

12-2023

WE WANT IT THAT WAY: POST-TRADITIONAL TRANSFER STUDENT ADVISING EXPECTATIONS AS THEY TRANSITION TO THE FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY

Jessica Davis

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Davis, Jessica, "WE WANT IT THAT WAY: POST-TRADITIONAL TRANSFER STUDENT ADVISING EXPECTATIONS AS THEY TRANSITION TO THE FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY" (2023). *Electronic Theses, Projects, and Dissertations*. 1802.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd/1802>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Office of Graduate Studies at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses, Projects, and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

WE WANT IT THAT WAY: POST-TRADITIONAL TRANSFER STUDENT
ADVISING EXPECTATIONS AS THEY TRANSITION TO THE FOUR-YEAR
UNIVERSITY

A Dissertation
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education
in
Educational Leadership

by
Jessica Chaney Davis
December 2023

WE WANT IT THAT WAY: POST-TRADITIONAL TRANSFER STUDENT
ADVISING EXPECTATIONS AS THEY TRANSITION TO THE FOUR-YEAR
UNIVERSITY

A Dissertation
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

by

Jessica Chaney Davis

December 2023

Approved by:

Eugene Wong, Committee Chair

Edna Martinez, Committee Member

Craig Seal, Committee Member

© 2023 Jessica Davis

ABSTRACT

Post-traditional students (typically defined as individuals who are at least 25 years of age, have experienced a gap in their educational journey, care for dependents, and who generally work full time [American Council on Education, 2022]), represented 35% of the post-secondary undergraduate population enrolled full time at four-year universities in the United States during the Fall 2019 term (NCES, 2020). The purpose of this phenomenological study was to understand the lived experiences of post-traditional transfer students and how their community college advising experience may have shaped/informed their advising expectations at their current university. Data was collected from six participants who shared their experiences of advising at their Community College and their advising expectations as they transitioned into the four-year institution through in-depth interviews. Through an Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (IPA), there were three key findings: 1) Trusted Advisor, 2) High Expectations, 3) First Impressions and Experiences. This study informs higher education leaders and practitioners how best to support this student population.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank my family for their unconditional support and love while on this educational journey. To my mom who gave me the kick that I needed very often. To my husband, Robert, who has been on this journey with me since my very first class, and to my rainbow babies who give me joy and motivation when I'm feeling down. I would also like to thank my friends who have cheered me on: Sara, Jesse, Aurora, Maria, and Sarah, you all have encouraged me to keep pushing while on your own journeys.

To my committee, thank you for your unwavering support through this process. The guidance you have provided me is something I will forever be grateful for. Dr. Wong, thank you for staying with me through this process. Through the constant revisions, anxiety, and tears; I could not have done this without you as my chair.

DEDICATION

This is dedicated to all the transfer students who are going through the transition process and navigating Higher Education. You are seen and you are heard. It's never too late to go back and finish.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

We want it that way: Post-traditional transfer student.....	iv
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES	ix
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
Problem Statement	1
Purpose Statement	2
Research Question	2
Significance of the Study	3
Theoretical Underpinnings	4
Assumptions	4
Delimitations	5
Definitions of Key Terms.....	5
Summary	6
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	7
Community Colleges.....	7
Academic Transfer.....	8
Transfer Process	13
Post-Traditional Students and the Transfer Process	17
Post Traditional Students	17
Transfer Process of Post-Traditional Students.....	22
Transition Theory and Transfer Students.....	26

Transition Theory	26
Studies Framed by Transition Theory	29
Transitional Barriers for Post-Traditional Students.....	34
Summary	36
The Nature of Academic Advising, Theories, and Approaches.....	36
Academic Advising.....	36
Nature of Advising.....	43
Advising Approaches and Strategies	45
Summary	59
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	60
Introduction	60
Purpose Statement	60
Research Question	61
Research Design	62
Methodology	62
Data Collection	63
Research Setting	63
Participants	64
Data Analysis.....	65
Positionality of the Researcher	66
Trustworthiness	68
Delimitations	69
Summary	70
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS	71

Introduction	71
Findings of the Study	71
Participant Introductions	72
Trusted Advisor.....	75
High Expectations.....	80
First Impressions and Experiences.....	83
Summary of Findings.....	87
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION AND RECOMENDATIONS.....	89
Introduction.....	89
Discussion of Findings.....	90
Finding 1: Trusted Advisor	91
Finding 2: High Expectations	93
Finding 3: First Impressions and Experiences	96
Recommendations for Educational Leaders	99
Support During the “Moving-In” Phase.....	99
Touchpoints	101
Support during the “Moving-Through” Phase	104
Limitations.....	107
Recommendations for Future Research	107
Conclusion	109
APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL.....	111
APPENDIX B: RECRUITMENT FLYER	113
APPENDIX C: INFORMED CONSENT	115
APPENDIX D: INSTIUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL	118

REFERENCES..... 121

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Transfer Pattern, Term, and Definitions(s).....	11
--	----

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Problem Statement

Post-traditional students (typically defined as individuals who are at least 25 years of age, have experienced a gap in their educational journey, care for dependents, and who generally work full time [American Council on Education, 2022]), represented 35% of the post-secondary undergraduate population enrolled full time at four-year universities in the United States during the Fall 2019 term (NCES, 2020). For post-traditional students who start at a community college and transfer to a four-year university, their lived experiences and academic advising needs tend to differ from those who are in a more traditional age group. Despite the literature available on traditional students' perceptions of advising and transition experiences, there is a lack of focus on the specific needs and experiences of the post-traditional transfer student population (Karmelita, 2020).

Most of the existing literature on how students perceive the advising received (e.g. Cheun, et., al., 2017; Davis & Cooper, 2001; Lynch, 2004; Miville & Sedlacek, 1995; Mottarella, et. al., 2004; Nunez & Yoshimi, 2017; Paul & Fitzpatrick, 2015;) and the effectiveness of various advising delivery systems (Kramer, et. al., 1985) focus on students either in a particular department or across an academic college rather than a specific population within the campus. Additionally, while there is research that examines the transition experiences of

transfer students coming from the community college to the four-year university using Schlossberg's Theory of Transition (see Henderson, 2013; Karmelita, 2020; Schaefer, 2010; Tovar & Simon, 2006; Wheeler, 2012), there is a lack of literature on the transition of post-traditional transfer students (Karmelita, 2020).

Purpose Statement

While studies have been done on the advising preferences and experiences of transfer students, there is limited research on the advising preferences and experiences of post-traditional transfer students as they transition from the Community College to the Comprehensive University. Using the "moving in" phase of Schlossberg's Theory of Transition (Anderson et al., 2012; Schlossberg et al., 1989), the purpose of this Interpretive Phenomenological study was to explore the advising expectations of post-traditional transfer students as they transition into a four-year university and how their advising experiences at the Community College may have impacted those expectations. The research aims to add to the existing literature on transfer student advising experiences and add to the limited literature on post-traditional transfer students. This study also aims to inform best advising practices for the post-traditional transfer student population.

Research Question

This study was guided by the following research question:

What are the lived academic advising experiences of post-traditional transfer students at a four-year institution and how have community college advising experiences shaped/informed their advising expectations at their current institution?

Participants who report positive advising experiences at the community college may be expecting positive advising experiences at the four-year institution while participants who report negative advising experiences at the community college may not expect positive advising experiences at the four-year institution.

Significance of the Study

As previously mentioned, 35% of the post-secondary undergraduate population enrolled full time at comprehensive in the United States during the Fall 2019 term were post-traditional students (NCES, 2020). Because post-traditional students represent a significant portion of the comprehensive university population, it is essential to understand this group of students in order to support their educational experience. This study will contribute to the research that examines transfer student experiences and grow the literature specifically focused on post-traditional transfer students. Furthermore, this study aims to provide insight on the specific advising experiences, perceptions, and expectations of this population.

Theoretical Underpinnings

The purpose of this interpretive phenomenological study was to gain a deeper understanding of the advising expectations of post-traditional transfer students as they transition into a four-year university and how some of their advising experiences at the Community College may have impacted those expectations.

Transition theory explains that transitions happen in three stages: “moving in”, “moving through”, and “moving out” (Anderson et al., 2012; Schlossberg et al., 1989). Additionally, transition theory proposes four factors (i.e. the 4S “System”) account for the different ways that individuals cope with the different stages of transition (Karmelita, 2020). These processes (or factors) include situation, self, support, and strategies. For this study, the focus was on the “moving in” stage for post-traditional students, and the support factor regarding advising expectations and experiences. More specifically, the support factor focused on the academic advising experiences at the four-year University for post-traditional students.

Assumptions

As the researcher, and as an active academic advisor at a four-year university, I had a few assumptions. First, I assumed that the students interviewed would have received some kind of academic advising while at the Community College and before transferring to the four-year University. Second, I assumed that students would have a wide variety of experiences with academic

advising. Third, I assumed that students would have a variety of expectations of what academic advising should look like at the four-year University. Lastly, I assumed the experiences and expectations of academic advising would differ from those in previous studies that did not focus on this population.

Delimitations

Creswell (2014) identifies delimitations as further defining specific parameters for a study. The delimitations for this study have been purposefully selected. This study focused specifically on post-traditional students aged 30 years and older, who have one or more life roles beyond that of being a student (i.e. working full or part time, taking care of dependents, etc.), who had some kind of gap in their formal education and who have transferred from a California Community College to a California State Four-Year University. This study will also address the academic advising experiences of the participants while at the community college as those experiences were expected to impact the participants advising expectations and experiences at the four-year university.

Definitions of Key Terms

Community College: Any non-profit institution that is regionally accredited to award the associate in arts or the associate of science as its highest degree (Cohen, et al., 2014, pg. 5).

Four-Year University: An institution of higher education with teaching and research facilities typically including those that have an undergraduate division

that awards bachelor's degrees and also include graduate school and professional schools that award master's degrees and doctorates.

Post-Traditional Student: Students who are 35 years of age and older, who have one or more life roles beyond that of being a student, and who had some kind of gap in their formal education.

Academic Transfer: The process of moving from the Community College to a Comprehensive University to engage in academic coursework.

Academic Advising: An active interaction between a student and advisor that is treated as a form of teaching where the focus is on a student's academic and personal development (Creamer, 2000).

Summary

This interpretive phenomenological study sought to gain a better understanding of academic advising expectations of post-traditional transfer students as they transitioned out of a California Community College and into the four-year university and how their past experiences may have shaped those expectations. In this chapter, I provided an overview of the post-traditional student population within higher education. I also presented the problem statement, the purpose of the study, research questions that will guide the study, and provided the rationale of why this study is important. Lastly, I reviewed the theoretical framework that will guide the study, its assumptions, and delimitations. In the following chapter, I synthesize the literature related to post-traditional transfer students and academic advising.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Community Colleges

Students have several options in pursuing higher education. Community colleges, comprehensive universities, and research institutions offer learning opportunities beyond high school experience. Community colleges, in particular, provide students with a wide array of opportunities including career education, continuing education, developmental education, community service, and academic transfer (Cohen et al., 2014).

Starting in the early 19th century and continuing through the 20th century, there was a growing need for workers trained for the expanding industries across the nation as well as a drive for greater access to higher education. Veblen (1918) and Sinclair ([1923] 1976) described the early community colleges as a system against the domination of the universities. In other words, they gave students a way to gain vocational training past that of the high school level whereas the university would have been the only option before community college. This also served as a way for community colleges to survive in the field of higher education and compete with other universities (Brint & Karabel, 1989). The community colleges, through the help of the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890 offered lower cost alternatives to the private colleges of the time and helped with the increased responsibility of schools to provide training to the

young which was previously placed on the family, workplace, and various other institutions (Cohen, et al., 2014).

The definition of community colleges has changed since the establishment of the colleges. The American Association of Junior Colleges in 1922 defined the junior colleges as “an institution offering two years of instruction of strictly collegiate grade” (Bogue, 1950, p. xvii). While Eells (1931) proposed various definitions of the junior college that included: institutions that offered two years of coursework to students as a supplement to the high school experience, a college that focuses all their energy on lower division courses, and “an institution offering two years of instruction of strictly collegiate grade” (p. 162). Jencks and Riesman (1968) defined the community colleges as an anti-university and devalued the original scholarship that four-year universities were founded on or even as a “catch basin for those few students unable or unwilling to enter ‘regular’ colleges” (Dougherty, 1994, p. 3). More recently, Cohen, et al. (2014) defined community colleges as “any non-profit institution regionally accredited to award the associate in arts or the associate in science as its highest degree” (p. 5). However, as an increasing number of community colleges have begun broaden their missions to offer and confer their own baccalaureate degrees (Levin, 2004; Toma, 2012); this will certainly result in the definition of “community college” to change in the future.

Academic Transfer

While there are many different functions within the community colleges, Cohen, et al. (2014) stated the primary function of community college, since their

founding in the early 1900s was to assist in the transfer of students to comprehensive universities or research institutions. Also called collegiate studies, the academic transfer function was instituted to advertise higher education by showing what it could offer to individuals. The academic transfer function also took pressure off the universities from having to offer courses to freshmen and sophomore students and making the community college the first point of access to higher education for these students. Taylor and Jain (2017) noted that many community colleges design their curriculum and programs around the assumption that students have a desire to and will transfer to a four-year institution. As Fink and Jenkins (2017) wrote, about 80% of students entering community college intend on transferring to earn a bachelor's degree but only one third transfer within 6 years and less than 15% earn a bachelor's degree.

As the growth in the need for higher education increased through the 20th century, prominent educators in higher education advocated for the universities to give up all lower division courses so that universities would be able to pursue research and professional development (Cohen, et. al, 2014). People such as Henry Tappan in 1851 from University of Michigan, William Mitchell in 1859 from University of Georgia, and William Folwell in 1869 from the University of Minnesota all commented that the universities should relinquish preparatory work (Cohen, et. al. 2014).

This idea allowed the community colleges to offer preparation to students who may have wanted to gain access to higher education but either did not meet admissions requirements due to poor performance or who wanted to know what higher education could offer them before going to the traditional university. This also allowed traditional universities to focus on upper division coursework and scholarship. In other words, the transfer function encompassed the idea of student flow and eventually, the liberal arts curriculum (Cohen, et. al., 2014).

The dominant understanding of the transfer function is the vertical transfer pathway (Taylor & Jain, 2017). Often defined as the primary mission of the community college (Cohen et al., 2014; Cross, 1985; Handel, 2013; Mullin, 2012), the vertical transfer pathway is defined as students starting at a community college, then transferring to a four-year university or research institution with or without an Associates degree. While the vertical pathway may be the ideal route for transfer, that is not the reality for students. The 2018 transfer and student mobility report from the National Student Clearinghouse (NCS) stated that of all students who transfer from a community college, 59.2% of those students transferred to a comprehensive university while the remaining 40.8% of students transferred laterally to another community college (NCS, 2018). The study also found that of students who started at a comprehensive university or research institution, 49.5% transferred to another comprehensive university or research institution while the remaining 50.5% reverse transferred to a community college (NCS, 2018). This study shows that while a large majority of

students who transferred did so vertically, there are other forms of transfer that should be considered as well.

Taylor (2016) defined eight common categories of transfer pathways and patterns based on existing literature. Using the information in the table below and the definitions of transfer is important for not only community college when describing the transfer process but also for four-year institutions when describing their transfer students. If one of the main functions of the community college is the transfer function, but only about 59% of those students who start at the community college transfer to a four-year institution within six years of starting, there needs to be a shift in the community college culture surrounding transfer (Taylor & Jain, 2017).

Table 1. Transfer Pattern, Term, and Definitions(s).

Transfer patterns and terms	Definition(s)
Vertical transfer	Students who begin at a two-year and transfer to a four-year with or without an associate’s degree (Townsend, 2001).
Lateral transfer	Students who transfer from a two-year institution to a 2-year institution, or a four-year institution to a four-year institution (Bahr, 2009).
Reverse transfer	Students who begin at a four-year and transfer to a 2-year institution, including undergraduate reverse transfer students, postbaccalaureate revers transfer students, double reverse transfer students, and summer sessioners (Hagedorn & Castro, 1999; Townsend, 2001; Townsend & Denver, 1999).

Reverse credit transfer	Transfer of credits from a four-year institution back to a 2-year institution for the purpose of conferring an associate degree (Taylor, 2016).
Swirlers and alternating enrollees	Students who attend more than two institutions and transfer or who transfer to and from community colleges (Adelman, 2004, 2006; de los Santos & Wright, 1989; Townsend, 2001).
Concurrent enrollees, co-enrollment, double-dipping, simultaneous enrollees	Students who attend more than one institution at the same time and transfer courses (Adelman, 2004, 2006; Crisp, 2013; McCormick, 2003; Townsend, 2001; Wang & Wickersham, 2014)
Dual credit, dual enrollment, Transient	Transfer of college-level courses taken during high school. Students who take courses as nondegree seeking students at other institutions with intention to transfer credits to their home institution (McCormick, 2003).

Adapted from Taylor (2016).

While community colleges have historically served a critical role in student transfer to pursue academic goals, the transfer process may not always be easily navigated. McDonough (2007) defined the college going culture as the culture necessary to establish college preparation as a normalized expectation in high school. For those students who start at the community college, there needs to be an additional culture in place for those who plan to transfer. Jain (2011) used critical race theory (CRT) to outline how necessary it is for institutions to create both transfer sending and transfer receptive cultures on their campuses. A *transfer sending* culture exists when a community college makes the transfer

function normal across the campus so that all students who seek to transfer are able to do so (Ornelas & Solorzano, 2004).

A *transfer receptive* culture is defined by Jain (2011) as “an institutional commitment by a four-year college or university to provide the support needed for students to transfer successfully” (p. 253). This type of culture views the receiving institution as an equal partner in the transfer function for the success of transfer students (Jain, 2013). Jain (2013) proposed that the effectiveness of transfer includes creating a transfer sending and transfer receptive culture at community colleges and four-year institutions, respectively and can therefore help students in the transfer process from the two-year institution to the four-year institution.

Transfer Process

Students may transfer from an institution for a number of different reasons. The Beginning Postsecondary Study (BPS) 2004-2009 report provided a national overview of reasons why students transfer from their original institution. For all institution types within the report, 57% transferred to pursue a bachelor’s degree, 38% for personal reasons, 28% finished all courses they could at the home institution, 19% for other reasons, 18% for scheduling problems, 17% were not satisfied with the institution, 11% for financial reasons, 6% for family responsibilities, and 3% had academic problems (United States Department of Education, 2018). Within the same BPS report, among those who started at a public two- year institution, 82% reported they transferred to pursue a

bachelor's degree but 27% stated they transferred for personal reasons and another 15% reported they transferred for scheduling issues.

Jain et. al. (2011) and Hererra and Jain (2013) proposed five elements that are necessary to normalize the transfer process. A normalized transfer culture includes both pre-transfer and post transfer elements. First, at the pre-transfer level, institutions should establish the transfer of students, especially post-traditional students and underrepresented students, as a high priority at the institution to ensure accessibility, retention and graduation of these students.

Continuing at the pre-transfer level, institutions should provide “outreach and resources that focus on the specific needs of transfer students while complimenting the community college mission of transfer” (Jain, et al., 2001, p 258). This can include providing transfer specific literature to students, providing admissions literature to students, creating outreach programs to bring in comprehensive universities to speak with transfer students, and provide training for counselors and other transfer agents at the community college to help students with the process.

The remaining three elements are considerations to be made post-transfer. Specifically, institutions “should offer financial and academic support through distinct opportunities for non-traditional and reentry students” (Jain et al., 2011, p 258). For example, specific scholarships and financial aid opportunities may be available for these students. Additionally, in-class teaching pedagogy

such as hands-on activities in the classroom and multi-modal ways of learning should also be available to help students achieve at high levels.

A fourth element is to acknowledge the lived experiences of students and be aware of the intersectionality between community and family. Yosso's (2005) model of community cultural wealth puts forth the notion that students possess familial capital which consists of "those cultural knowledges nurtured among *familia* (kin) that carry a sense of community history, memory, and cultural intuition" (p. 79). To better acknowledge these experiences institutions can create a physical space where their community backgrounds and wealth of knowledge are honored as well as a space in which they feel comfortable to bring their families.

Lastly, the fifth element seeks to create an appropriate and organic framework that would allow institutions to consider the complexity of the transfer process which is distinctly different from the high-school to college-going culture model (Jain, et al., 2011). From this framework, institutions can then assess, evaluate, and enhance transfer-receptive programs and initiatives that can eventually lead to future scholarship of transfer students.

Using these elements at both the pre-transfer and post-transfer stages can help advocate for policies that will prioritize the transfer function, advance the notion of including four-year institutions' responsibility for knowing the needs of the students they are admitting, and creating a welcoming environment for transfer students (Jain et al., 2011).

Dougherty & Kienzel (2006) looked at how transfer rates varied for students based on social background, and how the change in the background characteristics of students affected transfer rates overtime. The study looked at three types of variables: pre-college characteristics, external demands on the students, and experiences during college. One key finding that was different from other studies from the 1970s and 1980s was the impact of age on transfer. Dougherty & Kienzel (2006) found that age at the time of college entry had an impact on transfer. The results stated, “older college entrants, especially if they are over 30 years of age, are much less likely to transfer than student who enter college right out of high school” (p. 481) which was explained by the difference in educational aspirations, the external demands of the student such as marital status, parental status and employment status, part-time versus full-time enrollment status, and college major (e.g., academic vs. vocational major).

In a more recent study, Olivarez et. al. (2020), looked at the influence of state education policies on student enrollment, transfer, and completion specifically for Latinx students in Texas. Olivarez et. al. (2020) stated that while most transfer articulations aim to ease the process of transferring credit, most are ineffective in promoting transfer. The study found that students shared feelings of stress and anxiety surrounding transfer policies. Although the policies were created to encourage graduation, the rigidity of the policies did not allow for changes such as a vertical transfer to a four-year institution or changing a student’s major (Olivarez et. al., 2020). The study suggested that both

community college and university leaders when and how policies are introduced to student and how they are explained as to not overwhelm students (Olivarez et. al., 2020). The study also suggested that these policies be reviewed with students more than just during an orientation period or when students enter the institution (Olivarez et. al., 2020).

Students have different pathways through which they can transfer but as the literature shows, students may still have difficulty navigating the transfer process from the community college to the comprehensive university (Herrera & Jain, 2013; Jain et. al., 2011; Olivarez et. al., 2020). If there is no transfer sending culture at the community college the student is attending or transfer receiving culture at the intended comprehensive university, they may have difficulty knowing the requirements for transferring or when to transfer.

Post-Traditional Students and the Transfer Process

Post Traditional Students

Multiple and differing definitions have existed since the 1970s to define post-traditional students. Post-traditional students, also called non-traditional students or older adult students, represented 35% of the post-secondary full-time undergraduate population at the four-year institution and 50% who were enrolled full time at the community college level in the United States during the Fall 2019 term (NCES, 2020). Hughes (1983) and Kim et al., (2010) stated that because of the lack of consistent definitions in the literature, it has made it difficult to identify post-traditional students. In addition to Hughes' (1983) review of the literature,

two more recent reviews of the literature show the inconsistencies in definitions. Kim (2002) explored different definitions of non-traditional students which included research from 1987 through 1997 in education literature. In a later study, Chung and Turnbull (2014) explored definitions of non-traditional from 45 different studies that used working definitions of non-traditional students within the mental health literature. The majority of studies in the Chung and Turnbull (2014) review were published from 2000 onwards. Although Chung and Turnbull (2014) focused on mental health research within higher education, many of the definitions used between the Kim (2002) and Chung and Turnbull (2014) studies have overlapping traits. Additionally, in 2013 the American Council on Education (ACE) used the label post-traditional learners rather than non-traditional student based on a conversation with the president of Excelsior College, John Ebersole, who stated that adult learners “were not non-traditional or at-risk but rather post-traditional” (p.17). The updated ACE report from 2017 included labels and definitions from various organizations (ACE, 2017). These definitions included in the ACE (2017) report used language similar to the definitions used in the Kim (2002) and Chung and Turnbull (2014) literature reviews such as age, work status, academic preparedness, and other roles outside of being a student (i.e., spouse, partner, parent, caretaker).

Multiple definitions of post-traditional students use, what is defined by Levin (2014), as a trait framework. The framework usually relies largely on individual traits to identify and define post traditional students such as: age,

multiple roles, and gaps in education (Hughes, 1983; Kim, 2002; Chung & Turnbull, 2014; ACE, 2017). Using a trait framework, Levin (2014) stated that the assumption is students are “missing or deficient in specific qualities” (p. 23). Levin (2014) also stated that using the term of “nontraditional” and “non-traditional student” can be a problem for both scholars and practitioners because an increasing number of traditional aged (18-24) students in higher education also possess characteristics of non-traditional students (Panacii, 2015; Iloh, 2017). The goal, then, should be to move away from using a trait framework (Levin, 2014) to define post-traditional students in a deficit model. Rather, student personnel professionals should use characteristics such as age, multiple life roles, and gaps in education as a way to understand a growing group of students in terms of what they want and need from higher education, and how respond to their needs.

Age. Age has frequently been used to define post-traditional students (Hughes, 1983). Commonly, these students are referred to being older than a specific age. Early studies identified the age range from 22 years (Leckie, 1978; Weathersby & Tarule, 1980) to 30 years of age (Rawlins, 1979; Rawlins and Davies, 1981). The beginning age most frequently used for post-traditional students is 25 years (Bell, 2003; Butler, 1998; Carney-Crompton & Tan, 2002; Christie, 2009; Elliot, 1990; Ely, 1997; Hazzard, 1993; Hembly, 1997; Horn, 1996; Keith, 2007; Mello, 2004; Metzner & Bean, 1987; Meyers & Mobley, 2004; Nora, Kraemer & Itzen, 1997; Norris, 2011; O’Keefe, 1993; Sundberg, 1997; Sweet &

Moen, 2007; Vellella & Hu, 1991). While some studies have used ages of 28 (Bye et al., 2007), 30 (DeGregoria, 1987), 40 (Hollis-Sawyer, 2011) and 50 years (Hooper & Traupmann, 1983), there is limited literature that describes post-traditional students using the ages of 35 and older which as stated above, represented 35% of the post-secondary undergraduate population at the four-year institution and 50% at the community college level during the Fall 2019 term (NCES, 2020).

Multiple Life Roles. Another characteristic used to define post-traditional students has been that of the multiples roles they hold in addition to being a student (Chartrand, 1990; Cross, 1980, Dill & Henley, 1998; Eppler & Harju; 1997; Fairchild, 2003; Kasworm, 2003a, 2003b; Kim, 2002).

One role that post-traditional students may possess is that of being married (Hamby, 1997, 1998; Johnson & Nussbaum, 2012; Waltman, 1997). Other related relational statuses may be having a partner (Chartrand, 1990), or having a 'spouse' (Fortune, 1987; Morris et al., 2003), or not being single (Bitner, 1994). Other studies have also referred to post-traditional students as being divorced or widowed (Hembly, 1997, 1998; Kasworm, 2003a).

A second role that is commonly mentioned for post-traditional students is being a parent (Chartrand; 1980; Cross, 1980; Fairchild, 2003; Fortune, 1987; Kasworm, 2003a, 2003b), a student with dependents (Hansen, 1999; Kasworm, 2003a), being a caregiver (Hemby, 1997, 1998; Home, 1997), or having other family responsibilities (Hudson, et.al, 2008).

Lastly, while some definitions only refer to post-traditional students as employees or workers (Adebayo, 2006; Chartrand, 1990; Dill & Henley, 1998; Eppler & Harju, 1997; Fortune, 1987; Home, 1997; Hudson et al., 2008; Macari, et al., 2006; Mello, 2004), only a few provide details concerning the nature of work and part-time or full-time employment (Adebayo, 2006; Home, 1997; Kasworm, 2003a; Mello, 2004). Additionally, there is no consensus on how many hours constituted part-time and full-time work (Chung & Turnbull, 2014).

While the multiple life roles of post-traditional students are often described from a deficit perspective (Levin, 2014) and are used to explain why a post-traditional student may attend school part-time or may not perform well academically (Kasworm 2003b), Bradley and Graham (2000) described four ways in which post-traditional students succeed despite the challenges their multiple roles may present. First, post-traditional students tend to focus on their learning skills and knowledge that can be applied to their life circumstances. Second, post-traditional students, because of their age, may have a more complex knowledge base on which to draw upon. Third, post-traditional students are involved with their families, careers, and communities which provides a direct connection from the classroom to more meaningful real-life experiences. Lastly, post-traditional students tend to make the most out of class time when interacting with peers and faculty which allows them to most fully understand the presented material.

Gaps in Education. A third way post-traditional students have been defined is by having gaps within their education. While some studies only mention post-traditional students as those having a break from school (Bennett et al., 2007; Chang, 2007; DeGregoria; 1987; Mello, 2004; Johnson & Nussbaum, 2012; Sweet & Moen, 2007), other studies mention a specific time period such as between high school and college (Bennett et al., 2007; Chang, 2007). Additionally, while inconsistent in the amount of time, some studies mention a specific duration of time in the gap in education such as one year of study (Chang, 2007; Dill & Henley, 1998) or having spent at least two years away from studies (Sweet & Moen, 2007).

Multiple definitions exist to define post-traditional students. While there is significant research on post-traditional students starting with a cut-off age of 25, there is little research done for those students 40 and older within higher education. For the purposes of this study, the definition of post-traditional student being used will be students who are 40 years of age and older, who have one or more life roles outside that of being a student, and who had some kind of gap in their formal education.

Transfer Process of Post-Traditional Students

One early focal point of research on the transfer process examines the preparation of transfer students who transitioned to a 4-year university. Students have been surveyed and interviewed about their own preparations regarding transferring to a comprehensive university and what they perceived to be

differences between their community college and the 4-year university (see Berger & Malaney, 2003; Britt & Hirt, 1999; Cejda & Kaylor, 2001; Harbin, 1997; Laanan, 1996; Townsend, 1995; Townsend & Wilson, 2006; Vaala, 1991). In addition, the adjustment to the comprehensive university (for transfer students) have been documented in multiple studies (Bauer & Bauer, 1994; Chrystal et al., 2013; Davies & Casey, 1999; Pascarella et al., 1986). These studies typically focus on adjustment in three areas: academic experiences, social experiences, and personal experiences (Britt & Hirt, 1999).

While early research focused on the preparation for transfer, more recent work focuses on educational movements that have affected the transfer experience which includes “the development of transfer pathways, interinstitutional transfer policies (e.g., common course number and equivalencies), and reverse transfer programs” (Brinkley-Etzkoen & Cherry 2020, p. 17).

In a qualitative study, Castro and Cortez (2017) examined the lived experiences of Mexican community college transfer students at a research-intensive institution. The study sought to understand how Mexican students made meaning of their transfer experience and how those experiences, could inform thinking towards building a more transfer receptive culture (Castro & Cortez, 2017). Castro and Cortez (2017) interviewed six Mexican student who had transferred to a research-intensive university. The students ranged from 21-35 years of age and all the students were in different majors. The study identified

three themes from the interviews with the students: reasons the students started at the community college, family support, and intersectionality (Castro & Cortez, 2017). The students in the study started at a community college for a variety of reasons that nested at the intersection of ethno-racial identity, politics of educational opportunity, and socioeconomic status. Three commonalities emerged from the interviews; these included general misinformation about college, not being able to afford university tuition, and the students' perceived notion that they did not have the English language skills to start a 4-year institution (Castro & Cortez, 2017).

Each of the students also highlighted the role their families played in the transfer process including actions such as giving rides, providing housing, and offering emotional and financial support (Castro & Cortez, 2017). Each of the students indicated that family support was key to their ability to be successful (Castro & Cortez, 2017).

The third theme focused on the intersectionality of the student's identity and experience (Castro & Cortez, 2017). Each of the student brought layered experiences with them to the 4-year institution. When asked about their transfer experiences, students indicated different variables impacted their transition including age, ethnoracial identity, and class (Castro & Cortez, 2017). Students reported having feelings of racial isolation and feeling insecure about being a post-traditional student which created a climate of unwelcoming and unsupported experiences (Castro & Cortez, 2017).

The study found that by looking at the lived experiences and intersectionality among Latinx students helps expand the understanding of what obstacles exist for these students and how institutions can break down these barriers (Castro & Cortez, 2017). The researchers recommended that institutions “critically analyze their own assumptions regarding Latinx community college transfer students” (Castro & Cortez, 2017, p. 89) as this would help create a transfer receptive culture that considers the lived experiences of the students rather than the programming of the institution (Castro & Cortez, 2017).

In a quantitative study, D’Amico et al. (2014) explored the academic and social integration outcomes for community college students. The study used Tinto’s (1993) Longitudinal Model of Institutional Departure and Deil-Amen’s (2011) concept of “social-academic integrative moments” to rethink the causes and cures of student attrition and to inform the selection of potential predictors (D’Amico et al., 2014). The target population for the survey was transfer students from a 2-year institution; of the 968 participants, 48% were identified as non-traditional age (24 or older) (D’Amico et al., 2014). Following the conceptual framework outlined by Tinto (1993), the researchers examined regression models to look at early academic and social fit and academic success within six outcome variables which included first semester GPA, second semester enrollment, third semester enrollment, first semester attempted versus earned hours and second semester attempted versus earned hours (D’Amico et al., 2014). The study found that academic and previous college background were the

most important predictors of positive academic and social integration for transfer students (D'Amico et al., 2014). As such, the researchers recommended that it is important for institutions to look at the lived experience of transfer students and what happens prior to their arrival at the 4-year institution rather than only tracking academic and social integration once they start at the 4-year institution (D'Amico et al., 2014).

Most recently, Buenaflor (2021) conducted a qualitative study to examine the role that self-efficacy plays in the transfer student experiences. Using Bandura's (1994) construct of self-efficacy, Buenaflor (2021) examined how self-efficacy was reflected in student narratives about the transfer process and what those sources of self-efficacy were. Buenaflor (2021) found that students best benefited from the self-efficacy they developed while at the community college when engaged in the transfer process. Buenaflor (2021) concluded that while further research needs to be conducted on a student's ability to develop a sense of self-efficacy, the implications of the study showed the need to take into account a student's experiences and how they are impacted by specific policies of the institution, and by background factors such as race and ethnicity, age, and other soci-economic factors.

Transition Theory and Transfer Students

Transition Theory

The transition framework was originally developed by Nancy K. Schlossberg (1981, 1984) as a counseling theory used with retiring adults. The

theory has also been used in higher education research to explain the transitions of different student populations which will be described later in this section.

The transition process occurs in three stages: “moving in”, “moving through”, and “moving out” (Anderson et al., 2012; Schlossberg et al., 1989). As a student transfers from a community college to a comprehensive university to complete their degree, they will go through each of these phases.

The “moving in” phase will generally include the move to a new, often bigger campus than the student is accustomed to, an increased cost in tuition for the student, learning how to navigate new policies and procedures for the campus, and following a new class schedule.

The “moving through” phase incorporates the experiences a student encounters once they start coursework at the new institution. These experiences can include being in larger classes than at the community college, needing to find a new support system at the institution, finding a new balance for work, family, coursework, and socializing, and a potential increased workload for their courses.

The last phase, “moving out” centers on a students’ transition associated with graduation, potentially looking for new or better employment, and deciding on whether they will start graduate work.

Schlossberg’s transition theory proposed that four factors (i.e. the 4 “S” system) account for the differences in how individuals cope with change (Karmelita, 2020). The four coping factors are: Situation, Self, Support, and Strategies. As a student moves through each of the phases at the

comprehensive university, they will need to appraise their individual selection of coping mechanisms they use (Anderson et al., 2012).

Situation. Situation includes considering a student's daily routines, housing, employment status, finances, parental status, and obligation to others as they pertain to the student's overall academic experience.

Self. Self is the mindset and personality of the student experiencing the transition. The personal and demographic characteristics of a person bear directly on how they perceive and assess life.

Support. Support reflects on the resources available to the student, including institutional support. Hardin (2008) stated that a lack of support can hamper a student's transition to college.

Strategies. Strategies are the ways in which a student responds to or copes with transition. This can include how one accesses or seeks different support (Karmelita, 2020). Strategies may include taking action to improve an outcome, asking for more information, and the use of advising.

The four factors are not mutually exclusive but represent interconnected variables that can influence and act upon each other (Karmelita, 2020). How the student appraises their transition is key as it will influence how they feel and cope with the transition (Anderson et al., 2012). Additionally, the context in which this transition happens, or the relationship the student has to the transition and the impact the transition has on the individual's daily life are important to consider. The relativity, context, and impact of the transition on the student are important to

take into consideration as the coping resources needed for the transition will be different depending on the impact for that student (Anderson et al., 2012).

Studies Framed by Transition Theory

Despite the initial purpose of transition theory, others have applied the theory to studies in higher education with different student populations. These studies highlight not only the moving in, moving through, and moving out (Schlossberg et al., 1989) phases of the theory but also the 4S system of coping while going through those phases.

Veterans. Wheeler (2012) focused her study on the transition of veterans into the Community College. One of the main themes identified within the study was a mixed reaction to what would be considered support services within the 4S system (Schlossberg et al., 1989). This included interactions with the Veteran Affairs Certifying Officer (VACO) for recertifying their GI Benefits. Among the study participants, one student stated that office staff in the Counseling Center where the VACO office was located were “disrespectful” (Wheeler, 2012, p. 781) while others had more positive experiences with the office. While other services were used by the students, they were not consistent across the participants in the study. However, one consensus on the support services was the feeling that the Orientation model used at the campus was unhelpful. One student went as far to say that the Orientation was “really stupid” (Wheeler, 2012, p. 782). All the participants felt the Orientation model catered to traditional student needs. Wheeler (2012) concluded that because the veteran student population has

different needs than other adult student populations, the transition into Community College may be different as they transition out of military life. In particular, veterans had to not only adjust to college life but also civilian life (pg. 790). Rather than having veteran students rely on their own coping mechanisms, that they may not have had going into the military, Wheeler (2012) suggested that community colleges offer programs to help develop the coping skills to aid in their transition to civilian and collegiate life.

Students on Academic Probation. Tovar and Simon (2006) argued for the use of Schlossberg's Theory over traditional college development theories used by Tinto (1993) and Astin (1993) in understanding the college experience of these students. Tovar and Simon (2006) proposed that Schlossberg's Transition Theory helped to better address the minority student population and that the theory "considers these freshman on a more individual basis and, in particular, their needs that arise in adapting to college life" (p. 550).

Using the College Student Inventory, Tovar and Simon (2006) sought to assess the impact of institutional assistance on the academic motivation, coping skills, and reception of institutional assistance among probationary students of different ethnic backgrounds. These areas directly relate to the 4S structure of situation, self, strategies, and support. Tovar and Simon (2006) found that there were differences among ethnic groups in their attitudes towards instructors, interests, as well as attitudes towards institutional assistance and coping strategies. For example, Tovar and Simon (2006) found that Asian students were

more open to receiving institutional assistance (i.e., personal counseling) to help them transition to the institution as compared to Caucasian students.

Additionally, the study found that while Latino students were more likely to experience academic and social difference, they had a much more favorable impression towards faculty. Tovar and Simon (2006) concluded that those who work with students on probation should consider applying Schlossberg's theory to address the student's transitional needs rather than solely providing information on how to return to a good academic standing.

Athletes. In a dissertation by Henderson (2013), the author framed her work within Schlossberg's Transition theory to understand how Division I female athletes utilized the 4S variables as they transitioned out of college athletics. That is, Henderson (2013) focused on how the situation, the self, support, and strategies among athletes impacted the transition associated with the ending of their collegiate athletic careers. Henderson (2013) found that female student-athletes felt they were underprepared for life after college. While the student athletes were able to address and articulate what they needed to be prepared to move on from college, they felt that their responsibilities in their sports prohibited them from engaging in career development activities. Henderson (2013) suggested that academic advisors could assist student athletes in creating a post-competition plan to help with not only continuing to meet athletic eligibility requirements but also a plan for when they transition out of the institution post-graduation.

Adult Learners. Schaefer (2010) looked at the support needs of older baby boomer students as they transitioned back into college. Participants in the study ranged in age from 51-62 years and were all in the “moving in” stage of their transition as all participants had previously completed college credit prior to returning to college. Schaefer (2010) focused her analysis and discussion on the situation and support phases of the 4S system. Situationally, the participants in the study were primarily motivated by career aspirations rather than personal enrichment. Two of the participants returned to college after all their children had left home, two participants returned after retiring, while the remaining participants returned to college after they had experienced a job loss and/or promotion difficulties (Schaefer, 2010).

The need for support was an overarching theme for all the participants each of whom experienced more complex support needs. One of the greatest difficulties stated was the lack of knowledge or misinformation regarding the higher education process (Schaefer, 2010). Many of the students lacked a basic understanding of the logistics involved with the college experience such as navigating the web-based enrollment system, how to access campus resources such as the library or bookstore, and not understanding the articulation process.

Schaefer (2010) stated that it is important for advisors to “recognize the motivations of adult learners and respect their sense of urgency about degree completion” (p. 85). In one participant’s words, “Being aware that the needs of the adult student are different than the typical undergraduate student” (p. 85)

stresses the importance of knowing the unique needs of adult learners. Another participant discussed having to change to a more supportive advisor who understood the immediacy of wanting to finish their degree quickly. Schaefer (2010) also recommended that advisors could be trained on how to develop workshops for older adult students to focus on what they specifically need to know about the higher education process and to help with the transition to college.

In a similar study, Karmelita (2020) focused on advising adult learners who were participating in a transition program and experiencing the “moving in” phase of their college and academic advising experience. All participants in the study expressed a strong need for guidance from an academic advisor to “discuss academic planning, set goals, and learn more about the correlation between career and major” (p. 72). Another overarching theme among all participants were the barriers faced by transitioning to college. These barriers included the use of technology, health issues related to the aging process or by injuries that prompted the need to go back to school and feeling like an outsider at the institution. Karmelita (2020) noted that these barriers reflected both the 4S system of situation and support factors and how one manages the strategies associated with the transition. Overall, Karmelita (2020) highlighted the need for academic advising to adjust to the needs of adult learners as academic advisors “are better positioned than other institutional resources to provide support and connect adult learners to other institutional resources” (p. 76).

Transitional Barriers for Post-Traditional Students

While transition theory can be used to help “facilitate an understanding of adults in transition and aid them in connecting to the help they need to cope with [change]” (Evans et al., 2010, p. 213), it is important to be cognizant of barriers students may experience during a transition (Cross, 1991).

In early research, Pinkston (1981), found that adult learners faced several different barriers such as procedural, environmental, psychological, and financial concerns when they pursued their degree (Hardin, 2008). In more recent studies, these barriers have been categorized into four broad categories: institutional, situational, psychological, and educational (Compton et al., 2006; Council on Adult and Experiential Learning, 2000; Donohue & Wong, 1997; Hammer et al., 1998; Hardin, 1997; Nordstrom; 1997).

Institutional Barriers. Institutional barriers are those unintentionally imposed by a college or university (Cross, 1991). These barriers can include staff hours that end at the same time post-traditional students start their student responsibilities and policies or procedures that do not consider the needs of post-traditional students (Hardin, 2008).

Situational Barriers. Situational barriers include financial issues, lack of time, childcare, familial responsibilities, job responsibilities, and transportation issues (Eifler & Potthoff, 1998; Genco, 2007; Hardin, 2008; Kerka, 1989; Malhotra et al., 2007). Situational barriers are unique to the student and therefore cannot be removed by the institution (Hardin, 2008).

Psychological Barriers. Psychological barriers can include lack of self-confidence and poor self-image, inadequate coping skills, anxiety about schooling based on prior experience, and negative beliefs or expectations about outcomes (Kerka, 1989). For example, Donohue and Wong (1997), found that adult students faced a higher risk for psychological distress than traditional aged students and that their needs may be overlooked in a more traditional university setting.

Educational Barriers. At times, adult students may not be prepared academically to reenter higher education. This could be because of a decision or decisions that negatively impact their academic future (Hardin, 2008). Hardin (1997) writes that these students are misprepared rather than underprepared. These decisions could have been to not take college preparatory courses during high school or the decision to drop out of high school and complete their general education development (GED) diploma at a later date and start college with a false sense of security about their academic ability (Hardin, 2008). Other educational barriers may include being away from an academic setting for an extended period of time or having either a physical or learning disability that makes classroom activities a challenge (Hardin, 1997).

Overcoming Barriers. While there may be barriers for older adult students transitioning to college, colleges and universities can still help students overcome these barriers using the 4S system. Harris and Brooks (1998) stated “it is often difficult to categorize potential barriers into one and only one category” (p.226).

Using the support factor within the 4S system, colleges and universities can help students address these barriers and allow older adult students to have a successful transition into college (Anderson et al, 2012; Cross, 1991). According to Kasworm et al. (2002) most “adults desire a college where faculty and staff will value and respect them through special structures and programs that support their success” (p. 46). Increased access to support services such as academic advising, and support in financial services, can help students gain a better understanding of the institutional processes and which resources are available to them Karmelita (2020).

Summary

Polson (1994) stated “adults perhaps more than any other student population need someone within the institution who cares” (p. 22). As older adult students are going through the moving into phase at a university setting, it is important for academic advisors to help students acclimate to the expectations and norms of the institution (Karmelita, 2020). Transition theory and the 4S system help provide academic advisors with a lens through which to look at their practice and assist older adults students through the various phases of transition as well as helping these students better identity and overcome barriers that may be present throughout that transition.

The Nature of Academic Advising, Theories, and Approaches

Academic Advising

Over the past two centuries, academic advising has gained ground as an important component of higher education (Himes & Schulenberg, 2016). Ender, Winston, and Miller (1984) defined academic advising using seven conditions or principles, which when summed, define advising as a continuous process between a student and advisor, where the student is supported in achieving educational, career, and personal goals. Similarly, Creamer (2000) stated academic advising involved active participation of both the student and the advisor and should be treated as a form of teaching where the focus is on a student's academic and personal development.

Academic advising has been conducted in the United States since before the revolutionary war, when colleges focused on providing young boys with an education in becoming men through intellectual and physical discipline which was modeled and reinforced by teachers (Thelin, 2004; Vine, 1976). As more colleges and universities formed, institutions created roles for primary academic advisors starting in the 1870s, but the methods, theories, and goals that guided the profession were undefined and not examined (Frost, 2000). Curriculum expansion in the late 19th and early 20th centuries also impacted the development of academic advising (Schulenberg & Lindhorst, 2010). During the 1880s, Johns Hopkins University created specialized topics of focus, which also created the beginnings of undergraduate majors and the formal role of academic advisors to guide and approve student course choices (White & Khakpour, 2006). As academic disciplines continued to grow, so did advising. Gilman (1886) noted

that the underlying goal of advising appeared to include guidance for students to make meaningful choices in their electives as well as to advocate for and mediate student-faculty relationships. Gilman (1886) elaborated:

The adviser's relation to the student is like that of a lawyer to his client or of a physician to one who seeks his counsel. The office is not that of an inspector, not of a proctor, nor of a recipient of excuses, nor of a distant and unapproachable embodiment of the authority of the Faculty. It is the advisor's business to listen to difficulties which the student assigned to him may bring to his notice; to act as his representative if any collective action is necessary on the part of the board of instruction; to see that every part of his course of studies has received proper attention. (p.575)

While the ideal role of the advisor was to facilitate the development of maturity and educational focus through student choice (Schulenberg & Lindhorst, 2010), in practice, advising was heavily characterized as the approval of course and major selection rather than the relationship and conversation meant to guide the approval (Himes & Schulenberg, 2016).

Moving into the 20th century, higher education expanded as more diverse student populations started attending institutions of all types (Schulenberg & Lindhorst, 2010). During this time, the educational focus shifted towards the intellectual growth of students and away from the social, moral, and religious development (American Council on Education [ACE], 1949). During the 20th century, as with the 19th century, academic advising was not seen as a

specialized field (Raskin, 1979) but rather as “an extra job added onto the teaching workload” (Raskin, 1979, p. 101). However, Hopkins (1926) recognized that understanding more than the institutional structure and program requirements was needed by advisors. During this time, psychological counseling, vocational guidance, and academic advising were used interchangeably when referring to counseling and guidance with practice in these areas informed by clinical methods developed in psychology (Williamson, 1937). The intermingling of the advancing field of psychology, emerging practice of career counseling, and guidance in educational counseling held the assumption that students’ abilities were fixed, therefore academic decisions and vocational decisions were linearly linked, and assumed that the primary goal of higher education was to increase employment rather than to broaden a student’s social and personal development (MacIntosh, 1948). However, some scholars in the mid-20th century recognized that students make academic decisions on a broader social and personal context than had previously been considered:

It does not seem reasonable to allow a student to pick and choose his studies from the curriculum without asking any questions as to what the courses are, what relationship they have to other courses, and where they may eventually lead. (MacIntosh, 1948, p. 135)

This perspective follows the charge of the advisor role originally outlined at Harvard and John Hopkins University (Himes & Schulenberg, 2016).

After World War II, educators recognized the many complex influences and factors that affect a student's educational planning resulted in the recognition of a need to incorporate social sciences research into academic advising (Himes & Schulenberg, 2016). During the 1950s, there were several publications which called for greater attention to the student process in making sense of academic decisions (Hardee, 1955; Havemann & West, 1952). In some cases, this meant that academic advising shifted from faculty to specialists in academic advising with the first dedicated academic advisors and advising units being created in the 1950s (Gordon, 2004). Raskin (1979) wrote that principles of educational psychology informed the first sets of purposes, assumptions, theories, and methods for working with students and how to evaluate that work. Those who served in the primary role of advising during this time, often came from counseling and psychology backgrounds who applied theoretical perspectives and methods from these backgrounds to practice (Schulenberg & Lindhorst, 2008).

Despite the growth of specialized advisors in the mid-20th century, there was still an inconsistency in the practice and purpose of academic advising. Robertson (1958) visited 20 higher education institutions to complete a survey of advising to learn more about patterns of operation and common challenges. Robertson (1958) confirmed the perceived importance of helping students navigate academic problems. Although institutions were implementing programs designed to help students, advising was predominately clerical in practice with

many faculty members viewing students' desire for guidance as weak or suspect. It was felt by faculty that students should be able to read enough to follow instructions rather than having to assist students in "explaining complex or confusing regulations, checking up on the student programs, filling out forms, schedules, and audit sheets" (p.233). Additionally, Robertson (1958) wrote that academic advising was viewed simply as an extension of teaching and therefore should be done on the part of the faculty member. However, Robertson (1958) also went on to state that professional advising and counseling roles "should always be in support of the main effort, namely, the growth of each student towards wisdom and intellectual maturity" (p. 235).

Between the 1960s and 1980s, enrollment in higher education increased nearly 400% as institutions continued to increase capacity (National Institute of Education, 1984; Snyder, 1993). Institutions saw an increase in enrollment across a wider range of the American population, particularly among women and students of color (Himes & Schulenberg, 2016). Along with the increased enrollment numbers nationwide, there was also an increase in attrition rates among many institutions. This led to the emergence of a more distinct role for academic advising, increased attention to the purpose, theories, and methods applied to practice (Himes & Schulenberg, 2016) and the recognition by stakeholders that academic advising was critical in helping students succeed (Frost, 1991).

The rise in scholarship and attention within academic advising created more attempts to clearly articulate the goals and purpose of the practice and led to a refocus on teaching-oriented goals as the primary function of advising. Moore (1976) wrote “[Coordinators of advising] realized that advising can be a single-direction activity to select courses and plan schedules or a process for individualized teaching” (p. 374). With this increased attention paid to the role of advising in student success as well as the rise in the number of dedicated primary role advisors, the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) was formed in 1979. By facilitating the conversation about academic advising, NACADA (now known as NACADA: The Global Community of Academic Advising) developed leadership within the profession of academic advisors and garnered a commitment to scholarship-based practice through commissions, publications, and conferences (Cate & Miller, 2015). This formalized network has added to practitioner awareness of student development theory and directed attention to sharing perceived best practices (Himes & Schulenberg, 2016).

Starting in the early 2000s, advising practitioners began to make a concerted effort in clarifying the role of academic advising. As U.S. higher education has continued to accommodate increased enrollments (Aud et al., 2012) and focus directly on accountability, retention, and completion (McPhail, 2011), the advising community has grown and developed new ways of examining and explaining the role and work of academic advisors.

Throughout the history of academic advising, social structures such as changes in size and diversity of student enrollment, curricular developments, and the formation of NACADA have influenced advising (Himes & Schulenberg, 2016). Additionally, the American Council on Education Studies' (ACE) (1949) publication of *The Student Personnel Point of View* has helped change the perspectives, roles, and language used by practitioners as well as the creation and use of scholarship within academic advising. As higher education continues to go through global changes, it can be expected that the structures of higher education and academic advising will continue to play a key role in student success (Himes & Schulenberg, 2016).

Nature of Advising

With increased calls for clarifying the distinctive role of advising within higher education (Schulenberg & Lindhorst, 2008), NACADA sought a definition of academic advising in 2003. This endeavor resulted in a concept statement that highlighted the role academic advising plays in the learning and teaching mission of higher education. The NACADA Concept of Academic Advising laid out three components of practice: curriculum, pedagogy, and student learning outcomes (NACADA, 2006).

The curriculum component of academic advising draws on theories primarily in the social sciences, humanities, and education (NACADA, 2017). The curriculum focuses on what advising deals with and can range from the ideals of higher education to the realism of enrollment and retention efforts. The

curriculum also includes but is not limited to the “institution’s mission, culture, and expectations; the value, meaning, and interrelationship of the institution’s curriculum, modes of thinking, learning, and decision making; the selection of academic programs and courses; development of life and career goals; campus/community resources, policies, and procedures; and the transferability of skills and knowledge” (NACADA, 2017, para. 5).

The pedagogy of academic advising incorporates the preparation, facilitation, documentation, and assessment of advising interactions between students and their advisor (NACADA, 2017). Envisioning academic advising as a teaching process uses methods, strategies, and techniques that may vary among advisors but creates a fundamental relationship between the advisors and students that is characterized by mutual respect, trust, and ethical behavior. In this capacity, the student cannot be a passive repository for knowledge, but must have equal responsibility with the advisor for the quality of the learning process and product (Crookston, 1972).

The learning outcomes of academic advising are guided by an institution’s mission, goals, curriculum, and co-curriculum. As such, student outcomes for academic advising will vary from institution to institution. These outcomes must articulate what students will demonstrate, know, value, and do as a result in participating in academic advising (NACADA, 2017).

In addition to the Concept of Academic Advising, the NACADA Certification Task Force delineated five academic advisor competencies areas

(Cate & Miller, 2015). These competencies reflect the core understandings required by academic advisors and include conceptual knowledge of advising, knowledge of college student characteristics, skills and knowledge in career advising, communication and interpersonal skills, and institution-specific knowledge (NACADA, 2003). Finally, academic advisors must also know the diversity that exists in advising structures and models at various higher education institutions (Himes & Schulenberg, 2016).

Advising Approaches and Strategies

As academic advising is an interdisciplinary area of study, it is then up to the advisor to understand and use different advising approaches and strategies that will work with the students they advise and to create the conditions necessary for students to achieve success. For example, using scholarship from work on student development theory (e.g., Evans et al., 1998; Evans et al., 2010) and the student experiences within the campus environment (e.g. Harper & Quaye, 2009; Strange & Banning, 2001), academic advisors can effectively and actively incorporate and interpret the research on student success into their advising (Kimball & Campbell, 2013). There are multiple advising approaches and strategies an advisor can utilize when meeting with students that is generally guided by the advisor's individual interpretations about how to best support the developmental needs of their students. The strategy that is then used by advisors ideally is consistent with that of the overall approach of the institution or individual advisor. However, as all students interpret their advising

experiences differently, no single approach or strategy will work for all students (Kimball & Campbell, 2013).

Learning-Centered Advising. In 1987, Chickering and Gamson consolidated and published one of the best-known descriptions of teaching practices (Reynolds, 2013). This work was mainly focused on faculty classroom teaching, but the idea was to reach other audiences including administrators, state and national agencies, and policy makers (Chickering & Gamson, 2000). Chickering and Gamson (1987) wrote that good practices in undergraduate education:

- Encourages contact between students and faculty members,
- Advances reciprocity and cooperation among students,
- Advances active learning,
- Allows for prompt feedback, supports an emphasis of time on task,
- Communicates high expectations, and
- Induces a respect for diverse ways of learning (Chickering & Gamson, 1987, p.3).

While Chickering and Gamson (1987) stated “advising is [would be] considered important” (p.5), they did not elaborate on how advising might create an environment of learning or why advising should be considered important.

Expanding on Chickering and Gamson, Angelo (1993) created 14 principles that were directed towards teaching faculty with the hope that they would be used in the classroom:

1. Active learning is more effective than passive learning.
2. Learning requires focused attention and awareness of the importance of what is to be learned.
3. Learning is more effective and efficient when learners have explicit, reasonable, positive goals, and when their goals fit well with the teacher's goals.
4. To be remembered, new information must be meaningfully connected to prior knowledge, and it must first be remembered in order to be learned.
5. Unlearning what is already known is often more difficult than learning new information.
6. Information that is organized in personally meaningful ways is more likely to be remembered, learned, and used.
7. Learners need feedback on their learning, early and often, to learn well; to become independent learners, they need to become self-assessing and self-correcting.
8. The ways learners are assessed and evaluated powerfully affect the ways they study and learn.
9. Mastering a skill or body of knowledge takes great amounts of time and effort.
10. Learning to transfer, to apply previous knowledge and skills to new contexts, requires a great deal of directed practice.
11. High expectations encourage high achievement.

12. To be most effective, teachers need to balance levels of intellectual challenge and instructional support.
13. Motivation to learn is alterable; it can be positively or negatively affected by the task, the environment, the teacher, and the learner.
14. Interaction between teachers and learners is one of the most powerful factors in promoting learning; interaction among learners is another (pp.5-7).

Although the learning principles listed above come from research about classroom teaching, they still promote student learning which is a goal shared by academic advising. While some teachers and advisors assume that student learning is automatic or a result of good teaching or good advising, students learn for and by themselves through a process, change, or response to experiences (Reynolds, 2013). Advising and teaching should be used as a means of supporting student learning and focusing on the student: What is the student learning? Can they apply their learning? Will their learning support and encourage further learning? (Reynolds, 2013). While advisors can use some of the 7- and updated 14-point lists to strengthen learning in the advising setting, these points must include having clear, reasonable, and positive goals, including active involvement in the advising process, motivating students to learn more effectively, having high expectations to encourage high achievement, providing student feedback, and using advisor-student interactions to promote learning (Reynolds, 2013).

While there is importance to using enhanced teaching techniques in advising, it is important to remember that advisors are not teaching skills, approaches, or values but rather they are teaching students. The characteristics of each student must be acknowledged which then affect the advisor's decision making on how to best approach to helping the student.

Developmental Advising. While it continues to be one of the most fundamental and comprehensive approaches to advising, developmental advising was not widely adopted as a standard of practice until 1984 (Grites, 2013). Melvane Hardee (1970) provided the earliest comprehensive observations about the importance of student-faculty interaction through the academic advising process (Grites, 2013). Additionally, Hardee (1970) reiterated the differentiation between

(a) *faculty advising*, an activity dispatched by members of the teaching faculty and directed towards assisting students in their educational, vocational, and personal concerns at a defined level of competence, and (b) *counseling*, which enlists the efforts of persons who are specifically trained and experienced in the areas of educational, psychological, or clinical procedures (p. 9).

Slightly different than Hardee (1970) but still advocating for a student development approach, Crookston (1972/1994/2009) highlighted the differences between developmental and prescriptive advising. Crookston (1972/1994/2009) described the traditional relationship between advisor and student as

prescriptive. This implied the relationship was based on authority where the “advisor is the doctor, and the student is the patient” (p. 12). The student (patient) comes in for help with a problem (ailment), the advisor (doctor) prescribes something or gives advice. If the advice is followed by the student, the problem is solved. Presumably, this means the advisor has “taught” and the student “learns”. In contrast, developmental advising is based on the belief that the advisor and the student engage in a series of developmental tasks, reaching an agreement on who takes initiative, who takes responsibility, who supplies the knowledge, and how this knowledge is applied (Crookston, 1972/1994/2009). Developmental advising is not only concerned with a specific or personal or academic decision but helps with facilitating a student’s rational processes, behavioral awareness, problem-solving, decision-making, evaluation skills, and environmental and interpersonal interactions.

More specifically, Crookston (1972/1994/2009) took the concepts of developmental counseling in which advising would be concerned with to incorporate facilitating the “student’s rational processes, environmental and interpersonal interactions, behavioral awareness, and problem-solving, decision-making, and evaluation skills” (p. 78) and not just the specific personal or vocational decisions of the student into an advising session. Using these concepts, three terms and concepts were created that advisors still use within developmental advising: “a) a *developmental view* that implied growth as an outcome; b) *academic advising as teaching* that articulated the learning process

in which students and advisors became engaged; and c) *prescriptive* advising that established dichotomy and continuum along which the advising process can be viewed” (Grites, 2013, p. 47).

O’Banion (1972), on the other hand, argued that the process of academic advising “is to help the student choose a program of study which will serve him in the development of his total potential” (p. 62). O’Banion’s (1972) five step model focused more on the academic aspect of development rather than the overall development of a student. O’Banion’s first two steps focused on the vocational aspect of decision making that a student would engage in to make the advising process meaningful to the student. This process would then follow through to the last two steps which included course selection and scheduling.

Building off the work by Crookston (1972/1994/2009) and O’Banion (1972), the term *developmental academic advising* was first articulated by editors Winston, Ender, and Miller (1982) in “Developmental Approaches to Academic Advising”. Winston, Ender, and Miller (1982) took the stance that a dualistic approach was needed to educate the whole student and integrate the personal and intellectual development. This meant that a holistic approach could not be separated by academic affairs and student affairs but asserted that “such an integrated approach not only is possible, but that its touchstone is the academic advising process” (p. 4).

Overall, using developmental advising today, advisors need to keep a few things in mind:

1. While built on developmental theories, developmental advising is not a theory but an approach to working with students with a conceptual framework (Grites, 2013).
2. Developmental advising is holistic and includes the educational, career, and personal goals of the student (Grites, 2013).
3. Developmental advising is based on the growth (success) of the student (Grites, 2013).
4. Developmental advising is a shared activity between both the student and the advisor (Grites, 2013).

Appreciative Advising. Appreciative Advising (AA) is a framework and approach based on social constructivism and rooted within appreciative inquiry (AI) which focuses on the cooperative search for the positive in every living system (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005). AA is one of the few research-based models of advising and was first introduced at the program level at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro (UNCG) with students on academic probation (Bloom et al., 2013). With the integration of AA into their academic retention programming, UNCG saw the retention rate of students on academic probation increase by 18% with a gain in GPA of .73 (Kamphoff et al., 2007).

Collins (2001) defined appreciative advising as a framework for guiding advisors who wished to move from providing good service to providing great service to students. AA focuses on the intentional process of asking positive,

open-ended questions that help students optimize their experiences and achieve their goals, dreams, and potentials (Bloom, Hutson, & He, 2008).

Appreciative advising involves a six-phase model that highlights the appreciative mindset and allows for students and advisors to a) build trust and rapport with each other (disarm); b) reveal their strengths and assets (discover); c) be inspired by their hopes and dreams (dream); d) co-construct a plan to make their goals a reality (design); e) provide mutual support and accountability throughout the process (deliver); and f) challenge each other to set high expectations (don't settle) (Bloom et al., 2008).

Appreciative advising provides a theory-to-practice package for academic advisors to follow (Bloom et al., 2013). As it is derived from research-based theories such as appreciative inquiry, it also provides suggestions for advisors to enhance their quality of advising services with a focus on verbal and nonverbal behaviors with specific techniques in each of the six phases. This action-based advising highlights what advisors may already be doing in their advising and allows them to reflect and enhance the intentional facilitation of all their advising sessions (Bloom et al., 2013).

Strengths-Based Advising. As increased access to higher education began in the 1970s, there was a paradigm shift from a *survival of the fittest* mentality of only accepting the brightest students into a university towards one of *deficit remediation* where a broader variety of students were admitted into the university (Schreiner, 2013). While both conditions still exist under the current

higher education environment, they both fail to look at the motivation of student success (Schreiner, 2013). Using a strengths-based approach allows for advisors to address how to engage students in the learning process and motivate them to fulfill their potential.

Schreiner and Anderson (2005) defined strengths-based advising as being “predicated on students’ natural talents and is used to build their confidence while motivating them to acquire the knowledge base and skills necessary for college-level achievement” (p. 22). Strengths-based advising first focuses on student motivation, assuming that when a student is more aware of their strengths, they will be motivated to set goals and achieve them at a higher level (Schreiner & Anderson, 2005). This then allows the student to shift the focus from problems faced to possibilities and allows the advisor to emphasize the abilities the student possesses. Once the student can see the possibilities, the advisor can then frame tasks differently by questioning the student about the talents and situations that have enabled them to be successful.

Lastly, the feeling students have with their advising experience when an advisor uses strength-based advising is different than in a developmental approach (Schreiner & Anders, 2005). Using this approach allows the student to feel understood and known by their advisors, resulting in higher motivation levels, and having a sense of direction and confidence (Schreiner, 2000). This allows the student to consider the advising relationship to be positive and provides a foundation for future success.

There are five steps within strengths-based advising that work best in sequence (Schreiner, 2013). First, the advisor begins by helping the student identify their talents. This builds rapport with the student as the advisor can focus on the individual student and their potential contributions to the learning environment (Schreiner, 2013).

Second, once the talents of the student have been identified, the advisor can then increase their awareness and appreciation of those strengths and help them see how they can be further developed. As some students may not value their talents, advisors need to help their students see their talents as unique and affirm them as assets. This affirmation process allows students to utilize their strengths as they face challenges or failures (Steele et al., 1993).

The third step involves the advisor discussing with the student their aspirations and how developing their talents identified in the previous step can help them reach their goals. This step is not about career planning primarily, but more about what kind of person the student wants to be (Schreiner, 2013). This process initiates the student articulating their own self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation in a process Markus and Nurius (1986) called *possible selves* which are those aspects of a person they most want to embody in the future. The envisioning process creates an image of a bright future for the student that helps them through difficult times.

Creating a plan for reaching a student's goals is the fourth step in strengths-based advising. Creating a plan helps students connect their passions

and strengths and can open them up to other possibilities for academic majors and careers (Bloom, et al., 2008). The plan is co-created by the advisor and the student that the student can then implement. The plan contains both short- and long-term goals important to the student and that align with their values and strengths.

The last step of strengths-based advising is a critical competent but often missed by advisors (Schreiner & Anderson, 2002, 2005). The last step involves teaching students how to transfer their strengths from one setting to another. This helps the student identify ways to apply their talents to new situations and challenges rather than only applying one specific skill set to one task (Schreiner, 2013).

Using a strengths-based advising approach flips the paradigm of focusing on student deficits and needs to the advisor working with a student who is present and puts the focus on talents as a foundation for addressing the future for the student (Schreiner, 2013). This approach allows the student to focus on their unique gifts and gain the most out of their college experience.

Proactive Advising. Formally known as *intrusive* advising, proactive advising was first introduced as an advising strategy with the work of Glennon (1975) who looked to blend advising and counseling into a form of student intervention that allows the advisor to provide students with information before they request it. Earl (1988) described the proactive advising model as

a deliberate, structured student intervention at the first indication of academic difficulty in order to motivate a student to seek help. By this

definition, intrusive advising utilizes the systematic skills of prescriptive advising while helping to solve the major problem of developmental advising, which is a student's reluctance to self-refer (p.1).

Proactive advising can be used more as an approach to advising students rather than a theory. For advisors to work proactively with students, more time may be required of the advisor to gain adequate information, good insight, and sound judgement (Varney, 2013). Glennon (1975) suggested that under a proactive approach, institutional personnel take the initiative in working with students rather than waiting for the student to ask for help. With this approach, the advisor and student tend to have more frequent interactions with each other that go beyond picking courses (Varney, 2013). This relationship-based approach can then focus on a students' abilities and challenges, discuss their progress, and refer to other resources the student may need, and institution can provide.

A proactive advising approach can be used in a variety of advising areas such as retention, at risk student advising, student communication and difficult situations, and critical outreach points (Varney, 2012). Through this outreach, students learn that their advisor can be their main connection to the institution which may result in them being more actively engaged in different aspects of college life and therefore more likely to stay at the institution (DiMaria, 2006).

Garing (1993) further suggested that proactive advising begins with inquiry. This is initiated as advisors help in the initial enrollment phase through student interviews, answering in depth questions regarding curriculum, and other

program nuances that may be involved in the student admission process. Garing (1993, pp. 101-103) also outlined four critical points when outreach is needed for proactive advising:

1. During the first three weeks of the academic term when students make academic and personal adjustments and identify areas in which they may need support.
2. The middle of the first term when students typically receive feedback and grades in their courses and can assess their current progress.
3. During the pre-registration process as students face important decisions and may need assistance from advisors in analyzing if their selected major is an appropriate fit or if other majors and career paths should be explored.
4. Between semesters, students who are underprepared or at-risk may have a higher tendency of dropping out. Contact with an advisor during this time may keep the relationship with the campus strong while the student is off campus during breaks.

When advisors can effectively communicate with students proactively, it can begin to build a mutually satisfying relationship that enables students to grow and develop academic success and independence (Varney, 2013). High advisor involvement aids students who may be experiencing academic difficulty; especially for those having trouble asking for help (Varney, 2013). Nutt (2000) stated that the proactive advisor “concentrates on developing the interpersonal

skills of effective listening, question, and referral [that] is vital for advisors in order for one-to-one academic advising to be successful” (p. 223).

Summary

An advisor’s approach typically comes from their own philosophy of academic advising that reflects their interpretation of relevant theories and literature. Frietag (2011), stated an advisor’s philosophy is “positive, self-motivation statement of what academic advising means to an advisor. It describes the theories an advisor uses as a foundation for their advising practice...it explains why they are an advisor, guides their day-today decision making, helps shape their professional goals and objectives, and provides a solid base for their advising practice” (p. 1). Advisors also refine their advising approaches through conversations with colleagues and interactions with students. While there are many advising theories and approaches, advisors need to be flexible and adapt their advising strategies according to the needs of their students as keeping to one advising approach for all students disregards the diverse ways a student learns and presumes that all students learn in a linear developmental path (Kimball & Campbell, 2013). Using advising as an intentional process allows advisors to use multiple advising approaches that support student success based on the needs of the student they are meeting with.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter will readdress the purpose of this study and present the research question. This chapter will also explain the research design and methodology, data collection, methods, give a description of the setting for the research, and offer reasons for the selection of participants in the study. The subjectivities in a “Researcher as Instrument” statement including the researcher’s experience, beliefs, and assumptions that have helped shaped this study will be explained as well as the approach to data analysis, including the rationale for coding methods. Lastly, this chapter will show how trustworthiness will be achieved in the research and review both the delimitations and limitations of the study.

Purpose Statement

While studies have been done on the advising preferences and experiences of transfer students, there is limited contemporary research on the advising preferences and experiences of post-traditional transfer students as they transition from the Community College to the Comprehensive University. Using the “moving in” phase of Schlossberg’s Theory of Transition (Anderson et al., 2012; Schlossberg et al., 1989), the purpose of this Interpretive Phenomenological study was to explore the lived academic advising experiences

at the community college of post-traditional transfer students as they transition into the four-year university. The study also examined what their expectations of advising are at the four-year university. The research seeks to add to the existing literature on transfer student advising experiences and expand the limited literature on post-traditional transfer students. This study also aims to inform best advising practices for the post-traditional transfer student population.

Research Question

This study was guided by the following research question:

1. What are the lived academic advising experiences of post-traditional transfer students at a four-year institution and how have community college advising experiences shaped/informed their advising expectations at their current institution?

Participants who reported positive advising experiences at the community college may be expecting positive advising experiences at the four-year institution while participants who reported negative advising experiences at the community college may not expect positive advising experiences at the four-year institution.

The research question is examined within the context of the “moving in” phase of Schlossberg’s Transition Theory. The theory proposes that as students move into the four-year university they are learning about their new role at the institution, developing new relationships with professors and other students, and starting to become familiar with “the rules, regulations, norms, and expectations

of the new system” (Anderson et al., 2012, p. 57). This part of the university experience presents an ideal time during which to examine advising expectations and experiences of post-traditional students.

Research Design

Creswell (2014) states a qualitative study is appropriate “for exploring and understanding the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem” (p.4). As this study sought to understand the lived academic advising experiences of post-traditional community college transfer students, a qualitative method was used.

Methodology

As this study sought to understand the specific advising expectations of post traditional students as the transfer to the four-year university, using a phenomenological approach for this study was appropriate. Creswell (2014) defines a phenomenological study as one “where the researcher describes the lived experiences of individuals about a phenomenon as described by the participants” (p. 14). The phenomenon that was studied is the lived academic advising experiences of post-traditional transfer students and their expectations at the four-year university.

More specifically, this study utilized a Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) as conceptualized by Smith, Flowers, and Larkin (2009). Grounded in the field of psychology, IPA is “committed to the detailed

examination of how people make sense of their major life experiences” (Smith et al, 2009, p. 3). In IPA, identity is important, specifically, this research methodology examines in detail “what the experience for *this* person is like, what sense *this* particular person is making of what is happening to them” (Smith et al, 2009, p. 3).

Data Collection

Data for this study was collected from semi-structured in-depth interviews. The purpose was to “facilitate an interaction which permits participants to tell their own stories, in their own words” (Smith et al, 2009, p. 57). The interviews were conducted through zoom and lasted approximately 30-45 minutes in length. Please see APPENDIX A for the complete interview protocol. The interviews were transcribed using the transcription services provided through Zoom to allow the researcher to send the transcription to the participants for member checking and for analyzing the data provided in the interviews.

Research Setting

This study took place at Ripple University (RU; a pseudonym). RU is a four-year, public, comprehensive institution in Southern California. Over 70% of admitted transfer students are from a California Community College. For the Fall 2022 cohort specifically, 30% of the admitted students were transfer students.

RU is one campus of a 23-campus four-year institution in the state where 21% of those admitted system wide in the Fall of 2022 were transfer students

with 14% of those students admitted being age 30 years and over at the time of admission.

Participants

Polkinghouse (1989) recommended between 5 and 25 participants for a phenomenological study while Smith, Flowers, and Larkin (2009) emphasized the importance of gathering rich data within smaller sample sizes. Given these considerations, 6 participants were interviewed which was a robust sample size for a phenomenological study but manageable enough to conduct semi-structured, in-depth interviews and still yield abundant data.

Using purposeful sampling (Creswell, 2014), participants were selected from the incoming Fall 2022 Semester transfer student cohort at RU; participants must have been at least 30 years of age at the time of selection and also meet at least one of the following criteria:

- Have had at least a 3-year gap in their college/university education between high school and college.
- Work 20 or more hours per week
- Have one or more dependents or are helping to take care of one or more family members.

Due to Institutional Review Board (IRB) requirements regarding participant recruitment, this study employed an opportunity approach (Smith, et al., 2009) to recruit participants. A formal request for permission to present the study in courses was sent to individual faculty at RU that the researcher knows.

Additional requests to post the requirement flyer was sent to directors of campus centers and programs including the two-year pledge program (which is directly associated with transfer students), academic advising centers, peer mentoring and peer advising centers, the adult re-entry center, and the University's Student Union. For instructors who agreed to cooperate with the researcher, an in-person or zoom presentation of the study was made. In each presentation, the purpose of the study and the research design was described. Subsequently, a request to participate was made. The flyers that were posted contained a description of the study and its research design. All interested individuals (whether from a course or who viewed a posted flyer) were asked to complete a brief Qualtrics inquiry to confirm that they meet participation requirements. Those who met the requirements were contacted by the researcher (via email) to schedule a time to complete the interview.

Data Analysis

The interviews were transcribed using Zoom transcription services and were checked by the researcher for accuracy. Transcripts of the participant interviews were read multiple times to increase familiarity with the data and to develop emergent themes within the interviews (Smith, et al., 2009). Once the emergent themes were identified, additional analysis helped in generating connections across those themes.

Positionality of the Researcher

As an academic advisor, I meet with students from different walks of life. I meet with students who are excelling academically, and students are struggling to maintain the minimum grade point average to stay at the University as well as those who fall below those benchmarks. I have worked with students from 18 years old to students in their later 50s and 60s as well as students who start as first time freshman and who transfer to the University. I have a passion for working with students to help them succeed through their academic journey and to help make sure they have the resources needed to reach their academic goals. I believe that meeting with an academic advisor on a regular basis can help students stay on track with what courses they should be taking in order to graduate sooner rather than spending more time at the University than they may want to. As part of advising, I can also help a student map out a plan to follow and navigate the sometimes-confusing institution policies and procedures.

While working with students, I have both an inside and outside perspective. Although I started off as a first-time freshman at a 4-year University, I eventually transferred to a different 4-year university after my junior year. I had to navigate a new school and a new major as well as figure out what resources were available for me to make it through to graduation. While I did transfer, I did not attend a community college first, so I do not know of the differences between attending a community college and a 4-year institution so while I do not have the

first-hand knowledge of being a lateral transfer student, I still experienced many of the same transitions as transfer students from the community college.

Hopkins (2008) states “It’s important for researchers to consider what they are doing and how and why they are doing it, as well as thinking about who they are” (p. 387). Looking at my own transfer process and using my experience as an academic advisor has helped shape my view on how to help transfer students transition to and succeed at the four-year institution. Now having worked as an academic advisor for almost 10 years, and being in a coordinating role that focuses on transfer advising and orientation, I work even more closely with transfer students and have heard about their transition struggles.

Looking at my own journey, I have to reflect on the fact that I sought out knowledge of things I did not know. I am not, by upbringing, afraid to ask questions about things I do not understand or call around to different entities until I find the answers that I am looking for. Using a self-reflexivity lens (Tracy, 2010), I must realize that not all of the students I work with are going to have the same upbringing as I do to know to ask questions and be advocates for their own education. I must reflect on the fact that while I was not the first one in my family to go to college, the majority of the students that I work with are first generation students and may not have the same support system at home that I had to push me forward.

For this study, I needed to be mindful of my previous knowledge of working with post-traditional transfer students and the assumptions that I may

have based off previous advising experiences. Keeping my self-reflexivity in mind, I needed to understand that the experiences the students I interviewed were their own lived experiences that have shaped their journey and were different for every student. I need to be able to meet the students I work with where they are and what their overall goals are. Using my experiences as both a student and an academic advisor does give me a starting point on what the advising and transfer experiences of post-traditional students looks.

As I planned to gain a better understanding of the lived experiences of students, I needed to be sensitive to experiences that the participants may or may not want to share during the interview process. I also needed to take appropriate steps to protect my participants' confidentiality. Each component of this study was evaluated to make sure I maintained my professionalism and monitor my biases given my current profession and as a researcher.

Trustworthiness

Tracy (2010) suggested employing “think description, concrete detail, explication of tacit (nontextual knowledge), and showing rather than telling” (p. 840) to achieve credibility (trustworthiness). Creswell (2014) also suggested using member checking to determine accuracy of interview transcripts and using rich, thick descriptions, to convey findings. In this study, I allowed for member checking to confirm the accuracy of transcripts and provide participants the opportunity to clarify any information. I also sought to provide rich, thick descriptions of interview transcriptions and observations to allow for readers to

understand why I interpreted the data a certain way. Additionally, using zoom to conduct the interviews allowed for participants to keep their anonymity by having their cameras off if they chose to as well as using pseudonyms to change the names of participants.

I also made sure that my biases and subjectivities were monitored. I was upfront about the intent of my research and explained my researcher subjectivities (Glense, 2016). I also engaged in a self-reflexivity lens (Tracy, 2010) to make sure I am aware of the biases, prejudices, and beliefs that I am contributing to the study. Lastly, I made sure to separate my identity as an academic advisor from the study so as to only focus on my role as the researcher.

Delimitations

Creswell (2014) identifies delimitations as further defining specific parameters for a study. The delimitations were purposefully selected for the study. This study will focus specifically on post-traditional students aged 30 years and older, who have one or more life roles outside that of being a student, who had some kind of gap in their formal education and transferring from a California Community College to a California Comprehensive University. This study focused specifically on the academic advising experiences of the participants. Lastly, the study will focus on the expectations participants have of academic advising services and the Comprehensive University.

Summary

In this chapter, I presented the research questions and research design of my study. In addition, I also shared how data was collected, how I analyzed the data, and how I ensured trustworthiness of the data.

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

Introduction

This purpose of this study was to learn about the lived academic experiences of post-traditional transfer students and how their community college advising experiences may have shaped/informed their advising expectations at their current institution using Smith, Flowers, and Larkin's (2009) Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) methodology. To do this, the following question was used to guide the study,

1. What are the lived academic advising experiences of post-traditional transfer students at a four-year institution and how have community college advising experiences shaped/informed their advising expectations at their current institution?

Participants who reported positive advising experiences at the community college may be expecting positive advising experiences at the four-year institution while participants who reported negative advising experiences at the community college may not expect positive advising experiences at the four-year institution.

Findings of the Study

In this chapter, I present the results from the IPA (Smith, et al., 2009) within the transition theory framework. Anderson, Goodman, and Schlossberg's

(2012) transition theory was used to understand the advising expectations of post-traditional transfer students as they transitioned into a four-year institution and how their advising experiences at the community college may have influenced their current expectations. I begin with introductions of the six students who transferred from their community college to Ripple University (RU), a pseudonym for a four-year public university in Southern California. I share their stories of the academic journey from the community college to RU, and their additional life roles outside of being a student. The data collected from the participant interviews revealed three key themes. The themes bring attention to how participants characterized their academic advising experiences at their community college and their expectations of academic advising at their current institution. The themes also align with the three different phases of transition theory: moving in, moving through, and moving out (Anderson et al., 2012; Schlossberg, et al., 1989). The three themes identified are 1) trusted advisor (moving through/moving out), 2) high expectations (moving in/moving through), and 3) first impressions (moving in).

Participant Introductions

The following introductions of the six participants provide a brief snapshot of the participants and their lived experiences both before and while attending community college with the aim of giving context as each theme is presented below. All participant names are pseudonyms to protect their anonymity.

Althea is age 40 and a Social Work major. She worked in the healthcare field as a medical technician before deciding to go back to college in 2019. While at the Community College, Althea participated in the Education Opportunity Program (EOP). Currently, Althea is a supervisor at a company while completing her Social Work courses. Althea is also the mother to young children all in the K-12 school system.

Donna is age 45 and a Communication Studies major. Donna had children at a young age with her oldest child being 25 years of age and her youngest child at 18 years old. In addition to being a parent, Donna has also worked at a local community college since 2008. Donna started her educational journey later in life but stated that because she worked in the educational field, in addition to taking care of her children, her aspirations to complete her degree evolved while attending the community college. It took Donna six years of mostly online coursework at the community college to finish an Associate's Degree in Social and Behavioral Sciences. Once done with the Associate's Degree, Donna questioned what she wanted to do next and after a few years plus the global COVID-19 pandemic, she decided to focus on communication and completed the few courses needed to earn her Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT).

Bobby is age 45 and a Criminal Justice major. He graduated high school in 1995 and started taking courses at a community college. Bobby stated that he didn't do well in a lot of the courses he took which still gets him down as those grades continue to weigh down his grade point average (GPA). Bobby started

working at camps during the summers and then eventually left community college all together when a former teacher offered him a position as a teacher's aide. Bobby worked as an aide for 10 years before bouncing from job to job after that. After meeting his partner and being encouraged to get back on track with his education, he started taking courses again in Northern California. In 2015, he and his partner moved to Southern California where he started attending a community college in the area and finished his associate degree during the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition to attending school, Bobby also lives on campus in the dormitory while his partner lived in their apartment.

Anne-Marie is 43 years old and a Psychology major. Anne-Marie described herself as a "seventeenth generation" addict, coming from a background in which everyone in her family was addicted to something; she did not address her drug addiction until she was in her thirties. After going through many years of addiction and developing a criminal history, Anne-Marie started attending community college after spending 18 months being incarcerated. In addition to being a student Anne-Marie is a mother to seven with two still living at home and works two jobs: one at her community college and a new position within the county.

Brett is age 37 and a Criminal Justice major. Brett served four years in the Marine Corps before starting at the community college after he left active service. In addition to being a student, Brett has one daughter in her early teens, is

divorced, and works full time at the community college he graduated from as campus security.

Jerry is age 56 and a Criminal Justice major. Jerry started going to college around 24 or 25 years of age before stopping after he got married and started having children. After being out of school for 20 years, Jerry decided to finish his associates degree and then transfer to RU. Jerry stated that he is semi-retired, and volunteers at a legal clinic as well as working for In Home Support Services (IHSS) for the county assisting older adults in their home. Jerry also helps his wife at home while he attends school.

Trusted Advisor

Five out of the six participants spoke about an advisor/counselor at their community college that helped them navigate their time at the institution. All participants stressed the importance that this person played in their success at the community college and their ability to transfer. These perceptions reflect the moving through phase of transition theory (Anderson et al., 2012; Schlossberg, Lynch, & Chickering, 1989) which states that this phase is where students incorporate their experiences once they start at an institution. This “incorporation” could include being back in the classroom after being away from school, finding a new support system, finding a new balance between work, family, coursework, and socialization. For the participants, they found a new support system in having a person at the community college they could connect with to go over course requirements and transfer requirements to help them move out of the

community college. This was an important theme found in the analysis as it helped shape the expectations for participants later in their educational career and transfer experiences.

For Brett, it was one specific person, and he described his experience as, “We have an amazing transfer center. The counselor took me under with any questions I had, I would just go to her, and she would help me out with that”. Brett expressed that while he considered the information his counselor gave him as basic, it helped him narrow down his approach to school and what he needed to do as a student after not being school for such a long time and helped prepare him for transferring to RU.

Donna had a similar experience at her community college. After taking courses towards her associate in behavioral sciences, Donna knew she wanted to finish her Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) but was unsure of what she needed to do so that she could transfer. Donna was able to get plugged in with the articulation officer for her college who told her everything that she needed to do step by step to get the ADT done. Donna stated the articulation officer told her, “Here’s what you should take, you’re better off taking these. This class and this class or this class”. Ultimately, Donna decided to take all of the courses suggested including an additional economics course for units and gained her ADT. Donna attributed her being able to successfully transfer to her articulation officer. She also stated, “It was just an eye opener. He made it so easy”. Finding that support and being given the strategies to transfer, the articulation officer

helped Donna through the ‘moving through’ and ‘moving out’ phases of the transition process ((Anderson et al., 2012; Schlossberg, Lynch, & Chickering, 1989).

Althea, Bobby, and Anne-Marie did not speak of specific individuals that helped them at the community college but did speak of the support and strategies they received while at the community college that supported their respective transfers to RU. Althea, a participant in the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) at her community college, had a positive experience with her counselors. Althea stated, “They were very knowledgeable, they’re always available, and they always provided me with resources that I may not have knowledge of”. On the other hand, Althea stated that her experience with the counselors outside of EOP was not as positive stating, “One of the other general counselors gave me a lot of misinformation when I got ready to transfer to RU which wasn’t true. I’m just thankful that I had enough wisdom to seek other advising.” Althea shared that the misinformation she was given would have set her back an entire year before she would have been able to transfer. While Althea also stated that she wasn’t too worried about the misinformation because she’s an older student, she was concerned about younger students who would take a counselor for their word and potentially experience a set-back in achieving their goals. In Althea’s words “Yeah, that wasn’t cool”.

Bobby did not seek academic advising at the community college until he got closer to wanting to transfer to RU. Bobby stated, “I took a few classes here

and there and then, when I really decided on criminal justice, I got into the advising, and you, know, built a plan to finish my Associate's degree". Once Bobby landed on earning his associate in administration of justice, he met with a counselor every semester. Bobby stated that he didn't meet with the same counselor every time, but different counselors depending on who was available and because of the COVID-19 pandemic, all appointments were through zoom rather than in-person. In commenting about his experience, "The people that helped me out were really nice, really helpful. It was interesting to kind of meet a few different people along the way that were in the same department but were really just aimed at trying to get me graduated with this associate degree".

Anne-Marie, like Donna, also worked at her community college while attending classes. Anne-Marie only sought advising every semester because she overloaded with additional units and advising was required. Once she finished the certificate to be a drug and alcohol counselor, Anne-Marie met with the transfer counselors rather than a general counselor to start the transfer process. This is when Anne-Marie found out that she had more courses to finish than she thought. She stated, "at that point, which I should have done in the first place where I went to see the transfer counselor and I still had eight classes that needed to be done before I got my AA. It was annoying to say the least". While Anne-Marie was annoyed to find out that she needed eight additional courses to transfer to RU, she did find that the counselors at her community college were open to helping, promoting a transfer-sending culture. However, Anne-Marie also

felt that the counselors did not take into account the possibility that students' goals change during their time at the community college so while it was helpful to talk with them, it would be especially helpful if they anticipated potential academic changes.

While most participants had a good experience with advising at their community college, Jerry felt differently. Jerry felt that while at the community college, he had no direction. Knowing that he wanted to study the law, Jerry sought academic advising but stated, "The law is such a massive, you know, opportunities that you can take. I just wasn't sure, I needed direction. So, I did see counseling a couple of times but unfortunately, it wasn't what I was really looking for. So, I just enrolled to what I thought that's for me". Jerry stated that while he understood the academic advising from the community college would not necessarily give him any personal direction in what he wanted to do professionally, Jerry still felt he needed more information from the counselor with what would have been more helpful. Of his advising experience, Jerry stated, "A more direct, more specific kind of program that I wanted to do or to take and see what they can offer. There was no actual discussion of that you know, it was more general, more basic, hurry up take this, and move on, you know". Jerry did like that the community college advising offered a lot of options when it came to the courses and degree but also stated that for him, it was also a drawback as he felt there were too many options and not enough individualized attention for his

needs as student and what he wanted to get out of his time at the community college.

High Expectations

All participants discussed their expectations of advising services at RU. While each participant had expectations of advising that would support their success as a transfer student starting at a new institution, not all of them had very specific expectations. These expectations reflect the moving in phase of transition theory (Anderson et al., 2012; Schlossberg, Lynch, & Chickering, 1989) which states that this period is where students incorporate their experiences as they move to a new institution. This “incorporation” could include experiences such as attending a larger campus than their previous institution, navigating new technology expectations, and learning how to navigate new policies and procedures. For the participants, they wanted to find a new support system they could connect with to go over what transferred over to RU, course requirements, and graduation requirements to help them transition into RU successfully. This was an important theme found in the analysis as it helped to shape their first impressions.

When talking about her expectations of advising at RU, Althea was very straightforward in her answers. Althea stated that she expected her advisors “to be knowledgeable and offer students different campus resources if the advisor sees that a student is struggling”. Rather than discussing her individual advising expectations from a one-on-one perspective, Althea talked more about

resources that advisors should be able to refer students to rather than advising services. She stated, "Or if a person is homeless that there is, you know a small loan that they can take from the school to get assistance. Things like that".

Donna spoke of much higher expectations for advising as she entered RU. After the in-depth advising experience that she had at the community college from the transfer advisor, Donna expected the same level of expertise from RU advisors. Donna stated that she "expected the same level of expertise where I was academically evaluated. That probably would have met my expectations, because once I was done, I felt like I had a plan". Donna also stated that she wanted the "most bang for your buck" in making sure that she wasn't taking unnecessary courses towards her degree and getting the guidance courses that could count in multiple places like she did at the community college.

Bobby had expectations similar to those expressed by Donna when entering RU. Based on the advising experiences he received at the community college, he expected that the advising at RU would be "more advanced, and more knowledgeable" but also stated that he didn't have many expectations other than those. While Bobby stated that he hoped that he would have a smooth transition to RU, he didn't have any other expectations otherwise.

Anne-Marie's advising experience at the community college was more of her finding out information herself versus going to one person. Since she worked at the community college she attended, Anne-Marie was able to find out a lot of advising information on her own rather than going to specific people. As she

came to RU, Anne-Marie expected advisors to have a more proactive approach to reaching out to incoming transfer students stating, “even if it’s sent to an email that said like, these are the 14 things you need to do to register.” Anne-Marie spoke more about needing step by step guidance from an advisor to help her transition into RU and make sure that she was completing her degree in “the most efficient path to something and know like that little tidbit of information about how you have to do this one class before you can do anything else in your life”.

Despite having a good advising experience at the community college, Brett did not transfer to RU with high expectations of the advising he might receive. Since Brett worked with one person during his time at the community college, he came into RU not expecting the same level of attention stating, “Honestly, I kind of went in, not having; I already had really high expectations, and I knew that wasn’t going to be met because of who I was getting help by [at the CC], and they’re kind of going above and beyond”.

Jerry, not having had a positive experience at the community college in terms of advising, did not have high expectations for advising at RU. Jerry did not specifically state any specific expectations during his interview but rather talked about what the community college did not prepare him for in terms of transferring and knowing the policies, procedures, and red tape that would be at RU. Jerry felt that with transferring to RU, the community college should have prepared him better for what to expect at the four-year institution and what to expect from advising rather than to have his own expectations.

First Impressions and Experiences

First impressions can make a difference on the transfer process for students and whether the student feels the university they are transferring to promote a transfer receptive culture (Jain, et., al, 2014). Because of the timing of the study, all participants were near the end of their first semester at RU and were able to talk about their first impressions and experiences with advising services. While the advising experiences and expectations were very similar for all six participants, the first impressions and experiences varied for each participant. Additionally, the transfer orientation experience played a large role in the transition process for some of the participants.

For Althea, being a Social Work major, the advising received is more individualized for students as it's a program that required a supplemental application for RU students. Althea mentioned that during her first term, she met directly with the director of the program as well as her EOP advisor. She stated that the director of her program is "very accessible and knowledgeable" and can give her the information that she needs to navigate through the program. Althea also talked about her orientation experience stating that she felt the orientation was very thorough and she liked that it included presentations from people all over campus. Overall, Althea stated that her experience for advising at RU had so far been a positive one.

Bobby also had a positive transition into the four-year institution. While he didn't have a lot of expectations for advising at RU other than it being more

advanced, Bobby stated that his transition to RU had been smooth and that the advising received exceeded any expectations that he had coming in. Bobby stated, “the level of information and level of detail that was given, attention to detail, and all of that made me feel really comfortable when I was coming into the college”. Coming into RU, Bobby had hoped for a smooth transition from the community college and he talked about how smooth the transition to RU had been between the two different advising services and that it was not something he had expected to go so smoothly.

In speaking about her experience so far at RU, Anne-Marie spoke about one particular advisor during orientation who was able to walk her through the registration process. Anne-Marie stated, “the girl who helped me was amazing. I don’t know her name but that’s what she does, and she was able to just like, lead me through it and help me go fast”. At the time of her interview, Anne-Marie spoke of getting a new job and needing to change around her schedule for the upcoming semester but was confident that she would be able to receive the advising needed to help her switch courses around.

While three of the participants had positive first impressions and experiences at RU, the other three participants either did not have a positive experience or had not received enough advising at RU to form an opinion on the advising services provided.

Coming into RU, Brett had low expectations of advising because of the contact he had had at his community college. Speaking about his experiences so

far, Brett had only met with Peer Advisors from advising services. Brett described that experience as, “I was expecting a little bit more. Obviously, they’re student working, and you know they’re just like me and I want a little bit more of a connection, more like a back home experience I experienced back there [at the CC]”. While Brett did state that his experience had not been horrible or bad, he did acknowledge that RU is a bigger institution and that he probably would not get the same advising experience as he did from the community college.

Given his negative experience at the community college with advising, Jerry did not have high expectations of advising coming into RU. His low expectations and impressions were confirmed starting with his orientation experience. Jerry stated,

“It was very disappointing because there were a lot of kids there. It was a mass of kids where we’re taking the tour of the campus, which is fine, but we spend so much time on that we didn’t spend enough time to really go into the process of enrolling, seeing what kind of classes you can take, seeing what they offer, seeing the teachers, and you know the extra curriculum of those courses”.

Jerry felt that more time should have been focused on academics and courses during orientation rather than the other portions such as campus tours, financial aid, and housing. While Jerry did like that he learned about different programs and services the campus offers, he was very critical about the lack of advising and academic services received at orientation. Jerry did not talk about

any advising services received after orientation other than joining the Student Assistance in Learning (SAIL) program which provides both individual coaching and advising for students in the program.

Despite having a positive experience at the community college and high expectations of advising coming into RU, Donna did not have a positive first advising experience. Coming into RU, Donna said she felt that she was lacking a lot of information even after attending orientation and the transfer workshops that were held. Despite reaching out proactively to meet with an advisor to go over some questions that she had about some courses she took at the community college, she felt the advisor dismissed her questions by just stating “you took this and this; like what you have is good”. Donna felt that although the courses she took at the community college were counting towards her major, the advisor she met with did not go into detail of how to understand where within the major her courses were counting and how those courses would help her with the courses needed at RU. Donna also stated, “I had two appointments with that advisor that were, I’ll be frank, were negative. I wasn’t helped in the way that I was expecting which caused me to think maybe this isn’t the place for me and maybe I chose the wrong school”.

After her negative experience with the advisor, Donna met with the faculty member from her Business Communication course and had a completely different experience. The faculty member was able to help Donna set up an academic plan and map out what courses she needed and when to take them.

Donna felt that while she was happy to find someone that could help her walk through the courses that she needed for her degree, the experience with the first advisor still colored her view of the institution stating,

“advising is kind of like a first introduction. That’s the front door. So, the experience I had with the advisor really shaped my view of RU and how I approached resolving my issues. I met with the Dean last week because the response that I got from this person, especially regarding the online availability was very off putting”.

Summary of Findings

Three key themes emerged from this Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis of participant interviews regarding their advising experiences: 1) Trusted Advisor, 2) High Expectations, 3) First Impressions and Experiences. Each of the themes presented demonstrate how participants describe their experiences as transfer students, experiences with advising services, and how their experiences shaped their expectations and impressions.

In addition to the research question presented, it was expected that participants who reported positive advising experiences at the community college would expect positive advising experiences at the four-year institution while participants who reported negative advising experiences at the community college would not expect positive advising experience at the four-year institution. This expectation was partially supported by the Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis. Specifically, four out of the six participants expected to have a positive

experience of advising at the four-year institution because of their positive advising experiences at the Community College. However, only three out of the six participants reported having a positive advising experience at the four-year institution.

In chapter five, I present a discussion of these findings, recommendations for leaders in higher education and suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION AND RECOMENDATIONS

Introduction

Post-traditional students are typically defined as individuals who are at least 25 years of age, have experienced a gap in their educational journey, care for one or more dependents and generally work 20 or more hours per week (ACE, 2022). These students represent 33.4% of all undergraduate students nationwide (PNPI, 2023). Despite the literature available on traditional students' lived experiences, perceptions, and transition experiences, there is a lack of literature that focuses on the unique needs of post-traditional transfer students (Karmelita, 2020).

This interpretive phenomenological analysis aimed to understand the lived academic advising experiences of post-traditional transfer students and how their community college advising experience may have shaped/informed their advising expectations at their current university. Six post-traditional transfer students participated in this study. Participants were recruited through emails and social media posts through various centers on campus that support adult students and transfer students as well as through classroom presentations. Participants completed a survey to confirm they met the selection criteria of being a Fall 2022 transfer student, was at least 30 years of age, and had at least one of the other following criteria: had some kind of gap in their education after high school, worked at least 20 hours per week, and/or took care of one or more dependents.

Each of the participants fit one or more of the criteria needed for the study, all described their advising experiences differently and each expressed different views about how the advising experience shaped their transfer experience. Each participant utilized the transfer function from a California community college to Ripple University (RU). This chapter provides a discussion of the findings, recommendations for higher education leaders, and proposes future research opportunities. This chapter concludes with final thoughts regarding the study.

Discussion of Findings

Keeping with interpretive phenomenology analysis, six steps were used to analyze the interview transcripts. Step one was to read and re-read each transcript (Smith, et., al., 2009). This allowed the researcher to make the participant the focus of analysis. The second step in the analysis process was to conduct initial noting of the transcripts. This process is the first exploratory noting of anything of interest in the transcript and identifies ways in which the participant talks about, understands, and thinks about an issue. The third step was to start developing emerging themes within the transcripts. After the emergent themes were developed, step four was to identify connections among the emergent themes. More specifically, contextualization was used to create a temporal focus of critical events in which they happened for participants (Smith, et, al., 2009). After the first four steps are done for one transcript, the fifth step was to repeat the process for each participant transcript and then move onto step six which was to look for patterns across all the cases (Smith, et., al., 2009). This involved

laying out all the emergent themes and connections next to one another to find the connections between all the cases. This in-depth analysis yielded three primary themes in the participant responses. These themes include: 1) trusted advisor, 2) high expectations, and 3) first impressions.

Finding 1: Trusted Advisor

The trusted advisor theme appeared to be important for five of the six participants because it set the tone for advising expectations as they transferred to the four-year university. The finding that most of the current participants highlighted the importance of the advisor role is consistent with Karmelita (2020). While Karmelita's (2020) study focused on students within a specific transition program, she noted the importance of academic options and the desires for academic advising. Karmelita (2020) also reported in her study how students directly expressed a strong need for guidance from an academic advisor and how many participants within the study spent time during the interviews asking her to advise on specific questions. When talking about meeting with an articulation officer, Donna expressed the same type of need for advising stating, "And it was just an eye opener. He made it so easy. He already had it all laid out for me and it worked exactly like he said". Having an advisor to walk her through the process of transferring was especially important for Donna who had already finished courses at the community college for her associate degree. It was only after the encouragement of the articulation officer that she decided to re-enroll and finish her Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT).

Another finding that Karmelita (2020) reported was the need for connections among participants; especially when it came to connections to advisors because the participants in the transition program were not connected to academic support. The need for connection to an academic advisor was also prevalent in the current participants as it helped support their time at the community college. As Brett expressed in his interview about the advisor he worked with, "She went above and beyond to really really help me." He went on to further state "I think I gave my idea of what I wanted to do, and she gave me more options of how I could pursue that, or you know, kind of just get; it wasn't so rigid and structured as far as like, you need to do this, this, and this; here are your options".

In Schaefer's (2010) study, she found that participants put a heavy emphasis on advising and finding a connection to a particular advisor. Schaefer (2010) also found that advisors played a critical role in providing accurate information and motivation for post-traditional transfer students. Despite the majority of the current participants having had a positive experience with advising at the community college, Jerry spoke about his negative experiences stating "I did counseling a couple of times but unfortunately it wasn't what I was really looking for". When asked to elaborate on what he meant, Jerry stated, "There's not really any direction or personal direction in what you want. For example, if I was gonna talk to a counselor, and I want to tell them this is the type of law that I want to do. There was no discussion of that, it was more general, more basic

“hurry up take this and move on” you know”. Jerry’s experience aligns with what Schaefer (2010) discussed as the importance of recognizing the needs and motivations of post-traditional students and that some students may be more motivated by career aspirations, like Jerry, rather than personal enrichment.

This theme of finding a trusted advisor again helped set the tone of expectations for advising at the four-year institution for current participants. Participants in the current study expressed the value they found in having an advisor who was able to be a source of support at they moved through their community college journey. As both Karmelita (2020) and Schaefer (2010) explained, participants in their studies also expressed the need of having a specific connection to an academic advisor to help offer consistent academic aid to students.

Finding 2: High Expectations

High expectations of advising were also identified as an important theme among the current participants. Among the five participants who reported good advising experiences at their community college, four of these individuals expected the same level of advising at the four-year institution. This expectation in the level of support from the four-year institution is consistent with Schaefer’s (2010) finding which indicated that advisors played a critical role in offering consistent aid and assistance. Schaefer’s (2010) study focused on supporting older baby boomer students as they transitioned back into higher education. Additionally, just as in Schaefer’s (2010) study, this theme was focused on the

“moving in” phase of transition theory and more specifically around the support factor of the 4S system (Anderson, et., al., 2012). The support factor reflects the resources available to the student. These support factors can either be a help or hinderance to student’s transition into the four-year institution.

According to Schaefer’s (2010) study, participants expected advisors to understand the unique needs of post-traditional students and recognize that those needs are different than a “typical” undergraduate student. This also included helping students navigate the web-based enrollment system, directions on how to access campus resources, and understanding the articulation process. Participants in the current study also expected advisors to be knowledgeable about transfer student needs, degree requirements for the majors these students had declared and recognize when to refer students to support services when needed. Althea stated that she expected advisors at the four-year university “to be knowledgeable, to offer resources if someone is struggling”. This aligns with what Ann-Marie discussed regarding a more proactive approach to the registration process stating, “Even if it's like an email that said like, these are the 14 things you need to do to register.” Ann-Marie also stated that she wanted to be advised on “the things that are most important, like, these are your gateways for your degree.”

Donna had similar expectations in stating “I expected that same level of expertise. Where, I guess that you know where I was academically and would be evaluated”. Donna expectations aligns well with Queen (2020) who indicated that

students generally benefit from advising experiences tailored to their individual needs. Donna went on to state “And I think too, getting that assistance to know which courses can get the best bang for your buck. Like, which courses cover multiple requirements. You know that kind of inside expertise”. This statement further aligns with having an involved advisor who is interested in the individual student’s needs as addressed by Queen (2020).

While most of the current participants expected to have a good experience for advising, participants like Jerry, who did not have a positive advising experience at the community college, commented that he did not expect advising services to be helpful at the 4- year institution. Jerry’s advising experience at the community college is what Queen (2020) called a check-list style approach where a student is given a list of courses to take rather than courses that fit their interests. Jerry stated that when he sought help, he felt that it wasn’t what he was looking for saying “it was not very personal help as far as what I wanted to do.” This experience led Jerry to have low expectations of advising at the four-year institution and to expectations of more of the check-list style advising rather than a relational approach recommended by Queen (2020).

Having high expectations (of advising) was consistent among most of the current participants. In particular, participants highlighted the importance of advisors being knowledgeable in degree requirements, knowing how to refer students to resources, helping with career questions, and being able to walk students through transitioning to the four-year institution. These participant

responses illustrate how a relational, or developmental approach (Grites, 2013) to advising is important to post-traditional transfer students. Queen (2020) reported a similar finding when discussing the positive outcomes for students when they were able to build relationships with their advisors. These specific expectations of the four-year institution among the current participants appear to set the tone for their first impressions and experiences of advising at their new institution.

Finding 3: First Impressions and Experiences

The third theme identified in this project is that first impressions and experiences of advising at the four-year institution are important for post-traditional transfer students. The interviews for this study were completed late in the Fall Semester so all participants had experienced some kind of academic advising at the four-year institution during their first semester. The importance of first impressions aligns well with Jain, Herrera, Bernal, and Solrzòzano (2011) who reported that first impressions can make a difference on the transfer process for students and whether the student feels the university they've transferred to promotes a transfer receptive culture. Jain, et al., (2011) also stated that a transfer receptive culture is "an institutional commitment by a four-year college or university to provide the support needed for students to transfer successfully" (p. 253). Therefore, when a four-year institution makes a commitment to support transfer students, it may have a significant impact on transfer students' first impressions.

For some of the current participants, the Orientation experience played a big part in their first impressions of the four-year university. Althea felt that the Orientation was helpful and very thorough in presenting additional support areas for students. Jerry, however, felt that the orientation was focused on younger students which aligns with Wheeler's (2012) comment that the typical orientation model focuses on primarily traditional aged students (e.g., 18-25) rather than older students. Jerry felt that instead of taking an hour to tour the campus, the time could have been used to allow students to meet with an advisor and go over degree requirements and register for courses instead of only having three hours dedicated to academics on a group advising level and not having the time to meet with an advisor individually.

On the other hand, Ann-Marie spoke about an advisor at the four-year university that had given her a positive experience during orientation stating, "The girl who helped me was amazing. She was just able to lead me through it and help me go fast (in the registration process)". Anne-Marie's experience aligns with what Karmelita (2020) discussed in terms of potential barriers for post-traditional students and what Schaefer (2010) discussed in recommending that advisors understand the unique needs of post-traditional transfer students who may require more assistance in areas beyond basic academic requirements.

Karmelita (2020) also stated that as post-traditional students are going through the "moving-in" phase of their transition to the four-year university, it's important for academic advisors to help students acclimate to the

expectations and norms of the institution. While three of the participants spoke positively about their advising experiences within the first semester, Donna spoke very negatively about her transition experience. Donna did not feel that the first advisor she met with was helpful in explaining the transfer process and how to smoothly transition to the university. Donna stated that the advisor made her feel like she should already know how her courses transferred and should know what she would need to graduate because she was a transfer student; making her feel isolated and alienated. These perceptions appear to align with Queen (2020) who reported some participants felt that the advising services were more prescriptive in nature and left students with more of a checklist of required coursework but not necessarily solutions and answers to more detailed questions. Donna wanted more of the relational, or developmental advising approach as discussed by Queen (2020) where the advisor took interest in her goals, questions, and concerns to walk her through the “moving in” phase to the four-year institution.

Despite the high expectations of the current participants that were discussed as the second theme of the study, the first impressions and experiences discussed here did not align with those expectations which gave some participants the impression that the institution was not as transfer receptive as they thought when they originally started the transfer process. While Althea and Anne-Marie both experienced positive first impressions of RU which met their expectations coming from the community college, Donna and Jerry both had

high expectations regarding the advising they would receive but did not have positive first impressions from RU.

Recommendations for Educational Leaders

This section provides recommendations for leaders in the field of higher education which includes advising administrators with formal leadership roles, advising faculty, and academic advisors who interact with post-traditional transfer students and/or the transfer student population in general. There are specific recommendations for advising programs and how to support students through the “moving-in” phase of their transition and the “moving through” phase of their 4-year university experience. These recommendations assume that it is important to have contact with transfer students through a series of touchpoints at specific times during these two phases of the university experience.

Support During the “Moving-In” Phase

The literature shows that post-traditional transfer students are more likely to have additional responsibilities in their lives outside of attending school with 48.7% of post-traditional transfer students reporting having dependent children (PNPI, 2023) and 37.4% reporting that they work full time (PNPI, 2018). While transfer student experiences can vary widely, as the participants in the current study demonstrated, it has been documented that transfer student populations can struggle after initially entering the institution and need institutional support to transition successfully. Representing this adjustment scenario, Ann-Marie, Donna, Jerry, and Brett all struggled with different areas such as registration,

advising, and orientation as they entered the four-year institution. I argue, based on the results of this study, that an emphasis be placed on the transition process once a student accepts admission to the institution. The first recommendation to help post-traditional transfer students during the 'moving-in' phase of their transition is to use an assigned advising case load model at the institution along with a series of three touchpoints to support students.

An assigned caseload model ensures that each incoming student has a specific academic advisor that they can contact during their time at the institution to help with course planning, degree progress planning, and with referrals to campus resources. This model would be a hybrid between a self-contained advising model in which advising for all students from the time they are admitted to the time they depart is done by a centralized advising office (Habley, 1983) and a dual advising model where students would also have a faculty advisor (Habley, 1983). This hybrid model would allow for professional advisors to advise students on both general academic needs and major requirements as well as allow them to refer students to faculty for matters related to research opportunities, major questions outside the expertise of the staff advisor, graduate school information, and career information.

The Global Community on Academic Advising (NACADA) addressed caseload issues in their 2011 national survey. The median number of students to advisor at the time of the survey was 296 students (NACADA, 2011). While NACADA does not make a specific suggested ratio of students to one advisor, it

is suggested that an institution take into account the types of students to be advised, their advising needs, who is providing the advising (i.e. professional staff, faculty, graduate students, etc.), and what other responsibilities the advisor may have outside of advising in determining advising load.

Habley (2004) noted that an accepted recommendation for the number of students assigned to full-time, professional academic advisors should be around 400. However, for institutions who may have a larger caseload of students due to a lack of advisors and/or resources, advising offices will need to think strategically in defining their student populations when developing effective formats of advising (Applegate & Hartleroad, 2011).

Touchpoints

The first touchpoint for incoming students is to offer communication or advising prior to any kind of Orientation programming. This touchpoint will give them an introduction to not only the institution advising structure and what to expect as they continue the process of transferring (e.g., submitting transcripts, waiting for course evaluations, Orientation registration) but it also reinforces the idea that the institution has a transfer receptive culture. Using both proactive and developmental advising models, the first touchpoint will allow transfer students to start to develop a working relationship with their advisor. This will help students learn that their advisor can be their main connection to the institution (DiMaria, 2006) and may result in post-traditional transfer students being more actively engaged in different aspects of college life and therefore more likely to stay at the

institution. This pre-advising outreach can be in the form of an email sent to incoming transfer students from their advisor to welcome them to the institution, remind them about important institution deadlines, and help them prepare for any kind of Orientation programming the student may need to attend. Frost (2013) and The Global Community for Academic Advising (NACADA) (n.d.) both emphasize the importance of advising and that it is critical to student success but that students also need to be motivated to achieve success. In reaching out proactively and early to students, advisors can spend time with incoming students to gain adequate information and insight about the goals, needs, and expectations of these students (Varney, 2013).

A second touchpoint of the “moving-in” phase is to follow-up with post-traditional transfer students once they have attended their Orientation requirements. Depending on the Orientation experience for students, this follow-up can take many different forms. For RU specifically, transfer students learn about their degree requirements and register for their courses during their Orientation, typically at the end of the day. By creating a touchpoint to follow up with students who attend Orientation, advisors can proactively reach out to their assigned students to follow-up with any additional questions the student may have after their Orientation session and to check what courses the student registered for. For participants like Donna, who expressed that she didn’t feel supported after Orientation and for Jerry who felt that the Orientation he attended did not have enough academic information included into it, this touchpoint helps

create a sense that the university is an academically supportive environment and allows students to be reassured that they are capable of handling university life (Jain, et., al., 2011).

The third touch point during the “moving-in” stage should happen just before courses at the institution start. Again, depending upon the Orientation experience of students at an institution and when courses may start for a given semester, this touch point can be tailored to meet the needs of the students at that institution. At RU, Orientation for transfer students happens in July with Fall semester courses starting in mid-August. Given that a student could have almost a full month between when they attend Orientation and when courses start, the goal of the third touchpoint is to check in with students before courses start to prepare them for their first term at the institution. This touchpoint can be in the form of a workshop that allows to students to learn more about institution resources available to them and tips for how to be successful in their first term (i.e., time management, professor office hours, tutoring services, library services, parking tips etc.); additionally, any questions they may have thought of after Orientation may be addressed. This smaller workshop setting may also allow transfer students to meet others and start building a social network that will help in their transition process (Chrstyal, et., al., 2018; Gard, et., al., 2012).

In using these three touch points and pairing proactive advising with a developmental model of advising, advising can take a holistic approach to supporting students’ goals and to assist them through the “moving-in” stage of

their university experience. If an emphasis is placed on transfer students once they have been admitted it allows the institution to show transfer students that there is value and respect for them through “special structures and programs that support their success” (Kasworm, et. al., 2002).

Support during the “Moving-Through” Phase

Once post-traditional transfer students have progressed through the “moving-in” process at the institution, they will next go into the “moving-through” period at their four-year institution. This period of their academic experience is marked by how they balance their new activities with other parts of their lives and how supported and challenged they feel during their new educational journey. As this phase can be longer, these students will need help sustaining their energy and commitment to finishing their degree (Anderson, et., al., 2012).

The need for additional support as post-traditional transfer students was seen with all the participants in the study who each talked about needing different levels of support in their first semester. Althea discussed the large amount of support she received from advising after starting the semester while Anne-Marie stated that while she knew she needed assistance with preparing for her second semester, she didn't remember who to go to. Similarly, Donna discussed not having great support as she transitioned into the institution but once she found a faculty member to work with, she felt better support. However, participants such as Brett and Jerry did not feel supported through the first semester at RU as both

spoke about having to find out information on their own rather than having someone to reach out to.

Based upon the results of this study, a second recommendation for university personnel is to provide additional touchpoints for post-traditional transfer students during their first semester at the four-year institution. These additional touchpoints will continue to place an emphasis on the experiences and specific needs of post-traditional students as they continue to through their educational experience.

The first touchpoint during the “moving-through” phase should happen in the middle of the student’s first term. Continuing with the assigned caseload model as recommended earlier, advisors can use this mid-term check-in with students to provide important information as they prepare to register for their second term at the institution. As advisors should have done a follow-up with their case load during the second touchpoint of the “moving-in” phase, this touch point allows advisors and their advisees to continue to build upon the conversations that were of help before the term started. This may include talking with students about how they are doing in their courses, how they are balancing being at the four-year institution with the other aspects of their lives, and course planning for the next term. This discussion can also focus on topics such as study skills, time management, evaluation of student preparedness for class, and exploration of campus resources the student may need (Karmelita, 2020; Knowles, 1990). As students continue to move through their first semester, they

are not yet in a period of stability but a “period between two periods of stability” (Schlossberg, et., al., 2006, p. 24) (i.e., being settled at the community college and being fully integrated at the four-year institution). By having a touchpoint in the middle of the term to check-in with students, advisors can help post-traditional transfer students continue their transition to the four-year institution before they reach the end of their first term.

A second touchpoint during the “moving-through” phase is for advisors to check-in with students once their first term has ended. This touchpoint can be as simple as an email sent to the advisor’s caseload of students congratulating them on finishing their first term and reinforcing the idea that the advisor is available to provide support as needed. This touchpoint also allows the advisor to be aware of the struggles and successes the student experienced and it gives the student and advisor the ability to continue the narrative that has been built during the academic term. This also allows the advisor to acknowledge the uniqueness of each students’ journey (Karmelita, 2020). In offering this last touch point at the end of the term, the student also feels validated and respected as they finish out their first term (Kasworm, et., al., 2002).

Using these two touchpoints during the “moving-through” phase will continue to integrate the proactive and developmental advising that was established between the advisor and the student when the student was accepted

to the four-year institution and reinforces the importance the four-year institution places on the unique academic journey of post-traditional transfer students.

Limitations

This study focused on the experiences of post-traditional transfer students using an interpretive phenomenological approach. There are a few limitations to this study. The first is that the findings from the data may not be generalizable as all but one participant were in majors in Social and Behavioral Sciences at the university. Second, as seen in the findings, some participants had more advising than others at the community college. This may mean that their lived experiences were quite different from one another.

Recommendations for Future Research

The results of this project highlight numerous opportunities for future research addressing the needs of post-traditional transfer students. While this study aimed to understand the advising expectations of these students as they transitioned into the four-year institution in their first semester, the university itself should be examined as well. For example, examining the partnership between the four-year institution and local community colleges to aid in the transfer and transition process as well as looking at enrollment management, advising, the registrar office practices, and partnerships with leaders in the student affairs setting may be the focus of future work. Like the research conducted by Chan (2016), a case study could be conducted (with employees of

the 4-year institution) exploring their perspectives and expectations regarding advising for transfer students. This study could aim to understand how university personnel interact with and serve the transfer student population during the "moving-out", "moving-in" and "moving-through" phases of the college experience. I recommend this study include interviews with community college partners who work with assisting students in the transfer process and enrollment management staff at the four-year institution to understand existing practices for data collection and communication with post-traditional transfer students. Moreover, the role of the Registrar's office (e.g., how transfer student transcripts are evaluated) may be examined. Another component of this study could include the outreach and advising practices of academic advising offices both as students enter the four-year institution, and as they move through the transition.

A second recommendation for future research is a longitudinal study that begins at the point of admission into the four-year institution and follows students through the "moving-in" stage at the four-year institution through a series of check-ins with a qualitative interview. These interviews would focus specifically on the "moving-in" and "moving through" phases of transfer students during their first year at the four-year institution. There would be a series of four interviews that would last 30-60 minutes in length and focus on the students' lived experiences at the four-year institution. The first interview, like the one done in this study, will touch on the experiences of advising at the Community College and the expectation of advising as transfer students enter the four-year

institution. The second interview will be conducted during the middle of the first term and focuses on how the student is adjusting to the four-year university and if their expectations of advising have been met or if they have changed. The third interview will happen at the end of the first term and focus on how the student feels about their transition to the four-year institution, and what expectations they have as they enter their second semester. The last interview would be conducted at the end of the first year at the institution as they prepare for their second year at the four-year, what their advising experiences have been, and how their expectations and needs for advising may have changed across the first year. As this current study only captured the lived experiences of students towards the end of their first term at the four-year institution, a longitudinal study could capture the experiences of these students from the beginning of their transition all the way through their first year to explore how their advising needs may develop and change as they experience each transition phase.

Conclusion

Despite post-traditional students representing 33.4% of all undergraduate students nationwide (PNPI, 2018), there is a distinct lack of literature that focuses on the specific transition needs of these students. This study aimed to understand the lived academic advising experiences of post-traditional transfer students and how those experiences may shape/inform their expectations of advising at the four-year institution. This study showed that post-traditional transfer students enter the four-year institution with their own unique

stories, needs, and expectations that they feel will help them through their educational journey. This study also showed the importance that these post-traditional students place on academic advising services in assisting with their education journey.

APPENDIX A:
INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

WE WANT IT THAT WAY: POST-TRADITIONAL TRANSFER STUDENT
ADVISING EXPECTATIONS AS THEY TRANSITION TO THE 4-YEAR
UNIVERSITY

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Interview Description

Interviews will be semi-structured, and the process will follow the following protocol:

1. Introduction
2. Provide information about the study and informed consent information to the interviewee
3. Allow time for interviewee to ask any questions or share concerns
4. After interviewee has signed the consent form, begin recording and start interview

The following questions will guide the interview

1. Please tell me a little bit about your journey leading to attending Community College before transferring.
2. What other roles do you have outside of being a student?
3. Did you seek academic advising while at your Community College?
 - a. If not, can you explain why?
 - b. If so, how often did you seek advising?
4. Thinking about your advising experiences at the Community College, what did you like about the advising offered?
 - a. What did you not like about the advising offered?
 - b. What, if anything, would you like to have been done different when it came to advising at the Community College
5. Based on your experiences of advising at the Community College, what kind of expectations do you have for advising services at the four-year institution?
6. Is there anything else that you would like to add about your advising experiences and/or expectations of advising at the four-year institution?

Interview protocol created by Jessica Davis for the purposes of this study.

APPENDIX B:
RECRUITMENT FLYER



**INTERESTED
PARTICIPANTS ARE
INVITED TO
PARTICIPATE IN A
STUDY ENTITLED:**

We want it that way: Post-traditional transfer student advising expectations as they transition to the four-year university.

The purpose of this study is to gain a deeper understanding of the advising expectations of post traditional transfer students and how the advising experiences at the community college may have impacted those expectations.

This survey is part of the doctoral study for Jessica Davis, an EdD student at California State University, San Bernadino.

If you are interested in participating in the study, please scan the QR code to be taken to the demographic survey or contact Jessica Davis at jessica.davis@csusb.edu.



This study has been approved by the CSUSB Institutional Review Board (IRB Approval # IRB-FY2023-101)

ABOUT THE STUDY:

-Complete the 1-2 minute Demographic Survey.

-Participate in a one-on-one interview with the researcher. You will be contacted by email to set up the interview. The interview will be conducted through Zoom on a potential date and time that we have both agreed upon. The interview will be audio recorded so that the researcher can accurately record, transcribe, and reflect upon the discussion.

- Participate in member-checking which will take approximately 20-30 minutes. Member-checking will allow you as the participant to validate the transcription of your interview transcription as well as offer any clarification to anything that has been transcribed.

I will be available to meet with you or speak to you by phone should you have any questions. I may be reached by phone 760-953-7073 or through email at jessica.davis@csusb.edu.

Volunteers must meet these requirements:

- Be a Fall 2022 Semester Transfer student
- Must be at least 30 years of age
- Meet at least one of the following other criteria:
 - o Have had at least a 3 year gap in their college/university education between high school and college.
 - o Work 20 or more hours per week
 - o Have one or more dependents or are helping to take care of one or more family members.

APPENDIX C:
INFORMED CONSENT

Participant Informed Consent

The study you are being invited to participate in is designed to examine the lived advising experiences of post-traditional transfer students and their expectations of advising as they enter the four-year institution. This study is being conducted by Jessica Davis, Ed.D candidate, under the supervision of Dr. Eugene Wong, Professor of Child Development, California State University, San Bernardino. This study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board, California State University, San Bernardino.

PURPOSE: The purpose of this study is to gain a deeper understanding of the advising experiences post-traditional transfer students experienced while at the Community College and how those experiences may have influenced their expectations of advising as they enter the 4-year university.

DESCRIPTION: The interview that you will participate in will be semi-structured in nature. The interview questions will center around your role of being a student, other roles you may have outside of school, your advising experiences at your previous Community College(s), and your advising expectations at the 4-year institution. You will have the opportunity to ask questions and voice any concerns during the interview.

PARTICIPATION: Your participation is completely voluntary and you do not have to answer any questions you do not wish to answer. You are free to withdraw from participation at any time.

Confidentiality: All information collected in connection with this research study that contains identifiable information about a participant will remain confidential. Confidentiality will be ensured by assigning pseudonyms to participant individual recordings.

The audio recordings will be transcribed using the zoom transcription services provided by the platform. The audio files from the interviews will be deleted from the folder and computer after transcribing and there will be no connection between the transcription and the participant. Only the researcher will have access to the transcribed data, in a password-protected computer. The data will be stored for five years after the study has been completed and then deleted.

DURATION: The time allotted for this interview will be approximately 60 minutes.

RISKS: There are no foreseeable risks resulting from your participation in this study.

BENEFITS: There are no foreseeable benefits from your participation in this study.

VIDEO/AUDIO/PHOTOGRAPH:

I understand this research will be Video Recorded Initials_____

I understand that this research will be audio recorded Initials_____

CONTACT:

If you have any questions about this study and/or research subjects' rights, please contact Jessica Davis, Ed.D. Candidate, at (760) 953-7073 or jessica.davis@csusb.edu or contact Dr. Eugene Wong, Professor, 909-537-5573 or ewong@csusb.edu. You may also contact California State University, San Bernardino's Institutional Review Board Compliance Officer, Michael Gillespie at (909) 537-7588 or mgillesp@csusb.edu.

APPENDIX D:
INSTIUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL

From: do-not-reply@cayuse.com
To: [Eugene Wong](#); [Jessica Davis](#)
Subject: IRB-FY2023-101 - Modification: IRB Approval Protocol Change/Modification Letter
Date: Friday, December 2, 2022 9:06:08 AM



December 2, 2022

CSUSB INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

Protocol
Change/Modification
IRB-FY2023-101
Status: Exempt

Prof. Eugene Wong and Ms.
Jessica Davis College of Social &
B Sciences
California State University, San
Bernardino 5500 University
Parkway
San Bernardino, California 92407

Dear Prof. Eugene Wong and Ms. Jessica Davis:

The protocol change/modification to your application to use human subjects, titled "We want it that way: Post-traditional transfer student advising expectations as they transition to the four-year university" has been reviewed and approved by the Chair of the Institutional Review Board (IRB). A change in your informed consent requires resubmission of your protocol as amended. Please ensure your CITI Human Subjects Training is kept up-to-date and current throughout the study. A lapse in your approval may result in your not being able to use the data collected during the lapse in your approval.

This approval notice does not replace any departmental or additional campus approvals which may be required including access to CSUSB campus facilities and affiliate campuses.

Investigators should consider the changing COVID-19 circumstances based on current CDC, California Department of Public Health, and campus guidance and submit appropriate protocol modifications to the IRB as needed. CSUSB campus and affiliate

health screenings should be completed for all campus human research related activities. Human research activities conducted at off-campus sites should follow CDC, California Department of Public Health, and local guidance. See CSUSB's [COVID-19 Prevention Plan](#) for more information regarding campus requirements.

You are required to notify the IRB of the following by submitting the appropriate form (modification, unanticipated/adverse event, renewal, study closure) through the online Cayuse IRB Submission System.

- 1.If you need to make any changes/modification to your protocol submit a modification form as the IRB must review all changes before implementing them in your study to ensure the degree of risk has not changed.**
- 2. If any unanticipated adverse events are experienced by subjects during your research study or project.**
- 3. If your study has not been completed submit a renewal to the IRB.**
- 4. If you are no longer conducting the study or project submit a study closure.**

You are required to keep copies of the informed consent forms and data for at least three years.

If you have any questions regarding the IRB decision, please contact Michael Gillespie, Research Compliance Officer. Mr. Gillespie can be reached by phone at (909) 537-7588, by fax at (909) 537-7028, or by email at mgillesp@csusb.edu. Please include your application approval number IRB-FY2023-101 in all correspondence.

Best of luck with your

research. Sincerely,

King-To Yeung

King-To Yeung, Ph.D.,
IRB Chair CSUSB
Institutional Review Board

KY/MG

REFERENCES

- Ackermann, S.P. (1989). An analysis of two UCLA transfer and retention programs: The transfer alliance program and the supergraduate program. Los Angeles: Center for Academic Interinstitutional Programs, UCLA.
- Adebayo, D.O. (2006). Workload, social support, and work-school conflict among Nigerian nontraditional students. *Journal of Career Development, 33*(2), 125-141.
- Adelman C. (2004). Principal indicators of student academic histories in postsecondary education, 1972–2000. *Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences.*
- Adelman C. (2006). The toolbox revisited: Paths to degree completion from high school through college. *Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences.*
- American Council on Education (1949). *The student personnel point of view.*
- American Council on Education (2013). *Post-traditional learners and the transformation of postsecondary education: A manifesto for college leaders.*
- American Council on Education (2017). *The post-traditional learners manifesto revisited: Aligning postsecondary education with real life for adult student success.*
- Anderson, M.L., Goodman, J., & Schlossberg, N.K. (2012). *Counseling adults in transition: Linking Schlossberg's theory with practice in a diverse world* (4th edition). Springer Publishing Company.
- Angelo, T. (1993). "A teacher's dozen": Fourteen general research-based principles for improving higher learning in our classrooms. *AAHE Bulletin, 45*(8). 3-7, 13.
- Applegate, D.Y. & Hartleroad, G. (2011, March). Effective ways to deal with large advising loads. *Academic Advising Today, 34*(1).

<https://nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Academic-Advising-Today/View-Articles/Effective-Ways-to-Deal-with-Large-Advising-Loads.aspx>.

- Astin, A. (1993). *What matters in college: Four critical years revisited*. Jossey-Bass.
- Aud, S., Hussar, W. Johnson, F., Kena, G, Rother, E., Manning, E., ... Zhang, J. (2012). *The condition of education 2012* (Report No, 2012-045). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.
- Bahr P. R. (2009). College hopping: Exploring the occurrence, frequency, and consequences of lateral transfer. *Community College Review*, 36, 271-298.
- Barry, R.J. & Barry, P.A. (1992). Establishing equality in the articulation process. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 78, 35-44.
- Bauer, P.F., & Bauer, K.W. (1994). The community college as an academic bridge: Academic and personal concerns of community college student before and after transferring to a four-year institution. *College and University*, 69(3), 116-122.
- Bell, J.A. (2003). Statistics anxiety: The nontraditional student. *Education*, 124(1), 157-162.
- Bennett, S., Evans, T., Riedle, J. (2007). Comparing academic motivation and accomplishments among traditional, nontraditional, and distance education college students. *Psi Chi Undergraduate Journal of Psychological Research*, 12(4), 154-161.
- Berger, J.B., & Malaney, G.D. (2003). Assessing the transition of transfer students from community college to a university. *NASPA Journal*, 40, 1-23.
- Best, G. & Gehring, D. (1993). The academic performance of community college transfer students at a major state university in Kentucky. *Community College Review*, 21(2), 32-41.

- Bitner, J. (1994). A comparison of math anxiety in traditional and nontraditional developmental college students. *Research and Teaching in Developmental Education, 10*(2), 35-43.
- Bloom, J.L., Huston, B.L., & He, Y. (2008). *The appreciative advising revolution*. Stipes.
- Bloom, J.L., Hutson, B.L., & Ye, H. (2013). Appreciative Advising. In J. Drake, P. Jordan, & M.A. Miller. (Eds) *Academic advising approaches: Strategies that teach students to make the most of college* (pp. 83-99). Jossey-Bass.
- Bogue, J.P. (1950). *The community college*. McGraw-Hill.
- Bradley, J.S., & Graham, S.W. (2000). The effect of educational ethos and campus involvement on self-reported college outcomes for traditional and nontraditional undergraduates. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*(5), 488-502.
- Britt, L.W., & Hirt, J.B. (1999). Student experiences and institutional practices affecting spring semester transfer students. *NASPA Journal, 36*(3), 305-311.
- Buenaflor, S.H. (2021). Transfer student self-efficacy: A success-oriented narrative of the transfer student experience. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*. doi: 10.1080/10668926.2021.1967226.
- Butler, J.D. (1998). *The student teaching experience: A comparative study*. Unpublished manuscript. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED417181).
- Bye, D., Pushkar, D., & Conway, M. (2007). Motivation, interest, and positive affect in traditional and nontraditional undergraduate students. *Adult Education Quarterly, 57*(2), 141-158.
- Carlstrom, A. H., & Miller, M. A. (Eds.). (2013). *2011 NACADA national survey of academic advising* (Monograph No. 25). Manhattan, KS: National Academic Advising Association.

<https://nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/2011-NACADA-National-Survey.aspx>

- Carney-Crompton, S., & Tan, J. (2002). Support systems, psychological functioning, and academic performance of nontraditional female students. *Adult Education Quarterly* 52(2), 140-154.
- Castro, E.L., & Cortez, E. (2017). Exploring the lived experiences and intersectionalities of Mexican community college transfer students: Qualitative insights toward expanding a transfer receptive culture. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 41(2), 77-92.
- Cate, P., & Miller, M.A. (2015). Academic advising within the academy: History, mission, and role. In P. Folsom, F. Yoder, & J.E. Joslin (Eds.), *The new advisor guidebook: Mastering the art of academic advising* (pp. 39-52). Jossey-Bass.
- Chan, Z.C.Y. (2016). A qualitative study of freshman's and academic advisor' perspectives on academic advising in nursing. *Nurse education in practice*, 18, 23-29.
- Chang, H. (2007). Psychological distress and help-seeking among Taiwanese college students: Role of gender and student status. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*
- Chartrand, J. M. (1990). A casual analysis to predict the personal and academic adjustment of nontraditional students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 37(1), 65-73.
- Chickering, A.W., & Gamson, A.F. (1987). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *AAHE Bulletin*, 39(7), 3-7.
- Christie, H. (2009). Emotional journeys: Young people and transitions to university. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 30(2), 123-136
- Chrystal, L.L., Gansemer-Topf, A., & Laanan, F.S. (2013). Assessing students' transition from community college to a four-year institution. *Journal and Institutional Effectiveness*, 3(1), 1-18.

- Cheung, R. Y. S., Siu, A. M. H., & Shek, D. T. L. (2017). Survey of needs and expectations for academic advising in a Hong Kong university. *NACADA Journal*, 37(2), 21–32.
- Chung, E., & Turnbull, D. (2014). Who are ‘non-traditional students’? A systematic review of published definitions in research on mental health of tertiary students. *Academic Journals* 9(23), 1224-1238.
- Clark, P.L. (2013) Transfer students’ satisfaction with academic advising services: A comparative analysis of the two-year community college and the four-year institution (Publication No. 3576269) [Doctoral dissertation, Argosy University]. UMI Dissertation Publishing.
- Cohen, A.M., Brawer, F.B., & Kisker, C.B. (2014). *The American community college* (6th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Collins, J. (2001). *Good to great*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Coll, J. E., & Zalaquett, C. (2007). The relationship of worldviews of advisors and students and satisfaction with advising: A case of homogenous group impact. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice*, 9(3), 273-281.
- Compton, J.I., Cox, E., & Laanan, F.S. (2006). Adult Learners in Transition. In F.S. Laanan (Ed.), *Understanding students in transition: Trends and issues*. New Directions for Student Services. Jossey-Bass.
- Cooperrider, D.L. & Whitney, D. (2005). Appreciative inquiry: A positive revolution in change. In P. Holman & T. Devane (Eds.), *The change handbook* (pp. 245-263). Berrett-Koehler.
- Corts, D. P., Lounsbury, J. W., Saudargas, R. A., & Tatum, H. E. (2000). Assessing undergraduate satisfaction with an academic department: A method and case study. *College Student Journal*, 34(3), 399-399.
- Council on Adult and Experiential Learning. (2000) *Serving adult learners in higher education*.

http://www.cael.org/pdf/publication_pdf/Summary%20of%20Alfi%20Principles%20of%20Effectiveness.pdf.

- Creamer, D.G. (2000). Use of theory in academic advising. In V.N. Gordon, W.R. Habley, & Associates (Eds.), *Academic Advising: A comprehensive handbook* (pp. 18-34). Jossey-Bass.
- Creswell, J.W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage Publications.
- Crookston, B.B. (2009). A developmental view of academic advising as teaching. *NACADA Journal*, 29(1), 78-82. (Reprinted from *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 13, 1972, pp. 12-17; *NACADA Journal*, 14(2), 1994, pp.5-9).
- Cross, K.P. (1985). Determining missions and priorities of the fifth generation. In W.L. Deegan & D. Tillery (Eds.), *Renewing the American community college: Priorities and strategies for effective leadership*, 34-50. Jossey-Bass.
- Cross, K. P. (1991). *Adults as learners*. Jossey-Bass.
- D'Amico, M.M., Dika, S.L., Elling, T.W., Algozzine, B., & Ginn, D.J. (2013). Early integration and other outcomes for community college transfer students. *Research in Higher Education*, 55, 370-399.
- Davies, T.G., & Casey, K. (1999). Transfer student experiences: Comparing their academic and social lives at the community college and university. *College Student Journal*, 33(1), 60-71.
- Davis, J.S. & Cooper, D.L. (2001). Assessing advising style: Student perceptions of academic advisors. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 20(2), 53-62.
- DeGregoria, B. (1987). Counseling the nontraditional Italian-American student. *Community Review*, 8(1), 38-41.
- Deil-Amen, R. (2011). Socio-academic integrative moments: Rethinking academic and social integration among two-year college students in career-related programs. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 82(1), 54-91.

- 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.
- de los Santos A. G., Wright I. (1989). Community college and university student transfers. *Educational Record*, 79(3/4), 82-84.
- Dill, P. L. & Henley, T. B. (1998). Stressors of college: A comparison of traditional and nontraditional students. *The Journal of Psychology*, 132(1), 25-32.
- DiMaria, F. (2006). Keeping our engaged, at-risk kids in college. *The Education Digest*, 72(2), 52.
- 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.
- Donohue, T.L., & Wong, E.H. (1997). Achievement motivation and college satisfaction in traditional and nontraditional students. *Education*, 119, 237-244.
- Dougherty, K. (1994). *Contradictory college: The conflicting origins, impacts, and futures of the community college*. State University of New York Press.
- Dougherty, K.J., & Kienzl, G.S. (2006). It's not enough to get through the open door: Inequities by social background in transfer from community colleges to four-year college. *Teachers College Record*, 108(3), 452-487.
- Drake, J. K. (2011). The role of academic advising in student retention and persistence. *About Campus*, 16(3), 8-12.
- Drake, J., Jordan, P., & Miller, M.A. (2013). Preface. In Drake, J., Jordan, P., & Miller, M.A. (Eds), *Academic advising approaches: Strategies that teach students to make the most of college* (pp. ix-xv). Jossey-Bass.
- Earl, W.R. (1988). Intrusive advising of freshmen in academic difficulty. *NACADA Journal*, 8(2), 27-33.
- Eells, W.C. (1931). *The junior college*. Houghton Mifflin.

- Eifler, K., and Potthoff, D. E. (1998). Nontraditional teacher education students: A synthesis of the literature. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 49, 187–195.
- Elliot, J.C. (1990) Affect and mathematics achievement of nontraditional college students. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education* 21(2), 160-165.
- Ely, E.E. (1997, April). *The non-traditional student*. Paper presented at the American Association of Community College annual conference. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service N. ED 411906).
- Ender, S.C., Winston, R.B., & Miller, T.K. (1984). Academic advising reconsidered. In R.B. Winston, Jr., S.C. Ender, T.J. Frites, & Associates (Eds), *Developmental academic advising: Addressing students educational, career, and personal needs* (pp. 3-34). Jossey-Bass
- Eppler, M. A., & Harju, B. L. (1997). Achievement motivation goals in relation to academic performance in traditional and nontraditional college students. *Research in Higher Education*, 38(5), 557-573.
- Evans, N.J., Forney, D.S., & Guido-DiBrito, F.M. (1998). *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice*. Jossey-Bass.
- Evans, N.J., Forney, D.S., Guido-DiBrito, F.M., Patton, L.D., & Renn, K.A. (2010). *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Fairchild, E.E. (2003). Multiple roles of adult learners. *New Directions for Student Services* 2003(102), 11-16.
- Fink J, Jenkins D. Takes Two to Tango: Essential Practices of Highly Effective Transfer Partnerships. *Community College Review*. 2017;45(4):294-310.
- Flores, J.G., & Alonso, C.G. (1995). Using focus groups in educational research: Exploring teachers' perspective and educational change. *Evaluation Review*, 19(1), 84-101.
- Fortune, A.E. (1987). Multiple roles, stress, and well-being among MSW students. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 23(3), 81-90.

- Freitag, D. (2011). Creating a personal philosophy of academic advising. Retrieved from the NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources Web site: <http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Clearinghouse/AdvisingIssues/create-philosophy.htm>.
- Frost, S.H. (1991). *Academic advising for student success: A system of shared responsibility*. George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.
- Frost, S.H. (2000). History and philosophical foundations for academic advising. In V.N. Gordon & W.R. Habley (Eds.), *Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook* (1st ed.) (pp. 3-17). Jossey-Bass.
- Gard, D. R., V. Paton, and K. Gosselin. 2012. "Student Perceptions of Factors Contributing to Community-College-to-University Transfer Success." *Community College Journal of Research and Practice* 36 (11): 833–48.
- Garing, M.T. (1993). Intrusive academic advising. Academic advising: Organizing and delivering services for student success. *New Directions for community College*, 82, 97-104.
- Genco, J. T. (2007). Adult re-entry students: Experiences preceding entry into a rural Appalachian community college. *Inquiry*, 12(1), 47–61.
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gilman, D.C. (1886). The group system of college studies in The Johns Hopkins University. *The Andover Review*, 5(30), 565-576.
- Glennon, R.E. (1975). Intrusive college counseling. *College Student Journal*, 9(1), 2-4.
- Glesne, C. (2016). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction*. Pearson. One Lake Street, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey 07458.
- Gordon, V.N. (1979). The evolution of academic advising: One institution's historical path. *NACADA Journal*, 24(1&2), 565-576.

- Graham, S., & Hughes, J. (1994). Moving down the road: Community college students' academic performance at the university. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 18(5), 449-464.
- Grites, T.J. (2013). Developmental Academic Advising. In J. Drake, P. Jordan, & M.A. Miller. (Eds), *Academic advising approaches: Strategies that teach students to make the most of college* (pp. 45-59). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Habley, W.R. (1983). Organizational structures for academic advising: Models and implications. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 24(6), 535-540.
- Habley, W.R., & McCauley, M.E. (1987). The relationship between institutional characteristics and the organization of advising services. *NACADA Journal*, 7(1), 27-39.
- Habley, W.R. & Morales, R.H. (1998). Advising models: Goal achievement and program effectiveness. *NACADA Journal*, 18(1), 35-41.
- Habley, W. R. (2004). Advisor load. Retrieved from the *NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising* Resources website: www.nacada.ksu.edu/Clearinghouse/AdvisingIssues/advisorload.htm
- Hagedorn, L.S., & Lester, J. (1999). Paradoxes: California' experience with reverse transfer students. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 106, 15-26.
- Hammer, L.B., Grigsby, T.D., and Woods, S. (1998). The conflicting demands of work, family, and school among students at an urban university. *Journal of Psychology*, 132, 220-227.
- Handel, S. (2013). *Recurring trends and persistent themes: A brief history of transfer. A report for the initiative on transfer policy and practice*. The College Board.

- Harbin, C.E. (1996). *A new plan: Total transfer management*. In J.N. (Ed.), *The community college: Opportunity and access for the America's first-year students (p29-47)*. (Monograph Series No. 19, The National Resource Center for the Freshman Year Experience and Students in Transition). University of South Carolina.
- Harbin, C.E. (1997). A survey of transfer students at four-year institutions serving a California community college. *Community College Review*, 25(2), 21-39.
- Hardee, M. (1955). *Counseling and guidance in general education*. New York, NY: World Book.
- Hardee, M.D. (1970). Faculty advising in college and universities. In the *American College Personnel Association student personnel series, No. 9*. American Personnel and Guidance Association.
- Hardin, C.J. (1997). Who belongs in higher education? In J. Higbee & P. Dwinell (Eds.), *Developmental Education and Its Role in Preparing Successful College Students*. National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition, University of South Carolina.
- Hardin, C.J. (2008). Adult students in higher education: A portrait of transitions. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2008(144), 49-57.
- Harper, S.R., & Quaye, S.J. (Eds). (2009). *Student engagement in higher education: Theoretical perspectives and practical approaches for diverse populations*. Guilford.
- Havemann, E. & West, P.S. (1952). *They went to college: The college graduate in America today*. Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- Hazzard, T. (1993). *Programs, issues, and concerns regarding nontraditional student with a focus on a model orientation session*. Florida State University Continuing Education.
- Hemby, V.K. (1997). Effects of keyboarding skill on self-reported computer anxiety among traditional versus nontraditional college students. *Delta Pi Epsilon Journal*, 39(1), 24-38.

- Hemby, V.K. (1998). Self-directedness in nontraditional college students: A behavioral factor in computer anxiety? *Computers in Human Behavior*, 14(2), 303-319.
- Henderson, M. (2013). *Coming to terms: Career development experiences of NCAA division I female student-athletes in transition* (Publication No. 3557564) [Doctoral dissertation, The George Washington University] ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
- Herrera, A., & Jain, D. (2013). Building a transfer-receptive culture at four-year institutions. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 162, 51-59.
- Hester, E. J. (2008). Student evaluations of advising: Moving beyond the mean. *College Teaching*, 56(1), 35-38.
- Hills, J.R. (1965). Transfer shock: The academic performance of the junior college transfer. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 33, 201-215.
- Himes, H., & Schulenberg, J. (2016). The evolution of academic advising as a practice and as a profession. In T.J. Grites, M.A. Miller, & J.G. Voller (Eds.), *Beyond foundations: Developing as a master academic advisor* (pp.1-20). Jossey-Bass.
- Hollinshead, B.C. (1936). The community college. *Junior College Journal*, 7, 111-116.
- Hollis-Sawyer, L. (2011). A math-related decrement stereotype threat reaction among older nontraditional college learners. *Educational Gerontology*, 37(4), 292-306.
- Home, A.M. (1997). Learning the hard way: Role strain, stress, role demands, and support in multiple-role women students. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 33(2), 335-346.
- Hooper, J.O., & Traupmann, J.A. (1983). Older women, the student role and mental health. *Educational Gerontology* 9(2-3), 233-242.

- Hopkins, L.B. (1926). *Personnel procedures in education: Observation and conclusions resulting from visits to fourteen institutions of higher learning*. The American Council on Education.
- Hopkins, P. (2007). Positionalities and knowledge: Negotiating ethics in practice. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, 6(3), 386–394.
- Horn, L. (1996). Nontraditional undergraduates, trends in enrollment from 1986-1992 and persistence and attainment among 1989-90 beginning postsecondary students. U.S. Department of Education, NCES.
- Hudson, R., Towey, J., Shinar, O. (2008). Depression and racial/ethnic variations within a diverse nontraditional college sample. *College Student Journal*, 42(1), 103-114.
- Hughes, R. (1983). The non-traditional student in higher education: A synthesis of the literature. *NASPA Journal* 23(3), 51-64.
- Iloh, C. (2017). Paving effective community college pathways by recognizing the Latino post-traditional student. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 1-7.
- Jain, D., Herrera, A., Bernal, S., & Solrzòzano, D. (2011). Critical race theory and the transfer function: Introducing a transfer receptive culture. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 35, 252-266.
- Jencks, C., Riesman, D. (1968). *The academic revolution*. New York: Doubleday.
- Johnson, M.L., Nussbaum, E. (2012). Achievement goals and coping strategies: Identifying the traditional/nontraditional students who use them. *Journal of College Student Development Theory*, 53(1), 41-54.
- Kamphoff, C.S., Huston, B.L., Amundsen, S.A., & Atwood, J.A. (2007). A motivational/ empowerment model applied to student on academic probation. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory, and Practice*, 8(4), 397-412.
- Karmelita, C. (2020). Advising adult learners during the transition to college. *NACADA Journal*, 40(1), 64-79.

- Kasworm, C.E. (2003a). Setting the stage: Adults in Higher Education. *New Directions for Student Services*, (103), 3-10.
- Kasworm, C.E., (2003b). From the adult student's perspective: Accelerated degree programs. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, (97), 17-27.
- Keith, P.M. (2007). Barriers and nontraditional students' use of academic and social services. *College Student Journal* 41(1), 1123-1137.
- Kerka, S. (1989) *Retaining Adults Students in Higher Education*. Columbus, Ohio: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education. (ED 308 401) http://www.ed.gov/databases/ERIC_digests/ed308401.html.
- Kim, K.A. (2002). ERIC review: Exploring the meaning of 'nontraditional' at the community college. *Community College Review*, 30(1), 74.
- Kimball, E. & Campbell, S.M. (2013). Advising strategies to support student learning success. In J. Drake, P. Jordan, & M.A. Miller. (Eds). *Academic advising approaches: Strategies that teach students to make the most of college* (pp. 3-15). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- King, M.C. (1993). Advising Models and Delivery Systems. In M.C. King. (Ed.). *Academic advising: Organizing and delivering services for student success* (pp.47-57). Jossey-Bass.
- Knowles, M.S. (1980). *The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy* (2nd ed.). Cambridge Books.
- Knowles, M. S. (1990). *The adult learner: A neglected species* (4th ed.). Gulf Publishing.
- Kohle Paul, W., & Fitzpatrick, C. (2015). Advising as servant leadership: Investigating student satisfaction. *The Journal of the National Academic Advising Association*, 35(2), 28-35.
- Kramer, G.L., Arrington, N.R., & Chynoweth, B. (1985). The academic advising center and faculty advising: A comparison. *NASPA Journal* 23(1), 24-35.

- Kuh, G., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J.H., Whitt, E.J., & Associates. (2005). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter*. Jossey-Bass.
- Laanan, F.S. (1996). Making the transition: Understanding the adjustment process of community college transfer students. *Community College Review*, 23(4), 69-84.
- Leckie, S. (1978). The new student on campus. *Educational Horizons*, 56. 196-199.
- Levin, J.S. (2014). *Nontraditional students and community colleges*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lopez, K. A., & Willis, D. G. (2004). Descriptive versus interpretive phenomenology: Their contributions to nursing knowledge. *Qualitative health research*, 14(5), 726-735.
- Lynch, M.L. (2004). A survey of undergraduate student reactions to academic advising. *NACADA Journal*, 24(1&2), 62-74.
- Macari, D.P., Maples, M.F., & D'Andrea, L. (2006). A comparative study of psychological development in nontraditional and traditional college students. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory Practice*, 7(3). doi: 10.2190/BV5H-3630-18CU-6C3B.
- MacIntosh, A. (1948). *Behind the academic curtain: A guide to getting the most out of college*. (1st ed.) Harper.
- Malhotra, N. K., Shapero, M., Sizoo, S., & Mun T. (2007). Factor structure of deterrents to adult participation in higher education. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*, 4(12), 81–90.
- Markus, H., & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. *American Psychologist*, 41, 954-969.
- Mayhall, J. L., & Burg, J. E. (2002). Techniques and interventions of solution-focused advising. *NACADA Journal*, 22(2), 79–85.
- McPhail, C.J. (2001). *The completion agenda: A call to action*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

- Mello, R. (2004). Teaching at the border of despair and hope: Supporting the education of non-traditional working-class student teachers. *Westminster Studies in Education* 27(2), 263-285.
- Metzner, B.S., & Bean, J.P. (1987). The estimation of a conceptual model of nontraditional undergraduate student attrition. *Research in Higher Education* 27(1), 15-38.
- Miville, M.L., & Sedlacek, W.E. (1995). An assessment of centralized versus faculty advising in a college of engineering. *NACADA Journal* 15(2), 20-25.
- Moore, A. (1989). *Background paper for the state commission on articulation and transfer*. Unpublished manuscript, Ohio Board of Regents.
- Moore, K.M. (1976). Faculty advising: Panacea or placebo? *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 17, 371-375.
- Mottarella, K.E., Fritzsche, B.A., & Cerabino, K.C. (2004). What do students want in advising? A policy capturing study. *NACADA Journal*, 24 (1&2), 48-61.
- Mullin, C.M. (2012). *Transfer: An indispensable part of the community college mission*. American Association of Community Colleges.
- Myers, J.E., Mobley, A. (2004). Wellness of undergraduates: Comparisons of traditional and nontraditional students. *Journal of College Counseling* 7(1), 40-49.
- NACADA. (2006). *NACADA Concepts of academic advising*. Retrieved from: <https://nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Pillars/Concept.aspx>.
- NACADA. (2017). *Concept of academic advising introduction*. Retrieved from: <https://nacada.ksu.edu/Portals/0/Events/Admin%20Inst/2017/Documents/Concept%20of%20Academic%20Advising.pdf?ver=2017-01-11-112959-953>.
- National Student Clearinghouse Research Center. (2018). *Transfer and mobility report: A national view of student movement in postsecondary institutions*,

- fall 2011 cohort* (Signature Report 15). Retrieved from:
<https://nscresearchcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/Signature-Report-15.pdf>
- Nora, A., Kraemer, B., & Itzen, R. (1997). *A casual model: ASHE annual meeting paper*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Albuquerque, NM.
- Nordstrom, A.D. (1997). Adult students: A valuable market to target. *Marketing News*, 31(19), 20.
- Norris, D.R. (2011). Interactions that trigger self-labeling: The case of older undergraduates. *Symbolic Interaction*, 34(2), 173-197.
- Núñez, A. M., & Yoshimi, J. (2017). A phenomenology of transfer: Students' experiences at a receiving institution. *Innovative Higher Education*, 42(2), 173-187.
- Nutt, C.L. (2000). One-to-one advising. In V.N. Gordon & W.H. Habley (Eds.), *Academic advising. A comprehensive handbook* (1st ed.) (pp. 220-237). Jossey-Bass.
- O'Banion, T. (2009). 1994 (1972): An academic advising model. *NACADA Journal*, 29(1), 83-89. (Reprinted from *Junior College Journal*, 42, 1972, pp. 62, 63, 66-69; *NACADA Journal*, 1994, 14[2], pp. 10-16)
- O'Keefe, V. (1993). *How to help adult and nontraditional students find success through the communication course*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Miami Beach, FL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED368006).
- Ornelas, A. & Solórzano, D. (2004). The transfer condition of Latina/o community college students in California: Policy recommendations and solutions. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 28, 233-248.
- Panacci, A.G. (2015). Adult students in higher education: Classroom experiences and needs. *College Quarterly*, 18(3).
- Pascarella, E.T., Smart, J.C., & Ethington, C.A. (1986). Long-term persistence of two-year college students. *Research in Higher Education*, 24, 47-71.

- Pinkston, R.A. (1987). University support program, academic achievement, and retention. (ERIC. ED283441).
- Pitter, G.W. (1999, June). *Ladders to success: Enhancing transfer from technical associate in science degrees to baccalaureates*. Paper presented at 39th annual forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Seattle.
- Polkinghorne, D. E. (1989). Phenomenological research methods. In R. S. Valle & S. Halling (Eds.), *Existential-phenomenological perspectives in psychology* (pp. 41–60). Plenum.
- Polson, C. J. (1994). Developmental advising for nontraditional students. *Adult Learning*, 6(1), 21–28.
- Postsecondary National Policy Institute. *Post-Traditional Students in Higher Education*. (2023, March).
https://pnpi.org/wpcontent/uploads/2023/03/PostTraditional_FactSheet_Mar2023.pdf
- Queen, A.E., (2020). Transfer student faculty academic advising: understanding student perspectives (Publication No. 27744496) [Doctoral dissertation, The College of William & Mary]. ProQuest LLC.
- Raskin, M. (1979). Critical issue: Faculty advising. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 56(2), 99-108.
- Reynolds, M.M. (2013). Learning-Centered Advising. In J. Drake, P. Jordan, & M.A. Miller. (Eds), *Academic advising approaches: Strategies that teach students to make the most of college* (pp. 33-43). Jossey-Bass.
- Robertson, J.H. (1958). Academic advising in colleges and universities: Its present state and present problem. *The North Central Association Quarterly*, 23, 222-239.
- Russell, J., Thomson, G., & Rosenthal, D. (2008). International student use of university health and counselling services. *Higher Education*, 56(1), 59-75.
- Schaefer, J.L. (2010). Voices of older baby boomer students: Supporting their transitions back into college. *Educational Gerontology* 36, 67-90.

- Schlossberg, N., Lynch, A., & Chickering, A. (1989). *Improving higher education environments for adults: Responsive programs and services for entry and departure*. Jossey-Bass.
- Schlossberg, N.K., Goodman, J., and Anderson, M.L. (2006), *Counseling Adults in Transition: Linking Practice with Theory*, 3rd edition, Springer Pub. Co, New York.
- Schreiner, L. (2000). *Career Quest: A validity study*. New Castle, PA: The Institute for Motivational Living.
- Schreiner, L.A. (2010). The “thriving quotient”: A new vision for student success. *About Campus*, 15(2), 2-10.
- Schreiner, L.A. (2013). Strengths-Based Advising. In J. 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.
- Schreiner, L.A., & Anderson, E.C. (2005). Strengths-based advising: A new lens for higher education. *NACADA Journal*, 25(2), 20-29.
- Schulenberg, J., & Lindhorst, M. (2008). Advising is advising: Toward defining the practice and scholarship of academic advising. *NACADA Journal*, 28(1), 43-53.
- Schulenberg, J., & Lindhorst, M. (2010). The historical foundation and scholarly future of academic advising. In P. Hagen, T. Kuhn, & G. Padak (Eds.), *Scholarly inquiry in academic advising* (Monograph No. 20) (pp. 17-28). National Academic Advising Association.
- Sinclair, U.B. (1976). *Goose-step: A study of American education*. New York: AMS Press. (Originally published 1923).
- Smith, J.A., Flowers, P., & Larkin, M. (2009). *Interpretive phenomenological analysis: theory, method and research*. Sage Publications
- Soria, K. M. (2012). Advising satisfaction: Implications for first-year students’ sense of belonging and student retention. *The Mentor: An Academic Advising Journal*.

- Steele, C.M., Spencer, S.J., & Lynch, M. (1993). Self-image and dissonance: The role of affirmational resources. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64*(6), 885-896.
- Strange C.C., & Banning, J.H. (2001). *Education by design*. Jossey-Bass.
- Strayhorn, T. L. (2008). Academic advising needs of high-achieving black collegians at predominantly white institutions: A mixed methods investigation. *The Mentor: An Academic Advising Journal, 1*(8).
- Sundberg, L. (1997). *Marketing analysis for the nontraditional student at Carl Sandburg Community College*. Galesburg, IL: Carl Sandburg Community College.
- Suvedi, M., Ghimire, R. P., Millenbah, K. F., & Shrestha, K. (2015). Undergraduate students' perceptions of academic advising. *NACTA Journal, 59*(3), 227-233.
- Sweet, S., Moen, P. (2007). Integrating educational careers in work and family. *Community, Work Family 10*(2), 231-250.
- Taylor, J.L. (2016). Reverse credit transfer policies and programs: Policy rationales, implementation, and implications. *Community College Journal of research and Practice, 40*, 1074-1090.
- Taylor, J.L., & Jain, D. (2017). The multiple dimensions of transfer: Examining the transfer function in American higher education. *Community College Review 45*(4), 273-293.
- The Chronical of Higher Education Almanac, (2019). The Chronicle.
- Thelin, J.R. (2004). *A history of American higher education*. The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition*. (2nd edition). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tovar, E., & Simon, M.A. (2006). Academic probation as a dangerous opportunity: Factors influencing diverse college students' success. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 30*(7), 547-564.

- Townsend, B.K. (1995). Community college transfer students: A case study of survival. *The Review of Higher Education*, 18(2), 175-193.
- Townsend, B.K. (2001). Redefining the community college transfer mission. *Community College Review*, 29(1), 29-42.
- Townsend, B.K. & Denver, J.T. (1999). What do we know about reverse transfer students? *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 106, 5-14.
- Townsend, B.K. & Wilson, K.B. (2006). "A hand hold for a little bit": Factors facilitating the success of community college transfer students to a large research university. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47(4), 439-456.
- Tracy, S. J. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight 'big-tent' criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(10), 837-851.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (2015–16). *National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS:16)*
<https://nces.ed.gov/DataLab/TablesLibrary/TableDetails/13174?pageNum=2&subjectId=6&topicId=19&rst=true>.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Fall Enrollment component final data (2003 - 2017) and provisional data (2019) <https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/TrendGenerator/app/answer/2/8>.
- Varney, J. (2012). Proactive (intrusive) advising. *Academic Advising Today*, 35(3), 1-3.
- Varney, J. (2013). Proactive Advising. In J. 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.
- Veblen, T. (1918). *The higher learning in America: A memorandum on the conduct of universities by business men*. New York: B.W. Huebsch.

- Vianden, J., & Barlow, P. J. (2015). Strengthen the bond: Relationships between academic advising quality and undergraduate student loyalty. *NACADA Journal*, 35(2), 15–27.
- Villella, E.F., Hu, M. (1991). A factor analysis of variables affecting the retention decision of nontraditional college students. *NASPA Journal* 28(4), 334-341.
- Vine, P. (1976). The social function of eighteenth-century higher education. *History of Education Quarterly*, 16(4), 409-424.
- Walker, R. V., Zelin, A. I., Behrman, C., & Strnad, R. (2017). Qualitative analysis of student perceptions: “Some advisors care. Some don't.”. *NACADA Journal*, 37(2), 44-54.
- Weathersby, R.P., Tarule, J.M. (1980). *Adult development: Implications for higher education*. Washington, American Association for Higher Education.
- Wheeler, H.A. (2012). Veterans’ transition to community college: A case study. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 36(10), 775-792.
- White, M.R., & Khakpour, P. (2006). The advent of academic advising in America at The Johns Hopkins University. *The Mentor*.
<https://journals.psu.edu/mentor/article/view/61624/61275>.
- Williamson, E.G. (1937). *Student personnel work: An outline of clinical procedures* (1st ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Winston, R.B., Jr., & Miller, T.K., Ender, S.C., & Grites, T.J. (Eds). (1984). *Developmental academic advising*. Jossey-Bass.
- Winston, R.B., Jr., & Sandor, J.A. (1984). *Evaluating academic advising*. Athens, GA: Student Development Associates.
- Yosso, T.J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education*, 8(1), 69-91.