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School background

- University of Guam
  - Open-admissions, semester-based
  - One associate, 34 bachelors, 15 masters level programs

- 2008 Fall Semester Student Enrollment
  - 3387 Students
    - 38% male, 62% female
    - 69% full-time, 31% part-time
    - Average age, undergraduates: 23
    - 3000 degree-seeking undergraduates
      - 597 incoming freshmen
    - 49.3% Pacific Islander, 41% Asian, 5.1% White/Non-Hispanic, 0.7% Black/African American, 0.9% Hispanic, 1.7% Other, 1.1% Non-Resident Alien, 0.2% Native American
College Success Skills

- College success course, required of all freshman
  - Two credit course
  - Topics include:
    - time management,
    - stress management,
    - critical thinking and decision – making,
    - preferred learning style,
    - test taking strategies,
    - library skills,
    - overcoming procrastination
  - For Research and Workbook groups:
    - factors to consider when choosing a college major/career path
• Can negative thinking be altered using standard tools and procedures based in cognitive information processing theory?
Instruments used

• Career Thoughts Inventory (CTI)
  • Decision Making Confusion
  • Commitment Anxiety
  • External Conflict

• Career Thoughts Inventory Workbook
  • Used to challenge and alter negative career thoughts

• Self-Directed Search
Three interventions

• Workbook Group (#1)
  • CTI pretest
  • Self-Directed Search
  • CTI workbook
  • CTI posttest
Three interventions

- Research Group (#2)
  - CTI pretest
  - Self-Directed Search
  - Class presentation
  - CTI posttest

- Control Group
  - CTI pretest
  - Regular class activities
  - CTI posttest
method

- UOG Students
  - 497 freshmen (2008)
  - 51% Pell Grant eligible
  - 41% first generation college students

- Study Participants
  - 128 of 270 students enrolled in college success course
  - 50 (39%) men and 78 (61%) women
### Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Group Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workbook group</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research group</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control group</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ethnicity

- **Asian**
  - Japanese
  - Chinese
  - Korean
  - Filipino

- **Pacific Islander**
  - Chamorro
  - Pacific Islander
  - Chuukese
  - Yappese

- **Other**
  - Caucasian
  - Indian
## Results – Total Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pretest $M$ ($SD$)</th>
<th>Posttest $M$ ($SD$)</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$d$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workbook (n = 39)</td>
<td>47.5 (25.5)</td>
<td>32.2 (22.3)</td>
<td>4.30*</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Rep (n = 50)</td>
<td>55.3 (21.0)</td>
<td>46.3 (23.0)</td>
<td>3.39*</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (n = 39)</td>
<td>58.0 (19.7)</td>
<td>55.6 (22.2)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results – Decision Making Confusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pretest $M$ ($SD$)</th>
<th>Posttest $M$ ($SD$)</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$d$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workbook (n = 39)</td>
<td>9.92 (7.55)</td>
<td>6.79 (6.63)</td>
<td>3.41*</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Rep (n = 50)</td>
<td>12.38 (7.33)</td>
<td>9.12 (6.87)</td>
<td>3.71*</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (n = 39)</td>
<td>11.95 (6.30)</td>
<td>12.41 (7.48)</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Results – Commitment Anxiety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pretest M (SD)</th>
<th>Posttest M (SD)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workbook (n = 39)</td>
<td>13.05 (6.45)</td>
<td>8.36 (5.81)</td>
<td>5.45*</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Rep (n = 50)</td>
<td>14.62 (5.52)</td>
<td>12.18 (5.71)</td>
<td>4.56*</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (n = 39)</td>
<td>16.54 (5.29)</td>
<td>15.67 (6.13)</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Results – External Conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pretest $M$ ($SD$)</th>
<th>Posttest $M$ ($SD$)</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$d$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workbook (n = 39)</td>
<td>4.26 (3.54)</td>
<td>3.51 (3.06)</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Rep (n = 50)</td>
<td>6.50 (2.85)</td>
<td>5.52 (3.36)</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (n = 39)</td>
<td>6.54 (3.48)</td>
<td>5.97 (3.51)</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
discussion

• Workbook and research interventions = significant impact
  • Workbook → CASVE cycle, readiness, some SK & OK
  • Research Group → SDS → SK & OK

• Observation 1: Workbook had direct effect on CTI
  • Total score
  • Decision Making Confusion
  • Commitment Anxiety
  • Not External Conflict
Discussion

- **Observation 2: SDS & Research had indirect effect on CTI**
  - Effort in career exploration lessened confusion
  - DMC and CA subscales

- **Observation 3: CTI sensitive to:**
  - Direct effects of cognitive reframing
  - Detecting changes in negative career thinking
  - Committing to a plan of action and choice implementation
  - Clarifying SK → OK linkages
limitations

• Cohort groups used = quasi–experimental design
  • Pre-post testing and use of pretest as covariate offset non-equivalence of groups

• Experimental mortality may have threatened internal validity
  • Believed to be no systematic differences among groups

• External validity–unique geographic location and student groups

• Possible experimenter bias
conclusion

• Power of cognitive information processing theory using CTI Workbook

• Power of effortful career exploration through career decision making activity

• Future research
Questions and Comments?

These presentation slides are available at

http://www.career.fsu.edu/techcenter/

Meagan Thrift: meagan.thrift@gmail.com
Julie Ulloa-Heath: julieuh@uguam.uog.edu