet

student and institutional needs, colleges must "understand what students want from

academic advising" in order to serve the needs of students (Harrell & Reglin, 2018, p 36).

Research correlating student satisfaction and academic advising can assist colleges in

understanding the factors associated with student satisfaction to help with increasing

retention efforts (DeLaRosby, 2017). Additionally, "by systematically collecting

qualitative data, not only can we create a holistic view of student advising but also we

can create additional opportunities to improve our understanding and practice in student

advising" (Zhang et al., 2017, p. 5).

Academic Advising Approaches

He and Hutson (2016) stated that "academic advising approaches can be

categorized into five major types with their foci on information, intervention, student

holistic development, student learning outcomes, and strength and asset building" (p.

215). More specifically, these academic advising categories are addressed in the literature

as prescriptive, developmental, intrusive, appreciative, virtual, and group. Prescriptive or

traditional advising is described as an authoritative, passive process of helping students

select the proper courses for degree completion (DeLaRosby, 2017). Developmental advising involves helping students balance academic coursework and social activities (DeLaRosby, 2017). Intrusive advising allows advisors to monitor students' academic progress and reach out to students when certain benchmarks are not met (Thomas, 2017). Appreciative advising is ''the intentional, collaborative practice of asking positive, open-ended questions that help students optimize their educational experiences and achieve their dreams, goals, and potentials'' (Hutson et al., 2014, p. 48). Virtual advising is a process that uses online programs or digital means to provide advising sessions to students (Thompson & Prieto, 2013). Group advising is a technique used to advise several students at the same time (Battin, 2014).

Prescriptive Advising. Prescriptive advising or traditional advising has been the method of academic advising for many years and employed by various colleges. This method basically provides a schedule of classes for students to take to progress toward degree attainment. Students meet with an advisor once during a semester to register for classes for the next semester. This is done almost passively as advisors give students the information needed to register for classes and the student receives the information. According to DeLaRosby (2017) the majority of academic advising is performed by faculty who usually employ the prescriptive style to advising because a lower degree of importance is placed on advising duties. Interestingly, prescriptive or traditional advising uses extrinsic rewards such as grades and future salaries to help motivate or inspire at-risk students (Walters & Seyedian, 2016). The literature has not informed that prescriptive advising has a positive impact on retention, although many studies have

shown that academic advising has the propensity to effect change in student satisfaction and student retention. Prescriptive or traditional advising has done little to inform removal of barriers often associated with personal, behavioral, and environmental factors experienced by urban college students in particular, and community college students in general (Heller & Cassady, 2017).

Developmental Advising. Developmental advising provides a more holistic approach to academic advising than prescriptive advising because it focuses on cognitive and non-cognitive development of the student (He & Hutson, 2016). Developmental advising involves the advisor interacting with students to help the student become more academically and socially integrated with the college (DeLaRosby, 2017). Drake et al. (2013) explained that developmental advising is an important connection between advisors and students and has the propensity to affect persistence. Walters and Seyedian (2016) argued that developmental advising allows students to become active participants where intrinsic rewards are emphasized such as achievement to help students increase maturity and self-direction. Developmental advising allows discussion between advisor and student about academic goals and helps the student with problem solving and devising a path to accomplish goals (Zhang et al., 2017). Prior research on developmental advising showed a positive relationship with student engagement (Walters & Seyedian, 2016). According to DeLaRosby (2017) developmental advising used in conjunction with prescriptive advising is ideal.

Intrusive Advising. Intrusive advising is a proactive, intervention, oriented approach that allows advisors to reach out to students who are at risk or may experience

academic obstacles. Unlike prescriptive advising, intrusive advising does not focus

primarily on course selection but provides support and intervention tools to help at risk

students overcome academic challenges (He & Hutson, 2016; Thomas, 2017). For

example, if a student is in jeopardy of failing a course, an academic advisor will meet

with the student to recommend strategies and resources to help the student get grades in

better standing. Additionally, the academic advisor will follow-up with the students

periodically to ensure student makes appropriate behavior modification. Thomas (2017)

explained that intrusive advising is an effective approach for students assigned to

developmental courses and Varney (2013) suggested that this is best accomplished by

establishing an early relationship with at-risk students and frequent communication.

Intrusive advising allows students to become more actively engaged in academic

planning and "compels students to respond to issues in academic planning (Donaldson et

al., 2016, p. 32). This approach has been identified with improved retention among at-risk

students and students taking developmental courses (He & Hutson, 2016; Thomas, 2017).

Thomas (2017) argued that an effective intrusive advising program should contain the

characteristics of cohesion, cooperation, connection, and consistency. Thomas also

demonstrated that programs containing these characteristics have shown improved

outcomes for students in developmental courses at community colleges.

Appreciative Advising. Appreciative advising supports students in a positive and

holistic manner by promoting positive interactions between advisor and students.

Truschel (2015) suggested that appreciative advising can promote student integration

with the college. Appreciative advising seeks to change negative thought processes of

students by emphasizing strengths and assets of the students (He & Hutson, 2016). The

operating principles of this approach focus on helping students identify and affirm talent,

planning steps to achieve dreams and applying strengths to challenges (Schreiner, 2013;

Truschel, 2015). In addition to promoting cognitive and metacognitive development,

appreciative advising also promotes affective development of students (Bloom et al.,

2013). According to He and Hutson (2016), advisors should "build upon appreciative

inquiry and encourage students in *disarm, discover, dream, design, deliver, and don't

settle* phases and co-construct the learning process with students" (pp. 217-218). While

somewhat similar to developmental advising, appreciative advising emphasizes student's

strengths and assets and can be advantageous with diverse student populations because of

the individualized component (He & Hutson, 2016). At-risk students, such as those

attending community colleges, could benefit more from appreciative advising (Truschel,

2015). This approach is more time consuming than other approaches; however, Hutson et

al. (2014) and Zhang et al. (2017) found a positive relation between appreciative advising

and student retention, and Zhang et al. stated that "appreciative advising has been widely

adopted in higher education" (2017, p. 3).

     Virtual Advising. Virtual advising consists of using online programs to

administer advising sessions and usually available 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

This method provided information about degree requirements, course scheduling, and

information about the college. There are several benefits of using this approach such as

students' convenience, consistent dissemination of information, and reduction of time

constraints of an overburdened advising staff (Thompson & Prieto, 2013). However, they

point out that the method is impersonal and "could hurt unmotivated students" (Thompson & Prieto, 2013, p. 23). While many schools report using some form of virtual advising program, the literature is scant on its effectiveness of improved student outcomes and retention. Conversely, they also found that "virtualized advising systems would not successfully replicate the encouragement factor found in the face-to-face advising" (Thompson & Prieto, 2013, p. 13).

Group Advising. Group advising is an effective and proactive approach that allows several students to receive advising at the same time. This approach is beneficial in disseminating consistent information to many students who need to receive the same or similar information can be less time consuming than one-on-one advising, and can help students adjust to college (Ryan, 2015; Zhang et al., 2017). Group advising can promote personal student growth, encourage student engagement, build community, promote connectedness to the college, create a feeling of fitting in for the students, and promote positive student outcomes (Ryan, 2015). The group advising model works well with millennials and with students who are not performing well academically (Zhang et al., 2017). Moreover, group advising was instrumental in reducing student isolation and impacts student success (Battin, 2014).

Advising Frequency

Advising frequency and session duration, or advising intensity, also emerged in the literature as having a positive impact on student outcomes (Fosnacht et al., 2017; Walters & Seyedian, 2016). Research suggests that community college students who spend more than 30 minutes or have more than one contact encounter with advisor are

more successful than the students who do not (CCCSE, 2018). However, CCCSE (2018) also reported that only 16% of community college students received an intensive advising encounter with an academic advisor and 31% of students received less-intensive encounters lasting less than fifteen minutes. Given that many community college students are underprepared, are first generation, from low-income families, and have other early departure predisposition factors, advising intensity can help community colleges provide more comprehensive advising to more students (CCCSE, 2018).

Personal Attributes of College Students

Students matriculating into college bring with them their attitudes, beliefs, and values that have been shaped by their experiences, economic situations, and upbringing. However, students often find the college environment challenges their attitudes, beliefs, and values. Schunk et al. (2014) argued that student beliefs and values had a significant influence on student persistence. More research is needed on students' personal qualities and their effects on persistence because only a few studies have focused on attitudes and dispositions (Fong et al., 2016). Personal attributes and other non-cognitive factors, such as motivation, behaviors, strategies, and affect have not been well studied among diverse, urban college students (Farruggia et al., 2018). Several studies suggest that non-cognitive factors play a more pivotal role in student attrition than cognitive factors, such as knowledge and skills (Duckworth & Yeager, 2015; Fong et al., 2018). Students' desire for autonomy and competence increased the likelihood of persistence Guiffrida et al., 2013). Millar and Tanner (2011) asserted that "a strong sense of identity and positive self-concept are important psychological assets for students from at-risk populations" (p.

2). The research on student attitudes and the relationship to retention is not as voluminous as other factors; and, several theories and mixed findings emerged in the literature. However, most researchers agree that while many students desire to further their education, their attitudes and values can prohibit their persistence.

Motivation plays an integral part of college persistence and success, and a lot of researchers have focused on motivation, goal setting, and strategies (Slanger et al., 2015). Pintrich and De Groot (1990) identified expectancy, intrinsic value, and affect as the three motivational components to student motivation and more recent research has focused more on the value component of academic motivation. Academic motivation consists of the goals a student set for a task and how important the student believes the task to be (Han et al., 2017). Therefore, they maintained that a student's reason for performing a task affects their persistence in learning. Students who are intrinsically motivated play a pivotal role in their learning as these students engage more in learning activities and develop study strategies that lead to more positive outcomes according to Heller and Cassady (2017). Han et al. (2017) stated "even if a student is confronted by harsh environments or negative outcomes, a positive intrinsic value makes the learner continue to engage in the learning-related activities" (pp. 1,121). Many researchers agree that a student's desire to obtain an education does not always equal their motivation to obtain one. Low-income students' motivation for enrolling in college could stem from a desire to improve financial outcomes and urged advisors to focus on this aspect to improve academic outcomes (Guiffrida et al., 2013). Student motivation is sustained

when students participate and monitor their learning as well as set proactive goals and respond to feedback Zimmerman, 2013).

Non-cognitive skills, personal factors, and behavior, such as time management, balancing obligations, study habits, goal setting, self-awareness, and ownership of learning can also influence retention (Conley & French, 2014; Duckworth & Yeager, 2015). Students who have high GPAs, have mastered content knowledge, and scored well on standardized tests are not immune to the struggles of performing at the college level (Fong et al., 2018). Moreover, non-cognitive factors impact college success and retention, but interventions at this level can be instrumental in helping students grow (Fong et al., 2016). Self-regulated learning strategies are important and student academic outcomes were improved when students engaged in cognitive and metacognitive learning, and resource management (Heller & Cassady, 2017).

Cognitive factors such as knowledge and skills can have a direct impact on a student's decision to depart college early. Some students experience a gap in foundational learning and skills that make it difficult to perform in rigorous college courses. Several reasons for this gap in knowledge have emerged in the literature. First, this learning gap is a direct reflection on the preparations a student makes or fail to make in high school (Mokher et al., 2018). Secondly, high school students are not exposed to more rigorous coursework (Woods et al., 2019). Thirdly, the high school curriculum does not align with college expectations (Hanover Research, 2016). The lack of knowledge and skills to transition to college and perform at the college level can be a direct reflection of the preparations students make in high school and exposure to rigorous coursework many

students lack. Therefore, a student's personal attributes can impact college readiness and ability to perform at the college level. While students possess the cognitive ability to perform at the college level, they lack transferable skills and techniques necessary to be successful at the college level (Conley, 2014).

College Readiness

College readiness is described as having the knowledge and skills needed to perform college level coursework (Conley, 2014). College readiness has been associated with college student retention as many students enroll in community colleges unprepared for college level work (American Institutes of Research, 2020; CCCSE, 2016). Tierney and Sablan (2014) stated that "preparation for college level work is a key factor in persistence" (p. 944). Students who are academically unprepared for college level work are more likely to depart college early (DeAngelo & Franke, 2016). It is estimated that more than one-third of students entering college for the first time are not college ready (CCCSE, 2016; Hedrick et al., 2014); however, an estimated 86.0% of students believed they were (CCCSE, 2016). Less than one-fourth of underserved students are college ready (ACT, 2018), and two-thirds of students entering community colleges needed developmental courses (CCCSE, 2016). A decline in reading ability contributed to students' academic unpreparedness according to Shaffer et al. (2015) and ACT revealed a steady decline in math and English readiness has been present since 2014.

Emerging trends in the literature suggest that students who prepare academically while in high school by taking college prep courses are more likely to persist in college (Mokher et al., 2018). More rigorous coursework, such as advanced placement courses,

had a positive impact on retention and was germane to college success (Woods et al., 2019). An intense high school curriculum that consists of algebra through pre-calculus was associated with college success (Tierney & Sablan, 2014). However, many students enrolling in community colleges did not participate in a college-ready program (Hanover Research, 2016) and some community college students do not enroll immediately after high school according to CCCSE (2016). Research demonstrated that high school college prep courses do not necessarily prepare students for college level performance (Boatman & Long, 2018). Exposure to academically challenging work in high school is insufficient for success if students lack "confidence in their ability to succeed" (Martinez et al., 2017, p. 174).

For students living in depressed socio-economic areas, inequitable educational opportunities and lowered achievement expectations can impact college readiness of students from low-income families (Jimenez et al., 2016; Martinez et al., 2017). For example, analyzing 2015-16 school year data, the U S Government Accountability Office (GAO) adduced that schools in high poverty areas are less likely to offer courses that help prepare students for college such as higher math and sciences courses (Nowicki, 2018). Interestingly, the GAO also found that charter schools and smaller schools also were less likely to offer higher math and science courses that colleges expect student to have taken prior to enrollment (Nowicki, 2018). However, students who participate in their own learning and take ownership of their learning experience often find more success regardless of the academic challenge or lowered achievement expectations (Conley & French, 2014).

Students with deficient knowledge and skills are not prohibited from pursuing college enrollment at community colleges. Placement tests are often utilized to determine students' proficiency in writing, math, and reading (Boatman & Long, 2018). One-third of students entering community colleges are deficient in at least one of the above areas (Hedrick et al., 2014; Thomas, 2017). One-third of community college students require two or more learning support courses before taking college level courses (Chen & Simone, 2016). Approximately 60% of students lack proficiency in math, while less than one half of students graduating high school met the reading benchmark (ACT, 2018). Some of the deficiencies can be attributed to lack of preparation on the student's part while in high school; others can be attributed to a misalignment of college level expectations with high school course curriculum; and others can be attributed to lowered standards, lowered expectations, and systemic barriers as well as student attitudes and motivation (Douglas & Attewell, 2014; Martinez et al., 2017; Nowicki, 2018).

Students who score poorly on placement tests are placed in remedial or developmental courses to improve skills and knowledge to enable them to perform at the college level (Thomas, 2017). However, research demonstrated significant challenges with remediation. Remedial or developmental courses presented barriers to student persistence and that the majority of students enrolled in remedial courses do not reach a competency level (Jimenez et al., 2016). On the other hand, remediation is necessary at community colleges primarily due to the large number of academically underprepared students enrolling (Boatman & Long, 2018; Pruett & Absher, 2015). While remediation is intended to address knowledge and skill deficiencies and assist with college persistence

(Clotfelter et al., 2015; Pruett & Absher, 2015), research has confirmed that attrition is higher among students who are required to take two or more learning support courses (Frame & Cummins-Sebree, 2017; Jimenez et al., 2016; Ma & Baum, 2016; Pruett & Absher, 2015; Yu, 2015). While this phenomenon has not been fully explained in the literature, many students lack the motivation to persist through remedial courses (Douglas & Attewell, 2014). Traditionally, remedial coursework focuses more on cognitive related skills and less on non-cognitive skills, which has emerged in research as having a more pivotal impact on student persistence (Fong et al., 2016). Further, according to Fong et al., students in developmental courses may benefit more from motivational and self-regulated strategies.

Emerging trends in the literature identify a shift from the sole use of placement tests such as ACCUPLACER or COMPASS to utilizing high school transcripts and overall grade point average to place students in appropriate college level courses (Scott-Clayton et al., 2014; Woods et al., 2018). They also found evidence that placing students in developmental courses based solely on these standardized tests often results in misplacement of students. Students placed in developmental English courses based on COMPASS scores could have been successful in a credit bearing English course if the student had been placed in the credit bearing English course initially (Scott-Clayton & Rodríguez, 2015).

Behavioral Factors

Students' behavioral factors have been well studied with varying results associated with academic performance and persistence. However, not all studies used the

same variables, which could account for the mixed results and the college populations studied could vary depending on the college. Generally, behavioral factors consist of expectancies, environmental cues, and self-efficacy.

Student expectations about college involve students' beliefs about the college experience (Pleitz et al., 2015). Moreover, Pleitz et al. found that students enter college with skewed expectations of how college will be, especially pertaining to academics. They claimed that students have many flawed preconceived thoughts and expectations concerning three main areas of the college experience: "social life; institutional characteristics, and academic rigor" (Pleitz et al., 2015, p. 96). They further maintained that students are more likely to depart college early when there is a disconnection between their expectations of college and their experiences. Research has shown behavior and persistence are influenced by student expectations and experiences (Pleitz et al., 2015). Student expectations reflect their beliefs in their ability and impact academic performance and outcomes (Bolkan et al., 2018). Additionally, student expectations about academic course work are instrumental in determining the outcome of academic performance (Walsh & Robinson Kurpius, 2016). For instance, research has shown a positive correlation between student expectations and task performance. Walsh and Robinson Kurpius elucidated students will work harder to perform academically when their expectation is to do well. Pleitz et al. suggested that since student expectations play such an important role in students' decision to persist, investigating student expectations can prove to be valuable to community colleges.

Environmental Factors

Environmental experiences consist of resources, faculty support, family support,

financial barriers, and adjustment to college; whereas, social environment consists of

self-observation and self-judgment. Bandura (1997) argued that self-observation and self-

judgment are interdependent. Environmental factors, such as faculty support, financial

obligations, and family support and encouragement, as well as first generation status and

socio-economic status have been the object of numerous research studies. The results

have been mixed, but researchers agree that environmental factors impact student success

(Bolkan et al., 2018). Many studies suggest that first generation students have low

academic capital and students from lower socio-economic backgrounds are less likely to

persist (Heller & Cassady, 2017; Ma & Baum, 2016). However, Xu (2017) pointed out

colleges cannot control these factors and suggested that colleges focus more on the

environmental factors the college could control to improve college success. Heller and

Cassady also pointed out that quality instruction, classroom settings, and quality

discussions with teachers have a positive impact on academic success. On the other hand,

environmental factors and students' experiences impact self-efficacy and therefore,

academic outcomes (Bolkan et al., 2018).

Bandura (1986) argued that self-efficacy is crucial to achievement and motivation

and influences behavior. He also stated that self-efficacy reflects one's ability to

"organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given levels of

attainments" (Bandura, 1998, p. 624). Self-efficacy has received a considerable amount

of attention in the research literature. For instance, research supports self-efficacy being

associated with the performance of both academic and nonacademic tasks (Bolkan et al., 2018; Han et al., 2017; Martin et al., 2017). Students with higher self-efficacy were more likely to persist because they set higher goals (Bandura, 2004). Likewise, students with higher self-efficacy were more likely to regulate self-learning, were more goal oriented, and were more likely to exhibit behavior that promoted academic performance and persistence (Komarraju & Nadler, 2013). Highly self-efficacious students were better able to focus on the academic tasks despite distractions and were less likely to quit (Bolkan et al., 2018). However, only a moderate relationship exists between retention and self-efficacy and that self-efficacy had a positive link to academic achievement but not on persistence (Honicke & Broadbent, 2016). On the other hand, self-efficacy and motivation were not significant in improving retention at community colleges (Liao et al., 2014).

Academic self-efficacy is the confidence students have in performing academic tasks and "leads to specific behaviors that can encourage or discourage academic performance and attainment" (Han et al., 2017, p. 1120). They further argued that academic self-efficacy is an important factor in a student's persistence because of the enhanced relation to academic performance. Likewise, a positive link was demonstrated between academic self-efficacy, academic goals, and achievement (Schneider & Preckel, 2017). Higher academic self-efficacy yields positive persistence according to Walsh and Robinson Kurpius (2016). Self-concept and self-efficacy have been well studied in relation to student achievement with mixed results (Fong et al., 2016). Furthermore, they discovered sufficient evidence supporting a positive relationship between self-perceptions

and student success at community colleges. However, the literature does not point to clear parameters for such a relationship.

Academic and Social Integration

Academic and social integration have been identified as key factors in student retention. Academic and social integration have both formal and informal domains with formal academic integration involving students' ability to comply with accepted academic norms of the college (Xu, 2017). Informal academic integration involves student's ability to interact with faculty and other students apart from the classroom environment (Xu, 2017). Studies have shown that students who are able to integrate academically by interacting with faculty, taking greater responsibility for their learning, and investing in study habits and time management are more likely to persist than students who do not (Cholewa & Ramaswami, 2015; Conley & French, 2014; Duckworth & Yeager, 2015; Heller & Cassady, 2017). In addition, student engagement has shown a positive correlation to student success. Students who become more actively engaged with their coursework experience greater college success (Fredin et al., 2015). On the other hand, first-generation students often experience less academic engagement than students with more academic capital which could account for their early departure (Kantamneni et al., 2018). According to Kantamneni et al., first-generation students' lack of academic engagement could contribute to feelings of isolation and disconnectedness to college.

Formal social integration involves students participating in activities such as clubs and other campus activities, and informal social integration refers to how students interact with other students (Xu, 2017). Studies have shown that students who integrate

socially by participating in club activities and other social aspects of college life feel a

stronger connection to the campus environment and are more likely to persist (Cholewa

& Ramaswami, 2015; Duckworth & Yeager, 2015). Persistence is more likely among

students who become more academically and socially connected to the college (Cholewa

& Ramaswami, 2015). They also maintained that academic advisors play an integral role

in helping students integrate both academically and socially with the college (Cholewa &

Ramaswami, 2015). Research points to loneliness and lack of social support as being

significantly associated with retention. Extroverted and introverted students may require

different socialization and the programs and activities to help students integrate socially

may even alienate introverted students. However, there is a gap in the literature to

elucidate the profundity of social and academic integration of introverted and extroverted

students.

Even though community college students generally do not live on campus, these

colleges offer many opportunities for student to participate in social events such as clubs,

volunteer opportunities, and athletic activities. Social integration does not necessarily

have to include participation in social events, a student's ability to socialize with students

in class, participate in study groups, and learning communities can provide students with

the socialization needed to feel a sense of fitting in (Suvedi et al., 2015). Students whose

social experiences did not align with their expectations do not adjust well to social

aspects of college (Pleitz et al., 2015). They further theorized that when social

expectations are not met, students often blame the college for not meeting their needs.

Pleitz et al. also discovered that students with mismatched expectations of the college and

experiences were more likely to leave prematurely. Importantly, a student's feeling of belonging or fitting in had a more positive impact on college retention than did academic performance (Han et al., 2017). A student's level of commitment to obtaining a degree is linked to their level of social and academic integration (Caruth, 2018).

Tinto (1993) argued that student abilities and interests should fit with the institution to improve persistence. Students beginning college often have unrealistic expectancies of the college experience and Pleitz et al. (2015) posited that unrealistic expectations play a vital role in attrition. Skewed expectancies and lack of familiarity can cause anxiety and frustration for the student causing the student to question goals and ability, especially when this is coupled with lack of college readiness or preparedness. Millennials expect technology integration in coursework and the lack of technology integration can pose challenges for student performance (Turner & Thompson, 2014). Motivation to seek faculty assistance or to integrate into the social activities of the college requires a behavioral changes and social persuasion. Suvedi et al. (2015) explained that "colleges must intentionally help those students integrate socially and intellectually with the culture of the college by creating opportunities for extracurricular activities, informal student interactions and faculty-student interactions" that can be facilitated through academic advising (p. 228).

Economic and Social Disadvantages

Students enrolled in community colleges are often economically challenged, are first generation students, or experience other social disadvantages such racial or cultural differences, lack of prior educational opportunities, and lack of adequate housing.

Research illuminates that these student groups, which are often labeled at-risk, have different needs, circumstances, and characteristics than the general student population and face many academic, cultural, and financial barriers that hinders student success. Studies conducted on socio-economic status and first-generation students are abundant and reveal that the needs of these student groups are varied (Gibbons & Woodside, 2014). Petty (2014) found a connection between disadvantaged students, academic motivation, and academic performance. Findings inform that socio-economic status and first-generation students are strong predictors of early departure (Farruggia et al., 2018). Researchers suggest that effective retention strategies should address the special circumstances of these student groups.

Approximately 45.0% of community college students are low socio-economic students and are more likely to hold jobs, face financial challenges, and experience higher financial stress that can contribute to attrition (American Association of Community Colleges, 2014; Hafer et al., 2018; Ma & Baum, 2016; Schudde, 2016). Financial factors were strongly linked to college retention according to Britt et al. (2017). In fact, the American Association of Community Colleges (2014) reported that 22.0% of full-time students and 41.0% of part-time students at community colleges have full-time jobs. Students experiencing higher financial stress were more likely to leave school prematurely (Hogan et al., 2013). According to Britt et al. financial stress has been attributed to less academic and social integration. Work obligations impact time allocation for academic tasks and social integration, factors that are important to retention (Hafer et al., 2018; Schudde, 2016). In addition to financial challenges, low-income

students often face cultural differences in navigating the college environment that is often shaped by more affluent students (Schudde, 2016). Schudde further explains that cultural dissonance can cause low-income students to feel isolated or feel they do not fit in. Colleges should investigate specific factors that impact their particular student population before investing resources in retention programs that may not be applicable to particular student groups (Xu, 2017).

Many researchers have studied retention of first-generation students who are described as students whose parents did not obtain a college degree (Conefrey, 2018). These students represent approximately 30.0% of students attending community colleges according to Ma and Baum (2016). Researchers agree that first-generation students are more likely low-income, underprepared, minority students, factors identified in the literature as contributing to attrition (Conefrey, 2018; Fong et al., 2018). However, Fong et al. (2016) suggested that researchers cannot change this fact about students and should focus instead on identifying pertinent intervention strategies for this student group. Research showed only 48.0% of first-generation students persisted after 3 years of initial matriculation Cataldi et al. (2018). First-generation students often lack sustained familial support, lack familiarity of the college enrollment process, and experience college adjustment issues (Conefrey, 2018). First-generation students are more likely to suffer from low self-esteem, are less engaged academically, and possess poor study skills Gibbons et al., 2016). Gibbons and Woodside (2014) explained that social support is essential for first-generation students to persist and Martin (2017) argued that the lack of support is a contributing factor in a student's decision to depart early.

In addition to holding a job, many community college students have family obligations and other responsibilities that can interfere with academic tasks (Hafer et al., 2018; Heller & Cassady, 2017). For these students, often identified as nontraditional students, balancing work, school, and family obligations make it more difficult for them to integrate academically or socially with the college and can be a source of stress for the student (Mahaffey et al., 2015; Schudde, 2016). Other barriers such as transportation, reliable dependent care, food insecurity, and adequate and affordable housing can also impede academic progress and stifle persistence (Cady, 2014; Heller & Cassady, 2017; Mahaffey et al., 2015). Cady explained that food insecurity is a huge problem for many college students, especially low income and nontraditional students, and has the potential of affecting student outcomes and retention. An exploratory study by Mahaffey et al. (2015) found five emerging themes affecting student outcomes for nontraditional students and/or single mothers: (1) the marginalization of nontraditional students because many campus activities are held during times when nontraditional students cannot attend because of work demands or family obligations; (2) available and affordable childcare; (3) increased personal stresses due to role of being parent, spouse, significant other while juggling finances and academic course work; (4) "faculty and institutional insensitivity toward nontraditional students and student parents" such as assigning team projects at a time when students have work or family responsibilities; (5) struggles with finances, affordable childcare, affordable housing, and government program regulations such as aid to families with dependent children (p. 108). Research illustrates that retention rates for nontraditional students remain dismal and demonstrates the need for better understanding

of the struggles and disadvantages experienced by these students to better serve their needs (Zerquera et al., 2018).

Improving student outcomes and retention for all students, but especially for the above-mentioned student groups, have profound impact on the financial resources of community colleges, future employability of the student, and the economy (Boatman & Long, 2018; CCCSE, 2016; Kolenovic et al., 2013; Mertes & Jankoviac, 2016). Students who do not persist are more economically disadvantaged than their degreed counterparts as lifetime earning potential is much greater for individuals with degrees (BLS, 2017; Ma et al., 2019; Turner, 2016). Additionally, the BLS (2017) illustrated that college degree holders encounter less unemployment even when unemployment rates are high. Obtaining a college degree leads to "long-term economic health and an important gateway to the middle class" (Kolenovic et al., 2013, p. 272). Moreover, employers expect a more educated workforce to fill newly created jobs (Boatman & Long, 2018; CCCSE, 2016). A macroeconomic advantage exists with increased numbers of college credentialed individuals due to increased tax revenues for local and national economies (Kolenovic et al., 2013). They further posited that completing a college credential is linked to a reduced dependency on governmental financial assistance and reduced criminal activity.

Summary

The literature review highlighted several current and emerging trends in retention and academic advising studies. Clear from the research reviewed is that the retention rate at community colleges has remained relative static for the past eight years. The literature

review elucidated that prescriptive advising is still the most used academic advising approach, but it has been shown to be the least effective in addressing college student retention. Also revealed in the literature review was that community colleges are shifting their academic advising approaches and that the principles of teaching and learning are being incorporated with academic advising practice. Emerging in the literature review were non-cognitive factors such as motivation, behaviors, attitudes, and personal attributes that have been studied individually have not been well studied among diverse, urban college students. Arguably, teaching and learning strategies applied in tandem with intrusive academic advising may address more of the issues that affect student persistence. College readiness and the use of placement tests are being debated, because developmental education continues to be problematic for retention at community colleges.

What is known is that retention at community colleges is dismal and that more students enroll in community colleges unprepared for college level work than in other types of post-secondary institutions. Lack of preparedness calls for a strong support system so students persist. Researchers have shown that academic advising plays a major role in college student outcomes. What is not known is how intrusive advising can influence persistence. This study fills a gap in the literature by adding to the extant literature on intrusive advising, student persistence, and retention. Also, this adds to the growing body of evidence about the scholarship of teaching and learning and the scholarship of advising.

The lack of understanding of the role of intrusive advising in students' decisions to persist was a gap worth exploring. The best way to discover the experiences of students receiving intrusive advising interventions at an urban community college was to ask them. Therefore, the purpose of this basic qualitative inquiry was to explore the role of intrusive advising on retaining students at small, urban community college in the southeastern United States. A more detailed description of the basic qualitative inquiry is presented in Chapter 3.

Chapter 3: Research Method

The purpose of this basic qualitative inquiry was to explore the role of intrusive advising on retaining students at a small, urban community college in the southeastern United States. In Chapter 3, the research design and rationale, the role of the researcher, the methodology, trustworthiness, and ethical procedures for the study are explained. The Methodology section includes an explanation of participant selection, the sampling strategy, the data collection instrument, procedures for recruitment, participation, data collection, and data analysis plan.

Research Design and Rationale

Qualitative research, unlike quantitative research, does not rely on numeric values or measurements but is a process that permits the collection of nonnumeric textual data that can be recorded, analyzed, interpreted, and triangulated (Creswell, 2012; Yin, 2010). The basic qualitative design was used for this study, which allows the researcher to ask in-depth, open-ended questions, and it illuminates problems and realities by capturing detailed experiences as recounted by the participants (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Basic qualitative design allowed participants to express experiences, beliefs, concerns, feelings, and expectations regarding intrusive advising (Bogdan & Bilkan, 2007; Caelli et al., 2003). Collection of conversational data through interviews is best for studying a complex phenomenon to gain a deeper understanding of it from a human meaning-making perspective (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Creswell, 2014; Lodico et al., 2010; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). I used this approach to explore the role of intrusive advising in regard to the persistence of students, answering the following research questions:

1. How do students who have experienced intrusive advising at a small, urban community college, describe their advising and college experiences?

2. How do students who have experienced intrusive advising at a small, urban community college, describe the role of intrusive advising on their persistence decisions?

The basic qualitative approach differs from other types of qualitative research in that it aims to make meaning inductively through interviews of purposefully selected participants (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Basic qualitative design is not bounded by in-depth analysis of a system through multiple methods of data collection like case study design (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Yin, 2018). Gathering participant's stories is not the aim of basic qualitative design as it is in narrative qualitative research. Basic design does not require field work to study the culture of a group like an ethnographic approach. Capturing the essence of the lived experience through in-depth interviews is not the goal of basic qualitative design as it is in phenomenological studies. Nor is the objective to develop a theory by taking a grounded theory approach (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Therefore, basic qualitative design was the best approach to fulfill the purpose of this study. Using a basic qualitative interview approach enabled me to discover how intrusive advising played a role in student persistence at an urban community college.

Role of the Researcher

The role of the researcher for this study was outside observer and instrument of data collection. I have never been employed by nor have had any professional ties or

affiliation with the college under study. As an outsider, I did not have any prior

experience with the participants. Therefore, potential bias was limited. To manage

potential bias, I also maintained a reflective journal and recorded my feelings and

attitudes about topics and participants and reflexively returned to them to check my

biases during data analysis. It was also important for me to maintain a relationship with

the organization providing access to students. The organization has potential to benefit

from my study and so the gatekeeper with whom I have built a relationship remains

cordial and willing to assist me with my study despite the pandemic environment.

Methodology

I sought to gain in-depth knowledge about the role of intrusive advising on

retaining students at a small, urban community college. To construct this knowledge, I

needed participants to participate in the study. The Methodology section of the study

identifies the target population, identifies and justifies the sampling strategy, and explains

participant selection criteria. This section explains how participants were eligible to

participate in the study, the number of participants chosen, and the rationale for choosing

the number of participants. Further, this section explains procedures for how participants

were identified, contacted, and recruited.

Participant Selection

Most of the student population at the study site possesses one or more of the risk

factors identified in the literature as predictors of early departure. The target population

for this study were approximately 158 enrolled students of Study College who have

experienced at least one intrusive advising intervention. The sampling strategy I used for

this study was homogenous purposeful sampling. Homogeneous sampling is a type of

purposeful sampling that involves the selection of participants who have similar attributes

and "who have some specific knowledge about the topic being investigated" (Lodico et

al., 2010, p. 140). This sampling strategy allowed me to select the eight participants who

had experienced intrusive advising and could provide differing opinions about intrusive

advising (Patton, 2002).

To identify students who met the criteria of being at least 18 years of age and had

received at least one intrusive advising intervention, I worked with a site coordinator, the

provost of institutional effectiveness. Students 18 and over who have experienced at least

one intrusive advising intervention were the unit of analysis for this study (Ravitch &

Carl, 2021). The site coordinator had access to student records and was able to identify

students who met the criteria and sent out an initial email blast to 600 students. From this

initial email blast only four students responded with interest to participate in the study. I

worked with the site coordinator over the Summer 2021 and Fall 2021 semesters for help

with recruiting more students. The site coordinator worked with other advisors and

faculty to initiate a more concentrated effort to spread the word about the study. This

second, more targeted approach yielded nine more responses from participants who

expressed a desire to participate in the study.

In total, I received 10 consent forms; however, two students were eliminated

because they did not meet the criteria. From the first recruitment effort, three students

were interviewed, and from the second recruitment effort, five students were interviewed.

Based on the limited number of respondents, I was not able to compile a participant pool

to randomly select participants as suggested by Ravitch and Carl (2021). Guest et al. (2006) recommended 10-12 participants for a qualitative study to reach data saturation, however, I was still able to reach data saturation with eight participants, which also aligned with what Kuzel (1992) recommended for a homogeneous sample. Data saturation is determined when the data do not reveal any new information or themes (Guest et al., 2006). I transcribed and analyzed data after each interview and was able to understand that data saturation had been met (Charmaz, 2006).

Instrumentation

I produced an interview protocol that assisted me in asking the participants a series of semi-structured, open-ended questions (see Appendix A). These interview questions were drafted based on Bandura's (1977, 1986, 1997) triadic causation model and Tinto's (1975) model of student integration. These semi-structured, open-ended questions allowed me to collect data that explored the role of intrusive advising on retaining students at a small, urban community colleges in the southeastern United States. The questions also allowed participants to give their response without the restrictions of preset answers or researcher perspective (Creswell, 2012).

Field Testing of Interview Protocol

To field test the interview protocol, I followed a series of steps recommended by Castillo-Montoya (2016) and Jacob and Ferguson (2012). The first step was to ensure the interview questions aligned with the research questions. Alignment was accomplished by working with my faculty advisor to refine the interview questions and then creating a matrix to determine alignment with each research question. The matrix is in Appendix B.

The goal of creating the matrix was to determine if gaps existed between what would be asked and research questions (Castillo-Montoya, 2016). After creating the matrix, I realized there was some overlap. Therefore, I revised two questions.

I then asked two volunteer college students, one who is enrolled in a master's degree counseling program and the other a senior at a 4-year college, to do a close read of the interview protocol and offer feedback. These student volunteers have similar attributes, such as age and college enrollment, to the population the researcher wants to study (Castillo-Montoya, 2016; Jacob & Ferguson, 2012). The feedback from the volunteers shed light on how other college students may receive or respond to the interview questions. I was then able to tweak the protocol to ensure the participants understand. For example, the volunteers had questions on the purpose of the study and informed consent. The volunteers felt the questions were clear and well-structured and would allow for sufficient data collection.

The last step in field testing my interview protocol involved practice interviews with college students, one in person and the other via zoom, who mirrored the population I wanted to study. Both of these college students attended other community colleges and had experienced an intrusive advising encounter. This step allowed me to practice conducting the entire interview building rapport and give attention to recording the interview and to timing. The simulated interviews provided a realistic sense of time and approach to conducting the interview with research participants. Following the steps listed helped to improve the quality and trustworthiness of the interview protocol

(Castillo-Montoya, 2016). The final protocol resulting from development and field testing is presented in Appendix A.

Procedures for Recruitment, Participation, and Data Collection

The first step in the recruitment, participation, and data collection process was to obtain a letter of cooperation from Study College. Because I was not an employee of the study site, it was imperative that I identify and develop a relationship with a gatekeeper (Creswell, 2012). I developed a relationship with Study College's provost of institutional effectiveness, who was also my site coordinator, and gained initial verbal approval from him. Before I could gain access to any participants or collect data, I gained Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval from Walden University. After obtaining IRB approval from Walden University, I completed the IRB process at Study College and was given permission to conduct research and to gain access to participants. I then worked with the site coordinator whose department maintained a database of students' contact information and who had received intrusive advising and were at least 18year of age. I forwarded the recruitment email and recruitment flyer to the site coordinator. The site coordinator sent out an initial email invitation blast directly to 600 prospective student participants who had received at least one intrusive advising intervention. The first email blast was sent during the Summer 21 terms. After a dismal response to the first email blast, the site coordinator initiated a more concentrated effort after Fall 21 semester began in which he worked directly with advisors and faculty in the recruitment effort.

The recruitment solicitation emails identified me as the researcher, provided my contact information, described the purpose of the study, selection criteria, confidentiality,

protections, and directed students to contact me directly if they wanted to participate.

Once I received a response from a prospective participant, I forwarded an informed

consent, and asked for meeting times; the interview time was confirmed prior to

conducting the interview. Due to the low participation response rate, I did not compile an

interview pool of students who responded to the recruitment message sent by the college

as suggested by Ravitch and Carl (2021); however, I did maintain a participant log.

Due to COVID-19, conducting interviews via Zoom, rather than face to face, was

approved by Walden's IRB and the study site's IRB. A few minutes before the interview,

a link to the Zoom chat room was sent to the students' email address, the student

participants clicked on the linked and was joined to the one-on-one interview which

lasted approximately 30 minutes. The participants were informed that they were

volunteering their time, they were not obligated to participate, they could stop answering

questions at any time; and there would not be any repercussions for not participating in or

withdrawing from the study. I conducted each semi-structured interview using an

interview protocol (Corbin & Strauss, 2008) that I designed that "contained instructions

for the process of the interview, the interview questions, and space for note taking"

(Creswell, 2012, p. 225). The interview protocol ensured consistency in interviewing

participants. After conducting the first few interviews, I determined that I needed to add

the word "proactive" when explaining the purpose of the study.

To ensure privacy and confidentiality, I conducted the Zoom interviews in my

private office, when no one else was around to overhear the interview. Conducting the

interviews via Zoom allowed me to record in the application as well and allowed me to

focus on follow-up questions. Recording maintained data integrity and assisted in establishing reliability (Lodico et al., 2010). The recordings and transcribed interviews were saved onto a password protected external storage drive that I locked in a cabinet. Participants were debriefed by explaining the rationale of the study and asking for and answering questions the participants had. Participants were asked if I could follow-up via email or phone with them for member-checking of individual themes and to seek clarification should their responses be unclear to me. If participants agreed, I noted their contact information for follow-up and member checking.

After each interview I wrote my reflective responses to the interview in a journal. According to Ravitch and Carl (2021), "the research journal is a place to record your thoughts, questions, struggles, ideas, excitements, and experiences with the process of learning about and engaging in various aspects of research" (p. 116,). I used the journal to record my feelings and other observations about participants and data to enhance my learning and promote validity and transparency (Creswell, 2012; Vicary et al., 2016). I also used a research log to document logistical information about data collection, time and date the interviews were conducted, the length of the interview, time and date of transcription and member checking. My research log will serve as an audit trail and improve confirmability (Shenton, 2004).

I transcribed the recorded interviews once by listening and replaying the recording until I had finished transcribing the interview. To ensure I captured the participants' responses correctly, I replayed the recording one more time while comparing to the transcribed data and updated the transcription as needed. Data analysis

was done after each interview and sent to participants for member checking. After interviewing the eight participants that consented from the two recruitment efforts, I carefully reviewed the data collected and determined I had reached data saturation. Therefore, a third attempt to recruit more participants was not needed.

Data Analysis Plan

The steps involved in analyzing and interpreting qualitative data are collecting data, transcribing data, reading through the data, and coding the data (Creswell, 2012). Basic qualitative inquiries generate copious amounts of information and researchers should not wait until all data is collected to analyze (Lodico et al., 2010). They explained that "qualitative research analysis of data occurs throughout the study and guides the ongoing process of data collection (p. 301). After interviewing two to three students, I re-evaluated the interview process and made minor modifications. These modifications included adding the word "proactive" when explaining the purpose of the study and adding the word "proactive" to the interview question "how would you describe intrusive advising." I reviewed the data as it was collected and recorded and notated any thoughts or questions in the reflective journal. The audiotaped interviews were transcribed manually using word processing software and I read through the transcripts and any notes made on the interview protocol and reflective journal.

Thematic analysis was appropriately used for data analysis of this basic qualitative inquiry (Maguire & Delahunt, 2017). Patterns and themes were identified using Braun and Clarke's (2006) six step process. This method, an inductive process of data analysis, was used to develop central themes from the transcribed student interviews.

The primary step in thematic analysis was to read through and become familiar with the data and identify passages that are relevant to the research questions. The next step was coding. The coding process is a multi-step process that involves reading through the transcripts and dividing the text into segments which is then labeled with broad category names or codes and using 30 to 40 codes is common (Creswell, 2012). Coding was done by hand and involved me writing the code on the source document and "organizing the data into piles with the same codes" (Lodico et al., 2010, p. 306). It was important to make multiple copies of the source data before analysis in case cutting up sheets of transcribed data is necessary. After the data was coded, the next step included identifying themes, revising themes, and defining themes (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Themes are concepts that combine several codes that relate to the research questions and used to explain the data. Overlapping codes were consolidated to form themes. The final step was reporting the findings.

<div align="center">**Trustworthiness**</div>

Validating findings is crucial to qualitative research (Creswell, 2012). I took specific measures to lend credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability to this qualitative study so readers can assess the study's rigor (Ravitch & Carl, 2021). A section is presented for each validity criterion.

Credibility

Credibility was enhanced by adopting established research methods, debriefing frequently with my project advisor, writing reflective commentary in a research journal, transcribing my own data, and utilizing member checks (Shenton, 2004). I adopted a

well-established basic interview approach to study the phenomenon of intrusive advising (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). I intended to randomly select participants from my participant pool which would improve representation of the larger group (Bouma & Atkinson, 1995); however, due to the limited number of participants, participants were not randomly selected from an interview pool, but I interviewed the participants that presented. Frequent debriefing sessions with my project advising team also enhanced credibility. These sessions provided me with opportunities to evaluate ideas and interpretations as well as draw attention to researcher biases (Shenton, 2004).

Credibility was further augmented by transcribing my own data and referring to a reflective research journal. By transcribing my own data, I was able to more closely observe the data by listening repeatedly to the recorded interview (Bailey, 2008). Transcribing manually ensured I captured and interpreted data accurately and that it reflected the views of the study group (Cope, 2014). I checked my own bias by incorporating reflective commentary from my reflective research journal. Reflecting helped me monitor developing patterns and constructs; which, according to Lincoln and Guba (1985), lends to establishing credibility. Additionally, I used member checks to bolster credibility, a crucial process for establishing credibility (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Member checking afforded me the opportunity to ask the participants to verify the accuracy of the findings and improve interpretive validity (Maxwell, 1992). After the interview was transcribed and analyzed, I asked participants to review a summary of finding to verify if the account is "complete and realistic, if the themes are accurate to include, and if the interpretations are fair and representative" (Creswell, 2012, p. 259), or

if changes are needed. I focused on verification and was careful to not add new information to the interview.

Transferability

Transferability was addressed by providing critical and detailed information about the study site, describing the phenomenon under study, profiling participants of the study, detailing data collection methods, and providing the duration of the study. Providing these specific details of the study allows the reader to make comparisons of the findings to other similar situations or settings (Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Shenton, 2004).

Dependability

Dependability was improved by describing details of the research design and its implementation including details about data collection with an evaluation of the process (Shenton, 2004). My study project advising team served as external reviewers to ensure accuracy and consistency, thereby adding to dependability (Guba & Lincoln, 1989).

Confirmability

Confirmability was increased by acknowledging my beliefs and biases, by addressing the limitations of the study, and by using an audit trail (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Shenton, 2004). According to Shenton (2004) "beliefs underpinning decisions made and methods adopted should be acknowledged within the research report, the reasons for favoring one approach when others could have been taken explained and weaknesses in the techniques actually employed admitted" (p. 72). I have addressed the limitations of the study in Chapter 1.

The use of an audit trail was recommended by Shenton (2004) and Guba and

Lincoln (1989). My research log and reflective journal will serve as tools to audit when,

how, and from whom data were collected. My study project advising team and Walden's

IRB processes will also lend integrity to processes.

Discrepant Cases

Trustworthiness of the study was also enhanced by reporting discrepant cases.

Some participants presented conflicting or contradictory views about intrusive advising

and student retention. I reviewed the transcribed interview and notes and presented the

discrepant cases with my findings.

Ethical Procedures

Dominant issues with conducting research involve "informed consent, protecting

the participants from harm, and ensuring confidentiality" (Lodico et al., 2010, p. 147). To

help protect participants, I adhered to Walden University's and the study site's IRBs.

Before conducting any interviews, the participants signed an inform consent. The

informed consent was explained to the participants, detailing the voluntary nature of

participation, right to withdraw, purpose of the study, risks, benefits, and signatures.

Participants were given ample time to review the informed consent form; and I answered

questions participants had regarding the document. Anonymity of participants and

keeping data confidential are two ways researchers can minimize harm to participants and

maximize relationship building (Denscombe, 2010). I took measures to protect

participants from harm by assigning a number to each participant instead of using

participants' names, I securely stored external storage device and documents used during

the interview process. I saved recorded interviews and transcribed interviews on my password protected computer and external drive. Care was taken to ensure that responses and data collected will only be viewed by me by restricting access to my computer and ensuring the files are securely password protected when leaving my computer.

The inherent power imbalance of researcher and participant is a concern the researcher should not take lightly because the participants' willingness to participate in the study and to share their experiences is imperative for the researcher to obtain the needed data (Raheim et al., 2016). Therefore, developing a relationship with participants was essential to this basic qualitative inquiry to ensure the participants' comfort, trust, and confidence (Lodico et al., 2010). Ethical issues during all phases of data collection were taken into consideration. To help the participants feel comfortable, the details of the study was explained to them, and the participants were treated fairly and respectfully. The participants were informed that they were volunteering their time, they were not obligated to participate, they could leave before answering any questions, and there would not be any repercussions for not participating in or withdrawing from the study, and that their identities would not be disclosed.

Summary

Chapter 3 presented the qualitative methodology proposed for conducting the study for this dissertation. The purpose of this basic qualitative inquiry was to explore the role of intrusive advising in retaining students at a small, urban community college in the southeastern U.S. The chapter proposed the steps needed to interview students to obtain their perspectives to gain a deeper understanding about their experiences with intrusive

advising. The research design and rationale, role of the researcher, methodology, trustworthiness, and ethical considerations were discussed. Results will be presented in Chapter 4.

Chapter 4: Results

The purpose of this basic qualitative inquiry was to explore the role of intrusive advising on retaining students at a small, urban community colleges in the southeastern United States. Two research questions were used to guide this study and fulfill the study's purpose:

1. How do students who have experienced intrusive advising at a small, urban community college, describe their advising and college experiences?

2. How do students who have experienced intrusive advising at a small, urban community college, describe the role of intrusive advising on their persistence decisions?

Chapter 4 describes the study setting and details conditions that may have influenced participants' experience that may affect interpretation of the study results as well as relevant demographics. The chapter will also discuss how data collected proceeded as well as the process for data analysis, which will describe how themes and codes were derived as well as describing any discrepant cases and their qualities. Data analysis will be followed by a detailed description of the results and evidence of trustworthiness. The chapter will conclude with a summary of Chapter 4.

Setting

At the time interviews were conducted, students had recently returned to in person learning after institutions of higher learning were forced to online learning due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The institution closed campus for a period of time to make adjustments for the health and safety of students, faculty, and staff. Alternative learning

formats were incorporated so that students could continue their coursework via online learning formats.

Demographics

The ages of the participants ranged from 18 to over 40 years of age and included two males and six females for a total of eight participants. Some students had received several intrusive advising interventions and some students had attended the school for several years. Fifty percent were full time students and 50% were part time students.

Data Collection

Data collection was challenging. As discussed in Chapter 3, I initially wanted to interview at least 12 participants. However, the low participation rate dictated that I collect data from the students who returned the consent forms. Although I did receive consent forms for 10 students, two of those students did not meet criteria, and I was left to collect data from eight participants. These eight participants were interviewed using my interview protocol and open-ended questions that were approved by my supervisor, Walden's URR, and IRB, and the study site's IRB.

To reach participants, I worked with a point of contact, my site coordinator, at the study site for 2021 Summer and 2021 Fall Semesters. During the summer session, the site coordinator initially sent out an email solicitation to 600 students. From this solicitation, only four students responded with an interest in the study. Of those four, only three met the criteria of having received at least one intrusive advising intervention. Once the fall semester started, the site coordinator sent out a second, more targeted email solicitation and also asked professors to make mention of the study during classes. From this more

targeted approach, I received responses from an additional eight students. However, only six of those students returned the consent form and agreed to interviews. One of those participants did not meet the criteria and was eliminated.

The interviews were conducted via Zoom using the interview protocol I established and presented in Chapter 3. Although my email invitation and consent form stated a 30-minute Zoom meeting, some interviews were shorter than the 30 minutes and some were longer. On average, interviews lasted 20 minutes and produced two to three pages of transcribed data. Seven interviews consisted of both audio and video portions of the application. Due to technical difficulties, the first interview consisted only of audio. All interviews were recorded using the record function of the Zoom platform. To ensure privacy and confidentiality, I conducted the Zoom interviews in my private office, when no one else was around to overhear the interview. Likewise, transcription was done when I was alone in my private office. The recordings and transcribed interviews were saved onto a password protected external storage drive that I locked in a cabinet.

After conducting a few interviews, I discovered that I had to include the word "proactive" to the interview question "How would you describe intrusive advising?" as this wording created a source of confusion for some participants. Some technical challenges presented themselves using the Zoom format for two participants such as getting onto the application. In some instances, background noise from traffic and participants walking caused some interference. I experienced some technical issues with voice distortion and ringing on the line with the first interview.

Data Analysis

Eight semi-structured interviews were transcribed and analyzed. Participants had the opportunity to member check their transcriptions. Steps to conduct thematic analysis suggested by Braun and Clarke (2006) allowed me to inductively identify 50 open codes. A manual process of highlighting, cutting, and pasting using these functions within Microsoft Word. These codes were then merged into 10 axial categories and finally into five major themes. Environmental experiences and support, internal and external factors, and feeling valued as a student aligned with RQ 1. Growth and impact of intrusive advising aligned with RQ 2.

I identified environmental experiences and support as students' experiences and interactions with the college and how supported they felt by faculty and staff within that environment. Internal and external factors were identified as barriers students described that interfered with their performance and integration ability. Feeling valued as a student was described in terms of how students' interaction with faculty and staff made them feel. I identified growth as the by-product of being in an environment that supported students' maturation process, assisted with goals, and becoming more self-directed and motivated. Impact of intrusive advising was identified as whether the interaction students had with academic advising directly influenced their decision to persist. For instance, three of the participants indicated that intrusive advising was not a factor in their persistence decision, yet all of the participants indicated that they wanted intrusive advising to continue.

There were five instances of discrepant cases where participants' responses to certain interview questions were so very different from the others. For instance, when participants were asked "What positive and negative things have helped or hindered you staying in college?" Participant 5 responded,

> Um, well positive, what makes me stay in school is my daughter, I feel like me finishing out what I started is like a good role model for her and to influence her to want to grow up and do the positives that I've done in life. So, she is the reason why I want to stay in school.

I decided to keep discrepant case responses in the results because doing so added richness and enhanced the trustworthiness of my study.

Results

All participants were asked the same 13 open-ended interview questions. Interview questions 1, 2 and 8 provided background information about the participant's expectations and the number of interventions the participant had experienced. Interview questions 3-5 asked participants to describe their college and advising experiences. Interview questions 6, 7 and 9-12 were more specific to intrusive advising experiences. Interview question 13 asked the participants for suggestions for improving the experience for other students. Six participants recommended students get more involved in their educational journey and ask lots of questions. One participant suggested advisors introduce themselves during the onboarding/orientation process. Data analysis revealed five major themes that pertained to the research questions that guided this basic

qualitative inquiry. Three major themes aligned with RQ 1, and two major themes aligned with RQ 2.

Research Question 1: Students' Experiences

The three themes that aligned with this RQ are environmental experiences and support, internal and external obstacles, and feeling valued as a student.

Environmental Experiences and Support

All participants were asked the background interview question of *what were your initial feelings about attending college?* Thirty-seven percent expressed excitement about going to college and 50% used adjectives such as "uncertain," "apprehensive," "doubtful," and "confused." Participant 4 expressed concerns about "cost of attending college and the course curriculum and if I would be able to get the classes that I needed to move forward."

All participants were also asked to *describe their college experiences so far*. Fifty percent of the participants reported experiencing a supportive or positive environment and 50% shared experiencing challenging or negative college experiences. Participant 3 said "so far it's been pretty good" and elaborated on how nice the staff were. Participant 8 stated, "I feel like it has been pretty good. A lot of harsh times, you have to be organized in college, that's like the main goal and I am not a very organized person." However, Participant 1 stated "I feel disconnected from the school because a lot of activities are during the day and I work full time, … and can't participate." Participant 7 stated "so far it hasn't been a good experience because there isn't a lot of effective communication and the processes are very outdated." Twenty-five percent reported

challenges with the online class format or not being able to access the help needed with the online format. Thirty-seven percent of the participants expressed their experience through interaction with professors. Two participants stated that their interaction with the professors was positive and helpful, while one participant's reported experience was a negative interaction.

Interestingly, of the 50% of participants who reported a negative experience with the college environment, half of those participants reported feeling apprehensive or doubtful about starting college and the other half expressed initial excitement. Of the 50% of participants that reported experiencing a positive experience with the college environment, only one participant expressed initial excitement, Participant 3. Incidentally, of the 37% of participants that expressed initial excitement about attending college, only Participant 3 rated her college experience so far as "*pretty good.*"

Internal and External Factors

Participants reported internal (pertaining to school) and external (social relations, work commitments, family and health issues) factors and personal goals were integral in their overall college experience. All participants reported internal factors such as advising, faculty, and staff impacted their experience. Sixty-two percent of participants described positive relationships or interactions with academic advising. Participant 4 stated "the advisors are great and very helpful." Participant 2 had a less than optimal experience with academic advising. The participant said "it could be better. I remember sitting in the office and other kids would come by and pop in and I could never have a definite moment by myself."

Sixty-two percent of participants described external factors such as social relations, work commitments, and family and health issues effected their experience. Participant 1 reported that "there are people there to support me, but sometimes it is a little difficult getting to those people." Participant 3 shared the death of close family members took a toll on her, but the advising staff were very supportive. For Participant 7, learning new things and interacting with others with different points of view were important to the experience.

When asked *what positive or negative things have helped or hindered you staying in college?* Fifty percent responded with family and/or friend support. Participant 5 said being a good role model for her daughter was the reason she wanted to stay in school and Participant 8 elaborated on the biases of and negative interaction with one professor. Specifically, Participant 8 stated: "My teacher right now is very bias. He doesn't like girls."

Feeling Valued as a Student

Positive interactions with academic advising helped students feel valued. Fifty percent of participants responded that their interaction with advising was helpful, helped keep them on track, and that they mattered as a student. Participant 4 said "I was impressed with how the advisor interacted with me and made me feel that I mattered as a student. I have attended other colleges and did not feel like I received the level of support at those colleges as I received with the advisors here." Participant 1 stated,

> I think it has been helpful. In the beginning I thought it was just people that
>
> needed to meet a quota or that just needed to say that they did something but after

time seeing over and over that people really care and they would reach out to you

um I feel positive about it. I feel like I have made some connections that can help

carry me through and also make me want to complete my degree I have those

people and the resources that I can fall back on if I need assistance.

Research Question 2: Role of Intrusive Advising

The two themes aligning with RQ 2 are growth and impact of intrusive advising.

Growth is defined as the by-product of being in an environment that supported students'

maturation process, assisted with goals, and becoming more self-directed and motivated.

Growth

Eighty-seven percent of participants described experiencing some type of growth

as a result of their advising experience. Seven participants responded that intrusive

advising helped to motivate them or provided tools and resources that help them stay

track. One participant responded that advising "has shown me that I needed to become

more self-reliant and trust myself more." Participant 4 stated "I know if I need help or

clarification the staff is willing to help me and I feel like I'm getting value for my

education dollars." When asked "how have you changed since intrusive advising started?

Participant 5 said that intrusive advising was beneficial, but "I haven't really changed."

Participant 1 responded,

I have changed by being more organized when it comes to my courses. I am

reaching out to my professors more if I see that something may be an issue on my

end, um, with completing any work and that has helped me so that I can stay

abreast of what is going on in each class and let the professor know that way they

can assist me if any way possible on their end to be successful.

However, Participant 2 offered,

The session I had really didn't equip me. I think I have been doing well because I

wanted to do well. I had to make that determination myself. But the conversation I

had later with an academic advisor helped me understand more about college

environment and that I need to ask more questions.

Impact of Intrusive Advising

All participants were asked "Do you feel intrusive advising has helped you stay in

college?" Sixty-three percent responded, yes, it was a factor in their decision to persist

because it (intrusive advising) has been beneficial in helping them reach goals

(graduation), help motivate them, or help them stay on track to graduate. Participant 4

stated that "I don't feel like I'm on my own here," while Participant 8 responded "they

are helping me stay on track." Participant 1 said "Yes. I do because there is a sense of

being held accountable and knowing that someone would know your ability so that has

helped me to continue my courses." Thirty-seven percent of the participants responded

that intrusive advising was not a factor in their decision to persist. One participant said

this was her first semester back after several years. Participant 2 said "I didn't receive

that kind of intervention until I was on academic probation." Responding to a follow-up

question of "How so," Participant 2 had this to say,

I think receiving those interventions would have helped me stay off academic

probation. I didn't know what I want to do I was really lost I didn't have that

counselor to say hey what are your grades looking like I think I needed that and had I had that then I would have definitely been better especially as a freshman student. I didn't receive those communications.

Even though Participant 7 expressed receiving 3-5 interventions, Participant 7 also responded,

No, because my advisement only mattered when it was time to register for classes or to have a hold removed. Um, typically the emails that are coming from my advisor are like you know I said are ones that are sent out to everyone. So, whether I'm graduating or not, I'm getting a graduation email. You know whether I'm receiving financial aid or not, I'm receiving an email about financial aid. So, I haven't received anything that was tailored specifically for me. You know what I'm saying so there wasn't a time where my advisor um you know sent some information or asked me questions or you know reached out or sent you know some type of survey or something out to me or generally speaking and I was like you know what that's empowered me or that just gave me a resource that I didn't think about. Like none of that has happened.

Incidentally, all eight participants stated they wanted intrusive advising to continue and described intrusive advising in terms such as: it was beneficial; provided tools, resources and guidance; and, want to have that relationship with advising. However, Participant 7 stated,

Yes, I would like for it to continue if it is going actually going to be interactive you know in the sense of trying to set time aside specifically for it to be tailored to

the student. Maybe some type of group advising where we're not necessarily divulging personal information but because we're all in the same major or because we're all in the same you know last name or something this information is tailored to us you know so that we don't spread our advisor out to thinly but I you know I would like to see something that is tailored specifically for to me to help me further. Yeah.

Participant 8 summed it up by saying that "Yes, I think it [intrusive advising] should continue because with this being a college with no dorm rooms, it is helpful."

Evidence of Trustworthiness

I implemented strategies to enhance trustworthiness as presented in Chapter 3. Credibility was enhanced by using established research methods and debriefing with my project advisor frequently. I also maintained a reflective journal, transcribed my own data, and utilized member checks as suggested by Shenton (2004). By transcribing my own data, I was able to closely observe the data by listening repeatedly to the recorded interview (Bailey, 2008). Transcribing manually ensured I captured and interpreted data accurately and that it reflected the views of the study group (Cope, 2014). However, an adjustment was made to the credibility strategies I discussed in Chapter 3. In Chapter 3, I stated that I would use random sampling to select participants from a participant pool to improve representation of the larger group (Bouma & Atkinson, 1995). Unfortunately, I experienced difficulties in acquiring the number of participants I originally wanted. I had to use the participants that responded and returned the consent form.

No adjustment was necessary to the transferability strategy. I provided critical and detailed information about the study site, I described the phenomenon under study, I provided demographics of the participants of the study, I detailed my data collection methods, and provided the duration of the study. Providing these specific details of the study allows the reader to make comparisons of the findings to other similar situations or settings. (Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Shenton, 2004).

I described the details of the research design and implementation and included details about data collection to show dependability. My project chair served as external reviewer to ensure accuracy and consistency (Guba & Lincoln, 1989) and my reflective journal assisted in evaluating the process as data were collected. I improved confirmability by addressing the limitations of the study and by keeping my research log and reflective journal which serve as an audit trail. Walden's IRB process and my project advising team were instrumental in lending integrity to processes. For instance, they advised me to include discrepant cases after reviewing the transcribed interview data.

Summary

Chapter 4 included data analysis of eight interviews study participants for this basic qualitative inquiry. Using the steps identified by Braun and Clarke (2006), I was able to inductively identify 50 codes that were merged into 10 categories. Five major themes emerged from the analysis. Three themes aligned with RQ 1: How do students who have experienced intrusive advising at a small, urban community college, describe their advising and college experiences? Participants described their advising and college experiences in terms of environmental experiences and support, internal and external

factors, and feeling valued as a student. Two themes emerged from data analysis that aligned with RQ 2: How do students who have experienced intrusive advising at a small, urban community college, describe the role of intrusive advising on their persistence decisions? Participants described the role of intrusive advising on their persistence decisions in terms of growth and impact of intrusive advising. Discrepant cases were presented with the findings to enhance the trustworthiness of my study. In Chapter 5, I will discuss my interpretations of the findings. Limitations of the study, recommendations, and implications will also be discussed.

Chapter 5: Discussions, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The purpose of this basic qualitative inquiry was to explore the role of intrusive advising on retaining students at a small, urban community college in the southeastern United States. Interviews were conducted with students who had experienced at least one intrusive advising intervention at a small urban community college. Five major themes emerged from the analysis. Three themes aligned with RQ 1: How do students who have experienced intrusive advising at a small, urban community college, describe their advising and college experiences? Participants described their advising and college experiences in terms of environmental experiences and support, internal and external factors, and feeling valued as a student. Two themes emerged from data analysis that aligned with RQ 2: How do students who have experienced intrusive advising at a small, urban community college, describe the role of intrusive advising on their persistence decisions? Participants described the role of intrusive advising on their persistence decisions in terms of growth and impact of intrusive advising. Discrepant cases were presented with the findings to enhance the trustworthiness of my study.

Chapter 5 presents the interpretation of the findings in relation to previous peer-reviewed published literature and in the context of the conceptual framework. Limitations of the study regarding trustworthiness that arose from execution of the study are then presented. Recommendations for further research are presented as grounded in the strengths and limitations of the current study as well as the literature reviewed in Chapter 2. Implications for positive social change, methods, theory, and practice are also presented in Chapter 5. A conclusion of the study ends the chapter.

Interpretation of the Findings

I conducted this study in a small urban community college environment guided by two research questions:

- RQ 1: How do students who have experienced intrusive advising at a small, urban community college, describe their advising and college experiences?

- RQ 2: How do students who have experienced intrusive advising at a small, urban community college, describe the role of intrusive advising on their persistence decisions?

Five themes emerged from my research of intrusive advising. Three themes aligned with RQ1, and two themes aligned with RQ2. In this Interpretation of the Findings section, I describe ways in which the current study's findings extend, confirm, or disconfirm existing knowledge of educational practice within peer-reviewed literature presented in Chapter 2. I also interpret the findings within the conceptual frameworks of Bandura's (1977, 1986, 1997) triadic reciprocal causation model and Tinto's (1975) model of integration and student retention.

Confirmation of Previous Findings

Several themes from my research were confirmed by previous research presented in Chapter 2. The themes from the present study that confirmed previous findings include environmental experience and support, internal and external factors, feeling valued as a student, which aligned with RQ 1, and growth, and impact of intrusive advising, which aligned with RQ 2. Following is a discussion of how these themes are congruent with previous findings.

First, the environmental experiences and support theme was identified as students' experiences and interactions with the college and how supported they felt by faculty and staff within that environment. Environmental experiences consist of resources, faculty support, family support, and adjustment to college, whereas social environment consists of self-observation and self-judgment. Participants described the support or the lack of support they received within the college environment that impacted their outcomes, and which challenged their attitudes, beliefs, and values. Therefore, my findings support research that found student expectations reflect their beliefs in their ability and impact academic performance and outcomes and that environmental factors and students' experiences impact self-efficacy and therefore, academic outcomes (Bolkan et al., 2018; Pleitz et al., 2015). Additionally, CCCSE (2018) identified that not having an assigned academic advisor can result in conflicting information and student dissatisfaction. This was consistent with my findings as some participants indicated they did not have an assigned advisor or did not know who their academic advisor was, which made students feel less supported.

Second, the theme internal and external factors was identified as barriers students described that interfered with their performance and ability to integrate within the college. Participants described a plurality of factors that were integral to their overall college experience that confirms prior findings impacting retention. These factors ranged from faculty support or lack thereof, financial and family obligations, family/friend support and encouragement, work obligations, personal problems, and personal goals. These findings confirm prior studies indicating that work obligations impact time

allocation for academic tasks and social integration, factors that are important to retention (Hafer et al., 2018; Schudde, 2016). In addition to holding a job, many community college students have family obligations and other responsibilities that can interfere with academic tasks (Hafer et al., 2018; Heller & Cassady, 2017). For these students, often identified as nontraditional students, balancing work, school, and family obligations make it more difficult for them to integrate academically or socially with the college and can be a source of stress for the student (Mahaffey et al., 2015; Schudde, 2016).

The third emerging theme from my findings that confirmed prior research was feeling valued as a student. Feeling valued as a student was described in terms of how students' interaction with faculty and staff made them feel. Participants in my study described their interactions with faculty and advisors as promoting feeling valued as a student. Some participants described how some advisors went above and beyond to provide assistance which made them feel valued as a student. Some participants described being provided tools and resources as beneficial to their outcomes. For an academic advising program to be effective it must incorporate elements that are truly beneficial for the student and be valued by the student (Walters & Seyedian, 2016). Quality and quantity of student interactions with advisors are beneficial to positive retention outcomes (DeLaRosby, 2017). Academic advisors should advocate for students to help students create meaningful academic relationships with faculty (Kimball & Campbell, 2013). Facilitating faculty–student interaction helps students feel more academically connected to the institution.

The fourth theme to emerge from my findings that confirmed prior studies is growth. For the present study, growth was defined as the by-product of being in an environment that supported students' maturation process, assisting with goals, and becoming more self-directed and motivated. Academic advising directly impacts student development (He & Hutson, 2016, p. 213). Participants experienced growth as a result of their academic advising experiences in terms of becoming more organized, more motivated, self-directed, and more self-reliant. My findings support studies that showed students who become more actively engaged with their coursework experience greater college success (Fredin et al., 2015). Students who can integrate academically by interacting with faculty, taking greater responsibility for their learning, and investing in study habits and time management are more likely to persist than students who do not (Cholewa & Ramaswami, 2015; Conley & French, 2014; Duckworth & Yeager, 2015; Heller & Cassady, 2017). Academic advising helps students develop necessary skills to navigate the college environment and curriculum content (McGill, 2016).

The last theme to emerge in my findings is the impact of intrusive advising, which was identified as whether the interaction students had with intrusive academic advising directly influenced their decision to persist. For the participants in this study, their interaction with intrusive advising had a direct impact on their decision to persist and confirms studies that demonstrated students' self-efficacy and persistence is influenced by strong relationships with academic advisors (Vianden & Barlow, 2014); and, that quality and quantity of student interactions with advisors are beneficial to positive retention outcomes (DeLaRosby, 2017).

Disconfirmation of Previous Findings

While several themes from this study were confirmed by previous research presented in Chapter 2, several themes disaffirmed previous findings about intrusive advising. Disaffirmed themes are environmental experiences and support, internal and external factors, and feeling valued as a student. These themes address RQ 1: How do students who have experienced intrusive advising at a small, urban community college, describe their advising and college experiences? Students had mixed experiences. The following discussion demonstrates how these themes were incongruent with previous findings.

First, the theme environmental experiences and support was identified as students' experiences and interactions with the college and how supported they felt by faculty and staff within that environment. The findings from this study did not confirm previous research conducted on intrusive advising as a means of teaching and learning. My findings did not support enhanced learning through intentional backward or sequential advising design (Kraft-Terry & Kau, 2019). None of the student participants mentioned that the material used in their intrusive advising interventions were sequentially organized that gave meaning, promoted discovery and learning, and helped them identify interrelationships within the college environment (Lowenstein, 2020). A reasonable explanation for this incongruence is that students were unaware of how the advising programs were designed.

Also, not part of the findings of this study were how students integrated socially with the campus environment. Prior studies showed that students who integrate socially

by participating in club activities and other social aspects of college life feel a stronger connection to the campus environment and are more likely to persist (Cholewa & Ramaswami, 2015; Duckworth & Yeager, 2015). It could be that my findings did not reveal social integration due to the study being conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic when students were compelled to stay socially distanced, were not on campus, and were taking courses online.

The second theme which was not affirmed by previous studies is internal and external factors. Factors were identified for the present study as barriers students described that interfered with their performance and integration ability. A prior study revealed that in addition to financial challenges, low-income students often face cultural differences in navigating the college environment that is often shaped by more affluent students (Schudde, 2016). My findings did not support a mismatch of cultural differences of navigating the college environment as a barrier identified by student participants. Demographic data for Study College revealed that 74% of students received the Pell grant, however, 92% of students share similar ethnicity, thereby reducing cultural shock that some students may face at other institutions.

The last theme not confirmed by the present study in previous research is the theme feeling valued as a student and described in terms of how students' interaction with faculty and staff made them feel. Findings from my study did not confirm a prior study that demonstrated a student's feeling of belonging or fitting in had a more positive impact on college retention than did academic performance (Han et al., 2017). In the current study, participants' responses indicated they were referring to their interaction

with academic advising, faculty, and staff and not how they perceived themselves fitting into the college environment. As with internal and external factors, my study findings may have been influenced by being conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic and so participants did not reveal fitting into the college environment as a role of intrusive advising.

Analysis and Interpretation of the Findings within Conceptual Frameworks

The conceptual frameworks guiding my study of intrusive advising and by which the findings were analyzed and interpreted were Bandura's (1977, 1986, 1997) triadic reciprocal causation model and Tinto's (1975) model of student integration. Bandura's triadic reciprocal model explains how (a) behavior, which consists of expectancies, environmental cues, and self-efficacy; (b) personal and cognitive factors, which consist of knowledge and skills, motivation, and affect; and (c) social environment, which consists of self-observation and self-judgment, are interdependent and can be driving forces in a student's decision to persist in college (Bandura, 1977, 1986, 1997). Tinto's (1975) model of student integration advances that student retention is precipitated on the students' ability to integrate academically and socially with the institution.

Theoretically, my findings confirm Bandura's model because participants described how their personal attributes and behavior, such as motivation, were influenced by their interaction with their environment. Students became more self-directed and goal-oriented in their interaction with the college environment and intrusive advising. For 63% of participants, the relationship between these three factors had a direct impact on their decision to persist. For the other 37% of participants who said that intrusive advising

interventions did not influence their decision to persist, they also described how their personal behavior was influenced by the environment, more specifically, academic/intrusive advising.

Tinto's (1975) model of student integration was somewhat confirmed. According to Tinto students who become both academically and socially connected to an institution are more likely to persist than those students who do not. Student social integration was not a theme derived by my study most likely because the research was conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic during which students were taking courses online. However, academic integration was present in my findings as participants described their interaction with instructors and advisors.

Limitations of the Study

Limitations of trustworthiness that arose from the execution of the current study included potential researcher bias, transferability, dependability, and participant response bias. An unanticipated limitation was not having a large participant pool from which to randomly select participants. An explanation of how these limitations were addressed is presented.

To address researcher bias, I constructed interview questions objectively to ensure they were not leading questions that support any personal assumptions. I transcribed the interviews and notes immediately following each interview and asked participants to member check interview transcripts to ensure their accuracy. I considered all the data collected, re-evaluated the data, and set aside pre-existing assumptions when analyzing data. Because I only collected data at only one site, transferability of the findings will be

limited to community colleges with characteristics similar to the study site. I provided a detailed description of the study site and profile of participants so readers of results can decide if study findings are transferable to another setting of interest.

To improve the dependability of data, I followed the suggestions of Lodico et al. (2010) and provided a "detailed description of data collection and analysis procedures…" (p. 276). Data was collected during time of COVID-19 pandemic and interviews were conducted via Zoom and recorded. Participant response bias was addressed by asking each participant open ended, non-confrontational and engaging questions. Participants spoke freely about their experiences, with emotions and inflection in their voices about their experiences.

However, a limitation not addressed in Chapter 1 was not having a large participant pool in which to randomly select participants. The dismally low participation rate dictated that I use the eight participants who returned consents and met criteria. To improve trustworthiness, I presented discrepant cases as part of my findings.

Recommendations

The findings from my basic qualitative inquiry highlighted the need for future research. Recommendations for future research are presented in the following discussion and include an alternate framework, methodology, and design. These recommendations are derived from a combination of the strengths and limitations of my study and from previous research presented in Chapter 2.

Theoretically, the current study used Bandura's triadic reciprocal causation model and Tinto's model of student integration as conceptual frameworks (Bandura, 1977,

1986, 1997; Tinto, 1975). Environment is an element of both theories. Community college students interviewed did not divulge they were involved in campus activities, however, several stated they had jobs and families. Most had been compelled to take online courses during the COVID-19 pandemic. Replicating the current study during a non-pandemic time might yield different themes that may include social aspects of being on campus. Moreover, replicating the current study using Tinto's (1988) model of student attrition and persistence or a theory of retention for online learning might also lend a different lens.

The current study was conducted in a small urban community college and, therefore, is limited in transferability to other college settings. Further research replicating the current study is recommended in other settings to understand if similar or different results are forthcoming. Studies at medium and large urban community colleges and at rural colleges could be described and perhaps compared.

Dependability of the current study was impacted by the small number of participants studied. Increasing the sample size would add dependability of any future qualitative studies. Dependability is also affected by researcher and participant bias. Having another researcher conduct interviews in the same environment would either affirm or disaffirm the current study in terms of researcher and participant bias. Additionally, a survey is recommended for further study in the setting of the current study based on the themes uncovered by my study. A survey would result in data gathered from many students and be more generalizable to the population of interest.

This study included a large percentage of high-risk students. Employing a grounded theory methodology may help develop a more plausible theory to address this particular population of students as indicated in the literature review (Fong et al., 2016; Gibbons & Woodside, 2014; and Xu, 2017). Additionally, widening the participant pool to students with lower risk of dropping might yield different results, which could be added to results from the current and previous studies. A meta-synthesis of qualitative studies would be appropriate for combining results of different studies. My study was limited to students at one small urban community college. A case study which also seeks academic advisors' perspectives is also recommended.

A related recommendation is a study of the process of intrusive advising. Backward design was recommended in the literature to identify student learning objectives and then work backward to develop activities that would contribute to the prescribed learning outcomes. Kraft-Terry and Kau (2019) supported developing a proactive advising curriculum using the backward design to ensure learning objectives are met and include comprehensive assessment plans to evaluate the curriculum (p. 60). They studied an intentionally developed proactive advising curriculum using backward design with students who were at-risk academically and found an improvement in student learning, although they were not able to make a connection to improved grades or retention. Conducting a process evaluation of an intrusive advising program may uncover how to best implement a specific advising program at small urban community colleges to improve retention.

Studies about virtual advising would be salient as campuses operate in an environment upended by a pandemic. Thompson and Prieto (2013) found that "virtualized advising systems would not successfully replicate the encouragement factor found in the face-to-face advising" (p. 13). Given the educational challenges presented by the COVID-19 pandemic, revisiting virtual advising using platforms such as Zoom or Teams, is worth exploring and could affirm or disaffirm the findings identified by Thompson and Prieto (2013). Such a study could be framed using a theory of online learning or the study could be a program evaluation.

Further research is also recommended to determine the extent to which an assigned advisor is instrumental in the early years of academic study in improving outcomes for students attending small urban colleges or colleges with a similar demographic as this study. CCCSE (2018) identified that not having an assigned academic advisor can result in conflicting information and student dissatisfaction.

Implications

The findings of my study about the role of intrusive advising on retaining students at a small urban community college has the potential to advance practice in the field of academic advising and inform academic advising policies. This study adds to the scholarship of teaching and learning to inform advising practices designed to help retain students.

Findings revealed students' interaction with their advisors impacted their growth, made them feel valued as students, and influenced their persistence decisions. The findings also revealed how supported or unsupported students felt due to interactions with

the college environment to include academic advising. My study did not address how much the retention rate improved at study college, but rather how intrusive advising played a role in students' decision to persist. Data can inform practice in the field of academic advising, and inform academic advising policies that better understand and meet the needs of students and to develop advising programs to meet the needs of a complex student population who possess many risk factors of early departure.

Conclusion

Community college student retention is a multifaceted phenomenon. While intrusive advising has been touted as a remedy to combat problematic attrition, the literature is scant about studies on how intrusive advising can contribute to improved retention at small urban colleges. This basic qualitative inquiry provided a contribution to the extant literature on intrusive advising. Research revealed community college retention as problematic. My findings revealed sustained interactions with academic advising improved student outcomes and intrusive advising was a factor for most students in their persistence decisions.

References

Abelman, R., & Molina, A. (2000). Style and substance revisited: A longitudinal analysis of intrusive intervention. *NACADA Journal, 21*(1&2), 32–39.

ACT. (2018). The condition of college and career readiness: National 2018. https://www.act.org/content/dam/act/unsecured/documents/cccr 2018/National-CCCR-2018.pdf

American Association of Community Colleges. (2014). Fast facts from our fact sheet. http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Documents/Facts14_Data_R3.pdf

American Institutes of Research. (2020). College and career readiness. https://www.air.org/topic/education/college-and-career-readiness

Backhus, D. (1989). Centralized intrusive advising and undergraduate retention. *NACADA Journal, 9*(1), 39–45.

Bailey, J. (2008). First steps in qualitative data analysis: transcribing. *Family Practice, 25*, 127–131.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*(2), 191–215.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory.* Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1989). Social cognitive theory. In R. Vasta (Ed.), *Annals of child development. Vol. 6. Six theories of child development* (pp. 1–60). JAI Press. https://www.uky.edu/~eushe2/Bandura/Bandura1989ACD.pdf

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. Freeman.

Bandura, A. (1998). Health promotion from the perspective of social cognitive theory.

Psychology and Health, *13*, 623–649.

https://doi.org/10.1080/08870449808407422

Bandura, A. (2004). Health promotion by social cognitive means. *Health Education &*

Behavior, *31*, 143–164. https://doi.org/10.1177/1090198104263660

Banta, T. W., Hansen, M. J., Black, K. E., & Jackson, J. E. (2002). Assessing advising

outcomes. *NACADA Journal, 22*(1), 5–14. https://doi.org/10.12930/0271-9517-

22.1.5

Battin, J. R. (2014). Improving academic advising through student seminars: A case

study. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 25*(3), 354–367.

Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and

implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report, 13*(4), 544–559.

http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR13-4/baxter.pdf

Bergman, Z., Bergman, M. M., & Thatcher, A. (2019). Agency and Bandura's model of

triadic reciprocal causation: An exploratory mobility study among metrorail

commuters in the Western Cape, South Africa. *Frontiers in Psychology.*

https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00411/full

Bitterman, J. E. (1985). Academic advising and adult education: An emerging synthesis.

NACADA Journal, 5(2), 29–33.

Bloom, B. S. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives. Handbook 1: Cognitive*

domain. Longman.

Bloom, J. L., Hutson, B. L., & He, Y. (2013). Appreciative advising. In J. K. Drake, P.

Jordan, & M. A. Miller (Eds.), *Academic Advising Approaches*. Jossey-Bass.

Boatman, A., & Long, B. T. (2018). Does remediation work for all students? How the effects of postsecondary remedial and developmental course vary by level of academic preparation. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 40*(1), 29–58.

Bogdan, R. C., & Bilkan, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods* (Laureate custom ed.). Pearson Education.

Bolkan, S., Pedersen, W. C., Stormes, K. N., & Manke, B. (2018). Predicting 4-year graduation: Using social cognitive career theory to model the impact of prescriptive advising, unit load, and students' self-efficacy. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice,* 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1177/1521025118783485

Bouma, G. D., & Atkinson, G. B. J. (1995). *A handbook of social science research* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Britt, S. L., Ammerman, D. A., Barrett, S. F., & Jones, S. (2017). Student loans, financial stress, and college student retention. *Journal of Student Financial Aid, 47*(1), 25–37.

Cady, C. L. (2014). Food insecurity as a student issue. *Journal of College and Character, 15*(4), 265–272. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1515/jcc-2014-0031

Caelli, K., Ray, L., & Mill, J. (2003). "Clear as mud": Toward greater clarity in generic

qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *2*(2).

    http://www.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/backissues/pdf/caellietal.pdf

Caruth, G. D. (2018). Student engagement, retention, and motivation: Assessing

    academic success in today's college students. *Participatory Educational Research*

    (PER), 5(1), 17–30.

Castillo-Montoya, M. (2016). Preparing for interview research: The interview protocol

    refinement framework. *The Qualitative Report, 21*(5), 811–831.

    https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol21/iss5/2

Cataldi, E. F., Bennett, C. T., & Chen, X. (2018). First-generation students: College

    access, persistence, and postbachelor's outcomes.

    https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2018/2018421.pdf

Center for Community College Student Engagement. (2016). *Expectations meet reality:*

    The underprepared student and community colleges.

    http://www.ccsse.org/docs/Underprepared_ Student.pdf

Center for Community College Student Engagement. (2018). *Show me the way: The*

    Power of advising in community colleges, 2018 National Report.

    https://www.ccsse.org/NR2018/Show_Me_The_Way.pdf

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through*

    qualitative analysis. Sage Publications.

Chen, G. (2018). What is a community college?. *Community College Review*.

    https://www.communitycollegereview.com/blog/what-is-a-community-college

Chen, X., & Simone, S. (2016). Remedial course taking at U.S. public 2- and 4-year

institutions: Scope, experiences, and outcomes. Statistical Analysis Report. U. S. Department of Education. https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2016/2016405.pdf

Cholewa, B., & Ramaswami, S. (2015). The effects of counseling on the retention and academic performance of underprepared freshmen. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice, 17*(2), 204–225. https://doi.org/10.1177/1521025115578233

Chrysikos, A., Ahmed, E., & Ward, R. (2017). Analysis of Tinto's student integration theory in first-year undergraduate computing students of a UK higher education institution. *International Journal of Comparative Education and Development, 19*(2/3), 97–121. https://doi.org/10.1108IJCED-10-2016-0019

Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2017). Thematic analysis, *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *12*(3), 297–298. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2016.1262613

Clotfelter, C., Ladd, H., Muschkin, C., & Vigdor, J. (2015). Developmental education in North Carolina community colleges. *Educational Evaluation & Policy Analysis*, *37*(3), 354–375. https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373714547267

Cohen, A. M., Brawer, F. B., & Kisker, C. B. (2014). *The American community college*. Jossey-Bass.

Community College Research Center. (2013). Designing a system for strategic advising. http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/designing-a-system-for-strategic-advising.pdf

Conefrey, T. (2018). Supporting first-generation students' adjustment to college with high impact practices. *Journal of College Student Retention*, 1–22.

https://doi.org/10.1177/1521025118807402

Conley, D. (2014, Spring). New conceptions of college and career ready: A profile

approach to admissions. *Journal of College Admissions.*

https://www.academia.edu/10525189/New_Conceptions_of_College_and_Career

_Ready_A_Profile_Approach_to_Admission

Conley, D., & French, E. (2014). Student ownership of learning as a key component of

college readiness. *American Behavioral Scientist.*

https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764213515232

Cope, D. (2014). Methods and meanings: Credibility and trustworthiness of qualitative

research. *Oncology Nursing Forum, 41*, 89–91.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and

Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory (3rd ed.*). Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating

quantitative and qualitative research* (Laureate custom ed.). Pearson Education.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods

approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and

mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

Crookston, B. (1972). A developmental view of academic advising as teaching. *Journal

of College Student Personnel, 13*, 12–17.

DeAngelo, L., & Franke, R. (2016). Social mobility and reproduction for whom? College

readiness and first-year retention. *American Educational Research Journal, 53*(6),

1588–1625. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831216674805

DeLaRosby, H. R. (2017). Student characteristics and collegiate environments that

    contribute to the overall satisfaction with academic advising among college

    students. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice,*

    19(2), 145–160.

Denscombe, M. (2010). *The good research guide: For small-scale research projects* (4th

    ed.). McGraw Hill Companies.

Donaldson, P., McKinney, L., Lee, M., & Pino, D. (2016). First-year community college

    students' perceptions of and attitudes toward intrusive academic advising.

    NACADA Journal, 36(1), 30–42. https://doi.org/10.12930/NACADA-15-012

Dougherty, K., Lahr, H., & Smith Morest, V. (2017). Reforming the American

    community college: Promising changes and their challenges. Community College

    Research Center. https://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/publications/reforming-american-

    community-college-promising-changes-challenges.html

Douglas, D., & Attewell, P. (2014). The Bridge and the Troll Underneath: Summer

    bridge programs and degree completion. *American Journal of Education,* 121.

Drake, J. K., Jordan, P., & Miller, M. A. (Eds.). (2013). *Academic advising approaches:*

    Strategies that teach students to make the most of college. Jossey-Bass.

Duckworth, A. L., & Yeager, D. S. (2015). Measurement matters: Assessing personal

    qualities other than cognitive ability for educational purposes. *Educational*

    Researcher, 44(4), 237–251.

Earl, W. R. (1988). Intrusive advising of freshmen in academic difficulty. *NACADA*

Journal, 8(2), 27–33.

Elfman, L. (2015). Urban colleges dealing with unique retention issues.

http://diverseeducation.com/article/78262/

Farruggia, S. P., Han, C., Watson, L., Moss, T. P., & Bottoms, B. L. (2018).

Noncognitive factors and college student success. *Journal of College Student*

Retention, 20(3), 308–327.

Fong, C. J., Acee, T. W., & Weinstein, C. E. (2018). A person-centered investigation of

achievement motivation goals and correlates of community college student

achievement and persistence. *Journal of College Student Retention, 20*(3), 369–

387. https://doi.org/10.1177/1521025116673374

Fong, C. J., Davis, C. W., Kim, Y., Kim, Y. W., Marriott, L., & Kim, S. (2016).

Psychosocial factors and community college success: A meta-analytic

investigation. *Review of Educational Research*, *87*, 388–424.

Fosnacht, K., McCormick, A. C., Nailos, J. N., & Ribera, A. K. (2017). Frequency of

first-year student interactions with advisors. *NACADA Journal, 37*(1), 74–86.

https://doi.org/10.12930/NACADA-15-048

Frame, D. L., & Cummins-Sebree, S. C. (2017). A case study on proactive (intrusive)

faculty contacts' influence on DFW rates in introductory psychology courses.

AURCO Journal, 23, 49–72.

Fredin, A., Fuchsteiner, P., & Portz, K. (2015). Working toward more engaged and

successful accounting students: A balanced scorecard approach. *American*

Journal of Business Education, 8(1), 49–62.

Gibbons, M. M., Rhinehart, A., & Hardin, E. (2016). How first-generation college

students adjust to college. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research,*

Theory & Practice, 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1177/1521025116682035

Gibbons, M. M., & Woodside, M. (2014). Addressing the needs of first-generation

college students: Lessons learned from adults from low-education families.

Journal of College Counseling, 17(1), 21–36. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-

1882.2014.00045.x

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation.* Sage Publications.

Guest, G., Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough? An

experiment with data saturation and variability. *Field Methods, 18*(1), 24.

https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X05279903

Guiffrida, D. A., Lynch, M. F., Wall, A. F., & Abel, D. S. (2013). Do reasons for

attending college affect academic outcomes? A test of a motivational model from

a self-determination theory perspective. *Journal of College Student Development,*

54(2), 121–139.

Hafer, L. C., Gibson, N. M., York, T. T., Fiester, H. R., & Tsemunhu, R. (2018). An

examination of student retention at a 2-year college through structural equation

modeling. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice,* 1–

22. https://doi.org/10.1177/1521025118770813

Han, C. W., Farruggia, S. P., & Moss, T. P. (2017). Effects of academic mindsets on

college students' achievement and retention. *Journal of College Student*

Development, 58(8), 1119–1134.

http://dx.doi.org.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/10.1353/csd.2017.0089

Hanover Research. (2016). College and career readiness structures.

https://cdn.education.ne.gov/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/College-and-Career-

Readiness-Structures.pdf

Harrell, J. C., & Reglin, G. (2018). Evaluation of a community college's nursing faculty

advising program relative to students' satisfaction and retention. *College Student*

Journal, 52(1), 33–48.

He, Y., & Hutson, B. (2016). Appreciative assessment in academic advising. *Review of*

Higher Education, 39(2), 213–240.

Hedrick, J., Light, M., & Dick, J. (2014). College readiness for rural youth initiative:

Creating a climate for success. *Journal of Social Studies Research, 2014*(1), 48–

57.

Heller, M. L., & Cassady, J. C. (2017). Predicting community college and university

student success: A test of the triadic reciprocal model for two populations.

Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice, 18(4), 431–

456.

Hemwall, M. K., & Trachte, K. (1999). Learning at the core: Toward a new

understanding of academic advising. *NACADA Journal, 19*(1), 5–11.

https://doi.org/10.12930/0271-9517-29.1.113

Hogan, E. A., Bryant, S. K., & Overmyer-Day, L. E. (2013). Relationships between

college students' credit card debt, undesirable academic behaviors and cognitions,

and academic performance. *College Student Journal, 47*(1), 102–112.

Honicke, T., & Broadbent, J. (2016). The influence of academic self-efficacy on

academic performance: A systematic review. *Educational Research Review*, *17*,

63–84. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2015.11.002

Hutson, B. L., Bloom, J. L., & He, Y. (2014). How appreciative advising is

revolutionizing academic advising: Framework, evolution and possible future

directions. *AI Practitioner, 16*(2), 47–53.

Jacob, S. A., & Ferguson, S. P. (2012). Writing interview protocols and conducting

interviews: Tips for students new to the field of qualitative research. *The

Qualitative Report, 17*(42), 1–10. http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR17/jacob.pdf

Jimenez, L., Sargrad, S., Morales, J., & Thompson, M. (2016). Remedial education: The

cost of catching up. Center for American Progress. https://www.american

progress.org/issues/education-k-12/reports/2016/09/28/144000/remedial-

education/

Kalinowski Ohrt, E. (2016). Proactive advising with first-generation students:

Suggestions for practice. *Mentor: An Academic Advising Journal*, *18*.

https://journals.psu.edu/mentor/article/view/61250/60883

Kantamneni, N., McCain, M. R. C., Shada, N., Hellwege, M. A., & Tate, J. (2018).

Contextual factors in the career development of prospective first-generation

college students: An application of social cognitive career theory. *Journal of

Career Assessment, 26*(1), 183–196. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072716680048

Karp, M. M., Hughes, K. L., & O'Gara, L. (2008). An exploration of Tinto's integration

framework for community college students. CCRC Working Paper No. 12. New

York City, NY: Community College Research Center, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Kimball, E., & Campbell, S. M. (2013). Advising strategies to support student learning success: Linking theory and philosophy with intentional practice. In J. K. Drake, P. Jordan, & M. A. Miller (Eds.), *Academic advising approaches: Strategies that teach students to make the most of college* (pp. 3–16). Jossey-Bass.

Kinkle, R. M. (2020). Factors influencing student success in associate degree respiratory therapy programs. *Health Professions Education, 6*(3), 343–353.

Kolenovic, Z., Linderman, D., & Karp, M. M. (2013). Improving student outcomes via comprehensive supports: Three-year outcomes from CUNY's accelerated study in associate programs (ASAP). *Community College Review*, *41*(4), 271–291. https://doi.org/10.1177/0091552113503709

Komarraju, M., & Nadler, D. (2013, June). Self-efficacy and academic achievement: Why do implicit beliefs, goals, and effort regulation matter? *Learning and Individual Differences, 25*, 67–72.

Kraft-Terry, S., & Kau, C. (2019). Direct measure assessment of learning outcome–driven proactive advising for academically at-risk students. *NACADA Journal*, *39*(1), 60–76.

Kuzel, A. (1992). Sampling in qualitative inquiry. In B. Crabtree & W. Miller (Eds.), *Doing Quality Research* (pp. 31–44). Sage Publications.

Lewis, B. (2019, August 27). Scaffolding Instruction Strategies. https://www.thoughtco.com/scaffolding-instruction-strategies-2081682

Liao, H. A., Edlin, M., & Ferdenzi, A. C. (2014). Persistence at an urban community college: The implications of self-efficacy and motivation. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 38*(7), 595–611.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Sage Publications.

Lodico, M. G., Spaulding, D. T., & Voegtle, K. H. (2010). *Methods in educational research: From theory to practice.* (Laureate custom ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

Lowenstein, M. (2020). If Advising is Teaching, What Do Advisors Teach? *NACADA Journal, 40*(2), 5–14.

Ma, J., & Baum, S. (2016). Trends in community colleges: Enrollment, prices, student debt, and completion. College Board. https://research.collegeboard.org/pdf/trends-community-colleges-research-brief.pdf

Ma, J., Pender, M., & Welch, M. (2019). Education Pays 2019: The benefits of higher education for individuals and society. Trends in Higher Education Series. College Board. https://research.collegeboard.org/pdf/education-pays-2019-full-report.pdf

Maguire, M., & Delahunt, B. (2017). Doing a thematic analysis: A practical, step-by-step guide for learning and teaching scholars. *AISHE-J, 8*(3), 3351–33514. http://ojs.aishe.org/index.php/aishe-j/article/view/335/553

Mahaffey, B. A., Hungerford, G., & Sill, S. (2015). College student mother needs at regional campuses: An exploratory study. *AURCO Journal, 21*, 105–115.

Martin, J. M. (2017). It just didn't work out: Examining nonreturning students' stories about their freshman experience. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory &Practice, 19*(2), 176–198.

Martin, K., Goldwasser, M., & Harris, E. (2017). Developmental education's impact of

    students' academic self-concept and self-efficacy. *Journal of College Student*

    Retention: Research, Theory & Practice, 18(4), 401–414.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/1521025115604850

Martinez, R. R., Baker, S. B., & Young, T. (2017). Promoting career and college

    readiness, aspirations, and self-efficacy: Curriculum field test. *The Career*

    Development Quarterly, 65, 173–188.

Maxwell, J. (1992). Understanding and validity in qualitative research. *Harvard*

    Educational Review, 62(3), 279–301.

    https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.62.3.8323320856251826

McCambridge, J., de Bruin, M., & Witton, J. (2012). The Effects of Demand

    Characteristics on Research Participant Behaviours in Non-Laboratory Settings: A

    Systematic Review. *Plos ONE*, *7*(6), e39116.

    https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0039116

McCarthy, J. (2016). Reflections on a flipped classroom in first year higher education.

    Issues in Educational Research, 26(2), 332–350.

McGill, C. M. (2016). "Cultivating ways of thinking": The developmental teaching

    perspective in academic advising. *New Horizons in Adult Education & Human*

    Resource Development, 28(1), 50–54.

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and*

    implementation (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Mertes, S. J., & Jankoviac, M. W. (2016, Spring). Creating a college-wide retention

program: A mixed methods approach. *Community College Enterprise,* 9–27.

Middleton, L., Hall, H., & Raeside, R. (2018). Applications and applicability of Social Cognitive Theory in information science research. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0961000618769985

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: an expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

Millar, B., & Tanner, D. (2011, October-December). Students' perceptions of their readiness for community college study. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, *6*(4). http://cnx.org/content/m41698/1.2/

Mokher, C. G., Leeds, D. M., & Harris, J. C. (2018, June 1). Adding it up: How the Florida college and career readiness initiative impacted development education. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 40*(2), 219–242. https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373717744891

National Academic Advising Association. (2006). NACADA. Concepts of academic advising. https://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Pillars/Concept.aspx

National Center for Education Statistics. (2016). U. S. Department of Education. First-time postsecondary students in 2011-12: three-year retention and attainment at first institution. https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2016137

National Center for Education Statistics. (2018). U. S. Department of Education. Undergraduate retention and graduation rates. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_ctr.asp

National Student Clearinghouse Research Center. (2017). Term enrollment estimates.

https://nscresearchcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/CurrentTermEnrollment-Fall2017a.pdf

National Student Clearinghouse Research Center. (2018, June 27). Snapshot report: First-year persistence and retention. https://nscresearchcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/SnapshotReport33.pdf

National Student Clearinghouse Research Center. (2019). Persistence and retention. https://nscresearchcenter.org/snapshotreport35-first-year-persistence-and-retention/

Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *SAGE Journal, 16*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847

Nowicki, J. M. (2018). *K-12 Education: Public High Schools with More Students in Poverty and Smaller Schools Provide Fewer Academic Offerings to Prepare for College*. Report to the Ranking Member, Committee on Education and the Workforce, House of Representatives. GAO-19-8. U. S. Government Accountability Office. https://www.gao.gov/assets/700/694961.pdf

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research and methods: Integrating theory and practice*. Sage Publications.

Petty, T. (2014). Motivating First-Generation Students to Academic Success and College Completion. *College Student Journal, 48*(2), 257–264.

Pintrich, P. R., & De Groot, E. V. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82, 33–40.

Pleitz, J. P., MacDougall, A. E., Terry, R. A., Buckley, M. R., & Campbell, N. J. (2015). Great Expectations: Examining the discrepancy between expectations and experiences on college student retention. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice*, *17*(1), 88–104. https://doi.org/10.1177/1521025115571252

Polit, D. F., & Beck, C. T. (2014). *Essentials of nursing research: Appraising evidence for nursing practice*. Wolters Kluwer/Lippincott/Williams & Wilkins Health.

Pruett, P. B., & Absher, B. (2015). Factors influencing retention of developmental education students in community colleges. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin, 81*(4), 32–40.

Raheim, M., Magnussen, L. H., Sekse, R. J., Lunde, A., Jacobsen, T., & Blystad, A. (2016). Researcher-researched relationship in qualitative research: Shifts in positions and researcher vulnerability. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-being*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.3402/qhw.v11.30996

Raisman, N. (2013). The cost of college attrition at four-year colleges and universities. The Educational Policy Institute. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED562625.pdf

Ravitch, S. M., & Carl, N. M. (2021). *Qualitative research: Bridging the conceptual, theoretical, and methodological* (2nd ed.). Sage publications.

Rios, A. L. (2019). Examining the Impacts of Intrusive Advising on the Retention and

Academic Success of First-Year, At-Risk, Community College Students. Fisher

Digital Publications.

https://fisherpub.sjfc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1407&context=education_et

d

Rodgers, K., Blunt, S., & Trible, L. (2014). A real PLUSS: An intrusive advising

program for underprepared STEM students. *NACADA Journal, 34*(1), 35–42.

Rose, C. (2020, March). Advising as teaching: The power of evidence-based teaching

practices in academic advising. *Academic Advising Today, 43*(1).

https://nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Academic-Advising-Today/View-

Articles/Advising-as-Teaching-The-Power-of-Evidence-Based-Teaching-

Practices-in-Academic-Advising.aspx

Rowh, M. (2018). Intrusive advising: 5 traits of successful proactive-advising programs.

University Business, 21(9), 31–34.

Ryan, M. (2013). Improving retention and academic achievement for first-time students

at a two-year college. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice,

37*(2), 131–134.

Ryan, R. (2015). Group advising. In P. Folsom, F. Yoder, F. & J. E. Joslin (Eds.), *The

new advisor guidebook: Mastering the art of academic advising*. Jossey-Bass.

Schneider, D., Sasso, D. P., & Puchner, L. (2017). Adviser and faculty perceptions of the

benefits and feasibility of intrusive advising. *Mentor: An Academic Advising

Journal*, *19*. https://journals.psu.edu/mentor/article/view/61239/60879

Schneider, M., & Preckel, F. (2017). Variables associated with achievement in higher

education: A systematic review of meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin*, *143*(6), 565–600. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000098

Schreiner, L. A. (2013). Strengths-based advising. In J. K. Drake, P. Jordan, & M. A. Miller (Eds.) *Academic advising approaches: Strategies that teach students to make the most of college* (pp. 105–120). Jossey-Bass and the National Academic Advising Association.

Schudde, L. (2016). The interplay of family income, campus residency, and student retention (what practitioners should know about cultural mismatch). *Journal of College & University Student Housing, 43*(1), 10–27.

Schunk, D. H., Meece, J. L., & Pintrich, P. R. (2014). *Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications* (4th ed.). Pearson Education.

Schwebel, D. C., Walburn, N. C., Klyce, K., & Jerrolds, K. L. (2012). Efficacy of advising outreach on student retention, academic progress and achievement, and frequency of advising contacts: A longitudinal randomized trial. *NACADA Journal, 32*(2), 36–43.

Scott-Clayton, J., Crosta, P. M., & Belfield, C. R. (2014). Improving the targeting of treatment: Evidence from college remediation. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *36*, 371–393. https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373713517935

Scott-Clayton, J., & Rodríguez, O. (2015). Development, discouragement, or diversion? New evidence on the effects of college remediation policy. *Education Finance and Policy*, *10*, 4–45. https://doi.org/10.1162/EDFP_a_00150

Shaffer, S. C., Eshbach, B. E., & Santiago-Blay, J. A. (2015). A dual approach to

fostering under-prepared student success: Focusing on doing and becoming. *Insight*: *A Journal of Scholarly Teaching*, *10*, 79–91.

Shapiro, D., Dundar, A., Wakhungu, P. K., Yuan, X., Nathan, A., & Hwang, Y. (2015, November). Completing college: A national view of student attainment rates Fall 2009 cohort (Signature Report No. 10). National Student Clearinghouse Research Center. https://nscresearchcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/ SignatureReport10.pdf

Shenton, A. K. (2004, July). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information, 22*(2), 63–75. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228708239_Strategies_for_Ensuring_Trustworthiness_in_Qualitative_Research_Projects

Slanger, W. D., Berg, E. A., Fisk, P. S., & Hanson, M. G. (2015). A longitudinal cohort study of student motivational factors related to academic success and retention using the college student inventory. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice,17*(3), 278–302.

Smith, J. S. (2007). Using data to inform decisions: Intrusive faculty advising at a community college. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 31*(10), 813–831.

Suvedi, M., Ghimire, R. P., Millenbah, K. F., & Shrestha, K. S. (2015). Undergraduate students' perceptions of academic advising. *NACTA Journal, 59*(3), 227–233.

Thomas, N. G. (2017). Using intrusive advising to improve student outcomes in developmental college courses. *Journal of College Student Retention,* 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1177/1521025117736740

Thompson, L. R., & Prieto, L. C. (2013). Improving retention among college students: investigating the utilization of virtualized advising. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal, 17*(4), 13–26.

Tierney, W. G., & Sablan, J. R. (2014). Examining college readiness. *American Behavioral Scientist, 58*(8), 943–946. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764213515228

Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Review of Educational Research*, *45*, 89–125.

Tinto, V. (1988). Stages of student departure: Reflections on the longitudinal character of student learning. *Journal of Higher Education*, *59*(4), 438–453.

Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* (2nd ed.). University of Chicago Press.

Truschel, J. (2015). Does the Use of Appreciative Advising Work? *Learning Assistance Review (TLAR)*, *20*(2), 61–76.

Tudor, T. T. (2018). Fully integrating academic advising with career coaching to increase student retention, graduation rates and future job satisfaction: An industry approach. *Industry and Higher Education, 32*(2), 73–79. https://doi.org/10.1177/0950422218759928

Turki, F. J., Jdaitawi, M., & Sheta, H. (2018). Fostering positive adjustment behaviour: Social connectedness, achievement motivation and emotional-social learning among male and female university students. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 19*(2), 145–158. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787417731202

Turner, P. (2016). Supporting freshmen males during their first year of college. *College*

Student Journal, 50(1).

Turner, P., & Thompson, E. (2014). College retention initiatives meeting the needs of millennial freshman students. *College Student Journal*, *48*(1), 94–104.

U. S. Census Bureau. (2014). Income, poverty, and health insurance coverage in the United States: 2013. https://www.census.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2014/cb14-169.html

U. S. Department of Education. (1991, March). Historically Black colleges and universities and higher education desegregation. https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/hq9511.html

U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2017). *TED: The Economics Daily.* Unemployment rate by educational attainment, age 25 and over, seasonally adjusted. https://www.bls.gov/opub/ted/2017/unemployment-rate-2-point-5-percent-for-college-grads-7-point-7-percent-for-high-school-dropouts-january-2017.htm

van den Wijngaard, O. (2019). Academic advising: A discipline of Praxis. *NACADA Review, 1*(1), 5–13. https://doi.org/10.12930/NACR-18-1020

Varney, J. (2013). Proactive advising. In J. K. Drake, P. Jordan, & M. A. Miller (Eds.), *Academic advising approaches: Strategies that teach students to make the most of college* (pp. 137–154). Jossey-Bass.

Vianden, J. (2016). Ties that bind: Academic advisors as agents of student relationship management. *NACADA Journal, 36*(1), 19–29. https://doi.org/10.12930/NACADA-15-026a

Vianden, J., & Barlow, P. J. (2014). Strengthen the bond: Relationships between academic advising quality and undergraduate student loyalty. *NACADA Journal, 35*(2), 15–27. https://doi.org/10.12930/NACADA-15-026

Vicary, S., Young, A., & Hicks, S. (2016). A reflective journal as learning process and contribution to quality and validity in interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Qualitative Social Work, 16*(4), 550–565. https://doi.org/10.1177/1473325016635244

Wade, B. K., & Yoder, E. P. (1995). *The professional status of teachers and academic advisers: It matters.* In A. G. Reinarz & E. R. White (Eds.), *Teaching through academic advising: A faculty perspective* (pp. 97–102). Jossey- Bass.

Walsh, K. J., & Robinson Kurpius, S. E. (2016). Parental, residential, and self-belief factors influencing academic persistence decisions of college freshmen. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice, 18*(1), 49–67.

Walters, G. (2016). Developing competency-based advising practices in response to paradigm shifts in higher education. *NACADA Journal, 36*(1).

Walters, L. M., & Seyedian, M. (2016). Improving academic advising using quality function deployment: A case study. *College Student Journal, 50*(2), 253–267.

Wells, K. (2011). *Narrative inquiry*. Oxford University Press.

Winkelmes, M. (2013). Transparency in teaching: Faculty share data and improve students' learning. *Liberal Education, 99*(2). https://www.aacu.org/publications-research/periodicals/transparency-teaching-faculty-share-data-and-improve-students

Winkelmes, M., Bernacki, M., Butler, J., Zochowski, M., Golanics, J., & Weavil, K. H. (2016). A teaching intervention that increases underserved college students' success. *Peer Review, 18*(1), 31–36.

https://www.aacu.org/peerreview/2016/winter-spring/Winkelmes

Woods, C. S., Park, T., Hu, S., & Jones, T. B. (2018). How high school coursework predicts introductory college-level course success. *Community College Review, 46*(2), 176–196.

Woods, C. S., Park, T., Hu, S., & Jones, T. B. (2019). Reading, writing, and English course pathways when developmental education is optional: Course enrollment and success for underprepared first-time-in-college students. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 43*(1), 5–25.

https://DOI.org/10.1080/10668926.2017.1391144

Xu, Y. J. (2017). Localizing college retention efforts: The distance between theoretical orientation and institution-specific needs. *Innovative Higher Education*, *42*(1), 49–63. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10755-016-9364-9

Yin, R. K. (2010). *Qualitative research from start to finish.* Guildford.

Yin, R. X. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). Sage Publications.

Yu, H. (2015, November). Student retention at two-year community colleges: A structural equation modeling approach. *International Journal of Continuing Education and Lifelong Learning, 8*(1), 85–101.

Zerquera, D. D., Ziskin, M., & Torres, V. (2018). Faculty views of "nontraditional"

students: Aligning perspectives for student success. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice, 20*(1), 29–46.

Zhang, X., Gossett, C., Simpson, J., & Davis, R. (2017). Advising students for success in higher education: An all-out effort. *Journal of College Student Retention, 1–25.* https://doi.org/10.1177/1521025116689097

Zimmerman, B. J. (2013). From cognitive modeling to self-regulation: A social cognitive career path. *Educational Psychologist, 48*(3), 135–147.

Appendix A: Interview Protocol

Title of Study: Exploring Intrusive Advising's Role in College Students' Persistence

Test tape recorder

Time of Interview:
 Start Time
 End Time

Date:

Place:

Interviewer: Carolyn Jordan

Interviewee #:

Introduction

Hello, I am Carolyn Jordan, a doctoral student at Walden University. Thank you for agreeing to be in my study about intrusive advising and college retention and thank you for setting aside time to volunteer. The interview should take less than 45 minutes. Does that amount of time work for you? I hope it is of value to you.

Purpose of the Study and Data Collection

The purpose of this study is to gain an understanding of intrusive advising's role in your decision to persist in college. There are no right or wrong responses and I want you to feel comfortable expressing your thoughts and experiences with me. I only ask that you do not disclose other students' names so we can protect their identity and respect their confidentiality. Is it OK with you if I audiotape the interview? That way I can concentrate on our conversation without being distracted with trying to write things down and miss a lot of the important information you have to share. Just so you are aware, this interview will be kept confidential, I'm the only researcher working on this project. Do you have any questions for me at this time about this study?

Informed Consent and Confidentiality

Do you have any questions about the consent form that you returned to me via email? I will be keeping a copy of your consent on file and will be kept confidential. Is that OK with you?

If you don't have any questions, at your convenience, please print a copy of the consent for your records.

Please know that your identity will be protected. No details about you or the college will be reported. You will be assigned a pseudonym, a pretend name, and that is how you will be referred to in the research report. OK?

Your information will be kept confidential, safeguarded in locked file cabinets and password protected computer. Data will be kept for at least five year according to university policy.

Do you have any questions regarding the study or anything that we have discussed so far?

If yes, answer questions, if no, move on. *Let's start, then.*

Turn on recording device and back up tape recorder

Demographic Data Questions:

Please tell me which age range best describe you. 18-24; 25-30; etc.

What is your gender? Male, female, or other

Are you attending full or part time?

What is your program of study or major?

How many terms have you attended this college?

Interview Questions:

1. *What were your initial feelings about attending college?*

2. *How prepared did you feel when you started college?*

3. *Please describe your college experiences so far.*

4. *What positive and negative things have helped or hindered you staying in college?*

5. *What was your initial opinion of academic advising and have those feelings changed?*
6. *How would you describe intrusive advising?*

7. *What were your thoughts when intrusive advising started?*

8. How many intrusive advising interventions have you had?

9. What are your thoughts about intrusive advising now?

10. Do you feel intrusive advising has helped you stay in college? How so?

11. Would you like intrusive advising to continue and why?

12. How have you changed since intrusive advising started?

13. What suggestions do you have to improve intrusive advising for other students?

What else, if anything, would you like to share with me about your college experiences, intrusive advising, and continued success in college?

Notes:

We're done. Again, thank you for your time and for adding to this study. Without your input, I would not be able to study intrusive advising. Remember, anything you shared today will be kept confidential. May I have your permission to contact you again for follow up information via phone?

Yes/No
Record information to follow-up.

I will send you a transcription of what I recorded within a few days. Please review the document carefully to ensure I have captured your responses accurately. Is a couple of days OK for you to get any corrections back to me?

Yes/No/Some other time

Again, thank you and I will be in touch via email.

End Time:

Appendix B: Interview Matrix

Research Questions:

    1. How do students who have experienced intrusive advising at a small, urban community college, describe their advising and college experiences?

    2. How do students who have experienced intrusive advising at a small, urban community college, describe the role of intrusive advising on their persistence decisions?

	Background	Research Question 1	Research Question 2
Interview Q 1	X		
Interview Q 2	X		
Interview Q 3		X	
Interview Q 4		X	
Interview Q 5		X	
Interview Q 6			X
Interview Q 7			X
Interview Q 8	X		
Interview Q 9			X
Interview Q 10			X
Interview Q 11			X
Interview Q 12			X
Interview Q 13	X	X	