4-2013

What University Personnel Should Know: Students' Career Confidence, Help-Seeking Stigmas, and Perceptions of College Career Centers

Anna Woodruff
Illinois Wesleyan University

What University Personnel Should Know: Students' Career Confidence,

Help-Seeking Stigmas, and Perceptions of College Career Centers

Anna Woodruff

Research Honors Thesis

Spring 2013

Abstract

Career center professionals face many challenges in providing services to undergraduate students. For example, students may be unaware of offered services (Garner, Rintz, & Valle, 2011) and therefore underutilize available career center resources. This is a problem because today's society places high value on developing the skills necessary to be successful in employment (Garver, Spralls, & Divine, 2009). Perceived stigma related to seeking career help (Ludwikowski, Vogel, & Armstrong, 2009), low career decision self-efficacy (O'Brien, 2003), and other barriers (Shivy & Koehly, 2002) can prevent students from seeking career services. Two studies were conducted which focused on evaluating student perceptions of career center services. The first study was a survey study evaluating students' awareness and use of career center services, stigma related to career counseling, and career decision self-efficacy. The second study involved assessing students' evaluations of individual career center counseling and workshops. The results showed that women and upper division students reported more awareness and use of career center services than did men and first-year students. Gender and year in school, however, were not associated with differences in more general perceptions of career counseling (e.g., stigma, value). Students who attended career center events reported high levels of satisfaction, enhancement of self-efficacy, and intention to use career services in the future.

Students' Awareness, Perception of, and Intent to Use College Career Center Services

College career centers provide many resources to students that will help prepare them for entering either the workforce in today's highly competitive market or for the equally challenging entry into graduate school (Garver, Spralls, & Divine, 2009). The current research on college career centers, however, has shown that their services are underutilized (Brotheridge & Power, 2008). Previous studies show that several barriers exist that keep students from using the career center. Students may hold stigmas regarding seeking help (Ludwikowski, Vogel, & Armstrong, 2009), may receive career guidance from other sources (Osborn &LoFrisco, 2012), or have low career decision self-efficacy (e.g., O'Brien, 2003), all of which may prevent them from seeking career services. Further, college students may not be using the services because they have little awareness of what services are offered (Garner, Rintz, &Valle, 2011). Previous research suggests that career centers that engage the study body will have more students taking advantage of the center's resources and feeling more prepared for their futures (Di Fabio & Bernaud, 2007). A common problem area for campus career centers is how to tailor their programs to target audiences, whether that is by year in school, gender, or ethnicity (Rakes, 1994; Rochlen & Blazina, 2002; Carter et.al., 2003).

The two present studies reported were conducted to evaluate student perceptions of career counseling services on a liberal arts college campus. The first study was a questionnaire study measuring student awareness of career center services, stigmas surrounding seeking help at a career center, and perceptions of career self-efficacy. The second study evaluated student experiences directly after using a career center service. To provide the context for these studies, the following literature review will provide a general overview of career counseling, as well as a

review of research on use of career services on college campuses, barriers college students face in using career center services, and career decision self-efficacy.

Overview of Career Centers

History

Some version of career counseling has been present in American culture since around 1890 (Pope, 2000). The history of career counseling can be divided into six stages throughout the last century. From 1890-1919, career counseling was described as "vocational guidance" and emerged as a professional occupation that aided people in escaping poverty and finding job placements. Career counselors utilized newly developed psychological tests as well as occupational assessment questionnaires. The second stage was from 1920-1939, when career counselors were placed in high schools for the first time to help develop students' job aspirations. In the third stage from 1940-1959, career counselors made the transition towards helping collegiate students as well. In the fourth period, from 1960-1979, career counselors helped American citizens with their career development in after new federal legislation was enacted. This included the Economic Opportunity Act, which created new job opportunities (e.g., Job Corps, Youth Opportunity Centers). The fifth stage was from 1980-1989, which saw the development of career counseling as a private practice because society valued career transitions more than ever before. The final stage from 1990 to the present, has focused on the finer details of preparing college graduates for the shift from academia into careers and the challenges on the psyche that shift entails. This stage has also focused more on specialty counseling (e.g., multicultural clients, minority clients, disabled clients) and the use of more sophisticated technology (Pope, 2000). In line with this stage, the current study provides a detailed view of

college student perceptions of current campus career services as well as insights into relevant

psychological factors such as help-seeking stigmas and career decision self-efficacy.

Campus Career Center Services

Career center staff on college campuses must focus their time and energy on creating and

executing a variety of services that are suitable for different students. The types of services may

differ based upon the overall organization of the center. Career centers can be classified as either

"centralized" or "decentralized." Centralized programs tend to operate at smaller institutions and

provide a general curriculum to all students, regardless of major or year in school. Decentralized

programs are typically found at large universities and the programs are split by academic

departments so the services are tailored to different majors (Schaub, 2012). Regardless of

centralized or decentralized organization, most career centers provide at least three general types

of services: career counseling, job search services, and event programming (Sutton & Gifford,

2011).

Career counseling. Students can make individual career counseling appointments with

career center staff to address concerns such as academic major indecision, anxiety surrounding

career options, or job search assistance (Schaub, 2012; Sutton & Gifford, 2011). Group

counseling is also provided by some career centers, which allows students to express their

feelings and obtain feedback from peers. Other career counseling services include "drop-in"

hours where students can ask for quick assistance (e.g., reviewing a resume; job application).

Students can also take career related assessment tests to learn which occupations they may be

well-suited, what career steps to take next, or about their personality type (Sutton & Gifford,

2011). For example, the Myers Briggs Type Indicator helps identify which of 16 personality

types best describe a student (Martin, 2011), providing information on how the student prefers

to focus their motivation, make decisions, and interact with the professional world. Individual counseling, group counseling, drop-in hours, and assessments can all help the career center staff identify the student's career related strengths and weaknesses as well as how to proceed effectively (Schaub, 2012).

Job search services. Career centers are frequently the liaison between potential employers and students, providing job search services that are vital to students in today's competitive world (Schaub, 2012). Job search services can include on-campus job fairs or interviews. These are opportunities brought to the campus for students to form networking connections, distribute resumes, and potentially acquire position in careers or internships.

Event programming. Career centers also frequently arrange event programming. Events often include workshops and seminars focused on improving interpersonal skills and preparing students for interacting with professionals (Schaub, 2012). Other examples of career center events include practice interviews and etiquette lessons for business dinners. Developing short evaluations of services can be very helpful to improve event programming, as well for recording demographics and number of students in attendance (Rakes, 1994).

Campus career centers must assess for what career assistance their students need and benefit from (Brotheridge & Power, 2008). Career counseling can be effective for students, and there are different ways for student to be successful. Studies showed that students perceived the most successful outcomes from attending individual career counseling instead of group counseling (Fouad et al., 2006), receiving handouts with career related information, and participating in career-related workshops (Rakes, 1994).

In collaboration with career center staff, Study 1 was designed to assess (a) awareness and usage of individual counseling, resume assistance, and other career services, and (b) if levels

of usage correlated with stigmas and overall perceived value of the career counseling. Study 2 was also designed with career center staff collaboration, and investigated student evaluations of actual career center services on a liberal arts campus.

Awareness and Utilization of Career Center Services

The largest hurdles for college career centers include capturing student interest and achieving satisfactory attendance (Garner, Rintz, & Valle, 2011). The resulting underutilization can be due to students' lack of awareness of services or negative perceptions of career centers. Thus, career center staff requires a better understanding of the limited awareness and perceptions of the career center so that the services may be strengthened.

Awareness of career center services has been studied, and the results show that awareness of services and events is low and usage is even lower. Previous studies have shown that out of graduating seniors, only 8.4% of them had accessed the career center for any help regarding post-grad plans (Garner, Rintz, & Valle, 2011). For example, Fouad et.al. (2006) electronically distributed career center surveys to undergraduate students, and received 694 responses out of 2,400 students at a large, Midwestern university. The results showed that while 51.2% of the respondents were aware of the career center, only 6.3% of students had ever used individual career counseling. Closer to two-thirds of the respondents were aware that the career center hosted career fairs, yet only 13.1% had attended. Students were even less aware of the career center's website (32.3%), the workshops put on by the center (35.5%), and resume assistance (30.2%). Again, less than 10% of students had previously used any of these services.

One major resource many students access is online information. Social media giant Facebook reaches over 901 million users monthly and many additional users may be reached on sites like Twitter and LinkedIn. A study by Osborn and LoFrisco (2012) investigated career

center usage of technology. Results found that 96% of 171 career centers surveyed reported they have social media sites providing information to their college campus. Of those online career centers, 90% of them posted on their Facebook or Twitter account at least one or two times weekly. One major benefit of social media is increased visibility of career center services, which will ideally lead to increased attendance at events or services. The biggest drawback reported to using social media was the effort and time required to update the web pages. Centers that tap into virtual audiences may perceive positive effects in attendance of events, as well as increased visibility to many students who are already actively using the websites.

Gender also affects awareness and use of career centers. Males are less likely to know about or use career center services (Di Fabio & Bernaud, 2007, Rochlen & Blazina, 2002). Females have also been found to visit the career center an average of seven times more than males (Junn, Fuller, & Derrell, 1996). When the counselor was relatable, open, and time efficient, however, male students are more likely to use their campus's career center (Di Fabio & Bernaud, 2007). In one study, male students were asked to read career related brochures and undergo assessment to see if there were any improvements in their awareness of the career center (Rochlen & Blazina, 2002). There were improvements of men's attitudes toward the career center, which may indicate that additional knowledge is an important variable to increase career center usage. Due to the possible differences of utilization of campus career center services from prior research by gender, I decided to investigate gender in the current study.

Differences in ethnicities also may be correlated with differences in awareness and usage of career center services. Carter et al. (2003) found that all ethnicities cited academic major and career exploration most frequently as causes for coming to the career center (79.4 % and 13.3% respectively); however, Caucasian students were more willing than the other ethnicities to seek

career services and also discuss other psychological issues. Asian, Black, and Hispanic students were more likely to use the career center for only career-related issues. With respect to actual use, Black students attended only one career counseling session, Asian and Hispanic students were more likely to attend two to nine sessions, and Caucasian students attended more than ten appointments (Carter et al., 2003), which emphasize the gap of utilization among different ethnicities.

Gloria and Hird (1999) argued that career centers may not be aware of different ethnicities' cultural values. Ethnic minority students perceive career opportunities differently than non-minorities, because despite expressing the same career aspirations as non-minorities, career fields do not have equal distributions of races (Flores & Heppner, 2002; Fouad & Byars-Winston, 2005). Further, ethnic minority students have reported a higher racial identity than Caucasian students (Gloria & Hird, 1999). Because strong racial identity may affect how ethnic minorities approach careers and career aspirations, career programs need to be tailored in a way that incorporates their identity more. When a university's ethnic minority population does not feel that the career center is useful or attuned to their cultural preferences, they will be less likely to attend services and other programming. Staff from career centers should be aware of ethnic differences of their students, as this may consequently affect the utilization, and consequently the center's approach to reach all ethnicities. Due to the possible differences of career service utilization by ethnicity, I decided to investigate ethnicity in the current study.

Barriers to Seeking Career Counseling Services

Despite a student's knowledge and awareness of services provided by their campus career center, many students are still reluctant to actually *go* to the career center for the services. Barriers include low or mismatched expectations of career centers, holding stigmas regarding

seeking career counseling services, and receiving career guidance from other sources (Di Fabio &Bernaud, 2007; Gloria &Hird, 1999; Ludwikowski, Vogel, & Armstrong, 2009; Osborn & LoFrisco, 2012).

Unclear Expectations

Students' expectations and perceptions for career counseling may be influenced by several factors. Students may not know what to expect at their career counseling sessions, and the fear of the unknown is a barrier. Further, career centers may be programming their events in irrelevant ways, which will create negative perceptions of the events.

Students often are unsure about what goes on at a career counseling session. A study by Fouad et al. (2006) identified that 694 undergraduate students found two significant reasons for not using the career center: (a) uncertainty about the career counseling process (13%) and (b) not thinking that the services would be helpful (6%). Shivy et al. (2002) investigated hypothetical preferences of students and found that they would strongly prefer career counselors who were direct and developed a strong student-counselor relationship. Students also reported that three sessions of career counseling sounded ideal. At these sessions, students would prefer to discuss specific careers and receive advice and opinions from the career counselors, as well as taking some career tests to guide them on where to go next on their career path. Students felt that the ideal use of career assistance scenarios would culminate in direct interaction with employed individuals (through internships, job shadowing, and career fairs). Career centers that are able to fulfill these tentative student expectations may be more successful on campus.

Students typically attend services that show the most practicality and relevance to their life at the present moment (Rakes, 1994). Making titles of programs related to the real world can encourage attendance. For example, "Improving Your Self-Presentation Skills" may attract fewer

participants than revising the title to "Interviewing for Introverts" (Rakes, 1994). Career center staff needs to be familiar with their student body so that programs can fit into campus culture without making students feel uncomfortable about the event. This familiarity can be a way for career services to improve how they can appeal to more students. Study 1 was designed to increase understanding of campus culture regarding the reputation of the campus career center and types of perceived barriers. Study 2 investigated the aspects of career services that students found most and least useful, as well as any future services students intended to seek.

Stigmas Regarding Seeking Career Help

Students may hold stigmas that make seeking help a challenge (Ludwikowski, Vogel, & Armstrong, 2009; Rochlen, Mohr, & Hargrove, 1999). Stigmas can appear in different forms, including public and self-stigma. Public stigma is defined as "the perception held by *society* than an individual is socially unacceptable and often leads to negative reactions towards them" (Vogel, Wade, & Haake, 2006, p. 325). Self-stigma is defined as "the perception held by *the individual* that he or she is personally unacceptable by seeking help" (Ludwikowski, Vogel, & Armstrong, 2009, p. 409). These two barriers have been identified as significant reasons preventing individuals from seeking help (Vogel, Wade, & Haake, 2006). Stigmas can shape negative attitudes towards seeking career services, which can lead to decreased use of career centers. Ludwikowski, Vogel, and Armstrong (2009) found that public and self-stigma had a moderate, positive correlation with each other ($r = .404$). On campuses with high levels of stigma, interventions focusing on enhancing group perceptions of help-seeking behavior may decrease public stigma, and interventions focusing on individual's awareness and values may decrease self-stigma (Ludwikowski, Vogel, & Armstrong, 2009). Career centers need to evaluate student stigmas, because the higher the stigma, the less positive attitudes are about seeking help and

utilization decreases (Vogel, Wade, & Haake, 2006). Stigma barriers are difficult for a career center to be aware of without formal research. The current study assessed collegians' career stigmas in order to replicate prior findings and provide the career center staff with information of how the student body perceived the career counseling.

Use of Alternative Resources

Some students do not use career center services because they have found career guidance from other places (Komiya, Good, & Sherrod, 2000). Fouad et al. (2006) found that their sample of 694 students discussed career concerns with parents (17%), friends (17%), other family/significant others (16%), academic advisors (16%), and professors (11%). Some of those participants also reported that while they had used the career centers, they still maintained influential additional resources. Career centers may find it beneficial to identify who is providing any career related information to students, because it may identify where the career center is weaker than outside resources (Rakes, 1994). Given this, Study 1 included questions assessing the degree to which students seek advice from additional informal (e.g., friends) and formal (e.g., books) sources.

Career Decision Self Efficacy

A common problem area for campus career centers is how to tailor their programs to target audiences, whether that is by year in school, gender, or ethnicity (Rakes, 1994; Rochlen & Blazina, 2002; Carter et al., 2003). Peterson (1993) argued that assessing career decision self-efficacy is a strong way for career centers to gauge starting points for where to begin students' career counseling programs.

Career Decision Self-Efficacy (CDSE) refers to a sense of self-efficacy related to career choices. Albert Bandura coined the term of self-efficacy and defined it as the confidence in one's

abilities to create and carry out a course of action (O'Brien, 2003). Thus, self-efficacy relates to perceived expectations of one's ability to perform specific goal-driven behaviors. According to self-efficacy theory, having confidence in both one's abilities and being able to reasonably predict the outcomes of behaviors will lead to more confidently made goals. So in relation to careers, CDSE is the confidence in oneself to create and follow a strategy that will get one close towards one's career goal. This suggests that when students have higher CDSE, they will be more confident with making career decisions, have stronger career related goals, and engage in active behaviors (Betz & Klein Voyten, 1997). For instance, a student with high CDSE would be able to find resources on internships, organize next steps to find and apply for internship, and successfully reach the end goal of securing an internship.

Bullock-Yowell, Andrews, and Buzzetta (2011) found there is a relationship between career decision-making self-efficacy and dysfunctional career thinking, such that collegiate students that felt negatively about occupation-related concepts have shown a lower career decision self-efficacy. The authors argued that without a satisfactory level of career-decision self-efficacy, students will struggle with developing skills, attaining employment knowledge and aspirations, and the confidence to meet career goals.

In addition, CDSE can be considered an important outcome indicator of effective career center services. Betz, Klein, and Taylor (1996) developed the Career Decision Self-Efficacy scale-Short Form (CDSESSF) which is a 25-question self-report questionnaire. The CDSESSF has been used extensively in research on the impact of college career services (Bullock-Yowell, Andrews, & Buzzetta, 2010; Peterson, 1993; Reese and Miller, 2006). Reese and Miller (2006) studied how a college course focused on solely exploring careers can increase creating academic goals and planning strategies, and increase skills needed for gaining occupational information

and career problem-solving. Results showed that pretest-to-posttest students did make a statistically significant reduction in perceived career decision difficulties, and an increase in CDSE. This demonstrates how the CDSESSF can be utilized to show confidence development. It is also important for students to be aware of their own career self-efficacy, because it can encourage them to use career centers to gain more career related confidence. For the current study, researchers investigated how prepared students felt in regards to their future career related decisions by measuring career decision self- efficacy in two ways. Study 1 measured general levels of career confidence, and Study 2 measured perceived changes in career self-efficacy due to usage of career center services.

The Current Studies

As indicated earlier, two studies were conducted to investigate general student perceptions of career counseling, as well as specific utilization of the campus career center. The first study was a survey study evaluating students' awareness and use of career center services, stigma related to career counseling, and career decision self-efficacy. The second study involved assessing students' evaluations of individual career center counseling and workshops. Both studies were conducted in collaboration with career center staff at a highly selective, liberal arts university in the Midwest. The local career center has three full time professional staff who offer a variety of services including individual career counseling, group services (e.g., speakers, seminars, career fairs), and drop in hours. Career center staff served as consultants for selecting and developing measures for both studies. They also collected data for Study 2.

Study 1- General Perceptions of Career Counseling and

Perceptions of Local Career Center Services

The goal of Study 1 was to investigate the student body's general perceptions of career counseling and the more specific perceptions of the local campus career center. There were three areas of analyses for this study: (a) correlational analysis, (b) hypothesis driven analyses of group differences, and (c) exploratory individual item analysis. Prior research had investigated the relationship between how society views seeking career-related help and how an individual views seeking career-related help, or public stigma and personal stigma (Vogel, Wade, & Haake, 2006). Thus, a primary goal was to replicate Di Fabio and Bernard's (2008) findings of a positive correlation between the two types of stigma and a negative relationship between stigma and value placed on career counseling.

Additional correlational analyses assessed whether stigmas and value related to career counseling were associated with usage of campus career center services. Demographic characteristics—gender, year in school, and ethnicity—were also used to identify potential group differences in stigma, value, and use. I hypothesized that women would perceive career center services more positively than men (e.g., less stigma, greater usage, fewer barriers). I also hypothesized that upper division students (sophomores, juniors, and seniors) would rate the career center more positively than first-year students. Additionally, I expected to see differences in use between Caucasian students and ethnic minority students, such that Caucasian students would report more use of career services. Finally, I planned analyses to evaluate the responses to individual item scales to identify which specific items were most and least frequently reported (e.g., types of announcements, advice resources).

Participants

Participants were 240 undergraduates from General Psychology classes at a four-year liberal arts university in the Midwest. All students participated in exchange for course credit. There were roughly equal percentages of males (44.2%, n =106) and females (55.8%, n =134). The majority of the sample were first year students ($n = 164$), with far fewer sophomores ($n = 47$), juniors ($n = 12$), and seniors ($n = 17$). Further, the majority of the sample were Caucasian ($n = 126$), with far fewer Asian American ($n = 22$), African American ($n = 19$), Hispanic ($n = 18$), or Undeclared Race ($n = 66$) participants.

There were originally 247 participants, but 7 participants were dropped because they did not fully complete the questionnaires. Because of the relatively low number of students in any one minority group, participants were classified as either Caucasian ($N = 126$) or MALANA ($N = 59$; Multi-Racial, African-American, Latino-American, Asian-American, and Native American students, with 66 participants dropped who either did not clearly identify their ethnicity or identified Caucasian and one other ethnicity).

In order to create similar size groups for analyses involving year in school, the first year students were divided by semester to form two groups ($N = 90$ fall semester, $N = 74$ spring semester) and the other three years were combined ($N = 76$). Detailed demographic data for the modified groups and other variables can be found in Table 1.

Procedures

The students completed the study as part of departmental mass testing opportunities for General Psychology students conducted at the beginning of each semester (fall, spring). Students were not aware that the survey would be focused on the career center when they signed up to participate. This was done to minimize selection bias. The surveys were completed

anonymously and administered through an online data collection website, *Psychdata.com*. The

surveys took on average ten minutes to complete.

Measures

Participants completed eight questionnaires, which were presented in three different

orders to help control for potential carry-over effects. See Appendix for all measures.

Scales Related to General Perceptions of Career Counseling. Four questionnaires

assessed students' perceptions of career counseling in general

Self-Stigma Scale. The *Self-Stigma of Seeking Help Scale Help* (Vogel, Wade, & Haake,

2006) was used in adapted form (Ludwikowski, Vogel, & Armstrong, 2009) to assess self-stigma

for career counseling. Specifically, the scale was used to assess the stigma an individual may

place on him or herself for seeking help regarding career counseling. Ludwikowski et al. (2009)

adapted Vogel's original scale (2006) by including 10 of the 28 original items, and changing

"therapist" to "career counselor" (e.g., "If I went to a career counselor, I would be less satisfied

with myself"). Participants responded on a scale of 1= strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree.

The adapted scale had a reported internal consistency of α= .89 (Ludwikowski, Vogel, &

Armstrong, 2009), and this study sample also found α=.89.

Public Stigma Scale. The *Stigma Scale for Receiving Psychological Help* (Komiya,

Good, & Sherrod, 2000) was used in adapted form (Ludwikowski, Vogel, & Armstrong, 2009) to

assess public stigma for career counseling. The scale assessed student perceptions of stigma on

the college campus related to seeking career counseling (e.g., "It is advisable for a student to

hide from people that he/she has seen a career counselor"). The scale had four items instead of

the original five items, due to administrative error. It was measured on a scale of 1= strongly

disagree to 4= strongly agree. It had acceptable internal consistency in both the original study, α= .72 (Komiya, Good, & Sherrod, 2000), and the current study, α=.82.

Attitudes Towards Career Counseling (ATCC) Subscale. This scale measured the perceived value of career counseling, and was a subset of items from the *Attitudes Towards Career Counseling Scale* (Rochlen, Mohr, & Hargrove, 1999). The scale for this study was modified from the original to include only four of the original ten items which focused on how valuable participants perceive career counseling to be (e.g., "If a career related dilemma arose for me, I would be pleased to know that career counseling services are available"). The scale ranged from 1=disagree to 4=agree. The original scale had a reported α=.80, and *r*=.80 for test-retest reliability (Rochlen, Mohr, & Hargrove, 1999). Internal consistency was adequate for the current study, α=.86.

Career Decision Self-Efficacy Scale (CDSE). The CDSE scale (O'Brien, 2003) consists of 25 Likert items used to assess confidence in making career-related decisions and partaking in activities related to making career decisions (e.g., "Choose a major or career that will fit your interests," and "Successfully manage the job interview process"). Anchors for the items were 1=no confidence at all to 5=complete confidence. It had a reliability estimate of α=.94 in both Betz and Taylor (2000) and this current study.

Perceptions of the Local Campus Career Center Questionnaire. Another five short questionnaires assessed students' evaluations of specific career center services on their campus. This questionnaire was developed specifically for this study based on (a) items asked in prior research on career center services and assessment strategies (Shivy & Koehly, 2002; Fouad et al., 2006) as well as (b) consultation with local campus career center staff. The scale was used to gather information about what type of campus career center announcements students saw

most/least, awareness and use of specific campus career center services, what outside resources students went to for career advice, and the overall reputation students of the career center.

Announcements Subscale. Likert items assessed the degree to which students heard about career center events from seven different sources (e.g., Facebook, posters). For each announcement type, anchors spanned from 1= not at all to 5=very frequently. The scale had a reliability estimate of α=.80.

Awareness and Use Subscale. Eight Likert items assessed student use of specific services (e.g., resume help, practice interviews), with anchors of 1= not aware & not used, 2= aware, but not used, 3= used once, 4= used more than once. This scale had a reliability estimate of α=.91.

Barriers Subscales. Thirteen Likert items assessed the degree to which students felt specific barriers were reasons for their reluctance to use the career center. These included feelings of anxiety around seeking help, time considerations, and lack of need for the services. Scale anchors for all items ranged from 1=not at all to 7=very frequently. Based on exploratory factor and reliability analyses, the items were grouped into two subscales with acceptable, if somewhat low, reliabilities: *Negative Expectations* (α=.75) and *Low Priority to Seek Help* (α=.76). The *Negative Expectations* subscale had five items and measured the degree to which students felt that the campus career center was a negative experience, either from friends or personal experience (e.g., "Seeking counseling is portrayed in society as negative"). The *Low Priority to Seek Help* subscale had five items and assessed students' perceptions that they did not have enough need for career services to make seeking help a priority (e.g.,, "Other commitments have higher priority").

Career Advice Subscales. Seven Likert items were used to tap what sources students used to gain career guidance. Scale anchors for all items ranged 1=not at all to 5= very frequently. Based on exploratory factor and reliability analyses, the items were grouped into two subscales with acceptable, if somewhat low, reliabilities: *Informal Sources*, which had acceptable reliability (α=.76), and *Formal Source*, which had marginal reliability (α=.69). The *Informal Sources* subscale had three items and measured the frequency students sought advice from classmates, close friends, and family. The *Formal Sources* subscale had four items and measured the frequency students sought advice from professors, the campus career center, books, and websites.

Reputation of the Career Center Scale. A single item was used to assess students' overall perception of the campus career center. Students were asked "What kind of overall reputation does the IWU Career center have among students?" The anchors were 0= extremely negative, and 11= extremely positive.

Results

Correlational Analyses: General Perceptions and Local Career Center Perceptions. Three sets of correlational analyses were conducted to investigate associations between the scales completed for Study 1. The first analyses investigated correlations among the General Perception scales: public stigma, self- stigma, value of career counseling, and career decision self-efficacy. The second analysis investigated correlations between the General Perception scales and the Local Career Services scales. The third analysis investigated correlations among the Local Career Services scales: announcements, awareness/use, career advices, and barriers to using local career centers.

Results from the first set of analyses (General Perceptions scales with one another) replicated prior research on stigma (public and self) and value of career counseling (ATCC). For all correlations and significance levels, see top left quadrant of Table 2.Self-stigma was significantly and positively correlated with public stigma, r = .40, $p < .05$. Stigmas (self$_1$ and public$_2$) were negatively correlated with the perceived value of career services (r$_1$ = -.48, r$_2$ = -.27, both $p < .05$).

Results from the second set of analyses (General Perceptions correlations with Local Career Services scales) showed several significant correlations (see lower quadrant on the left of Table 2). One apparent pattern was that Barriers (from Local Career Services scales) correlated most frequently and strongly with the four General Perception scales, such that Barriers (Negative Expectations and Low Priority) were positively correlated with stigmas ($r = .17$ to .51, $p < .01$), but negatively correlated with values (r's = -.34 to -.39, $p < .01$), and self-efficacy ($r =$ -.133, $p < .05$). In other words, students who reported higher stigmas and lower value of the career counseling tended to perceive increased levels of specific barriers to using career enter services on their college campus. The second major pattern involved a series of correlations with CDSE. Students who reported increased levels of seeking career advice had higher CDSE although these correlations were relatively small (r's = .13-.25).

Results from the third set of analyses (Local Career Services scales with one another) identified three patterns (see lower right quadrant of Table 2). To begin, Advice-Formal Sources was positively correlated with three of the other scales (Announcements, Awareness/Use, and Informal Sources) with correlations ranging from $r = .27$ to .43, $p < .05$. This suggests that students who sought out professional advice resources tended to also be aware of and use career center services and other resources for career guidance. Next, there was a moderate positive

correlation between awareness of Announcements and Awareness/Use of career center services, $r = .46$, $p < .05$, indicating that students who reported viewing more announcements were more likely to use career center services. Lastly, Barriers-Negative Expectations correlated strongly with Barriers-Low Priority, $r = .50$, $p < .01$, which makes sense because the two subscales came from the same original scale. One interesting finding was that neither Barrier subscale had any significant correlation to Awareness/Use, which indicates that underutilization of the career center was not associated with student reports of increased barriers.

Group Differences: Gender, Semester, and Ethnicity Effects. Sample size was insufficient to analyze effects of gender, year in school, and ethnicity in one 2 x 2 x 3 factorial ANOVA (cell sizes were under 15). Due to this, gender and ethnicity were analyzed separately, with year in school included in each analysis to identify any potential interactions while controlling for unequal distribution of genders (or ethnicity) across year in school.

A series of eleven 2 (Gender) x 3 (Year in school) ANOVAs were conducted to compare the effect of gender and year in school on the four general perception scale scores and the seven local career center subscales. With only one exception the interaction effects were not significant. Therefore, the main effects for gender and year in school will be presented first.

Gender. There were no significant main effects for gender on general perceptions of career counseling (see top half of Table 3), but there were main effects of gender on four of the seven Local Career Service scales: Announcements, Awareness/Use, Advice- Formal Sources, and Reputation (see bottom half of Table 3 for M, SD's, and F statistics). Women were significantly more likely to see announcements, use services, seek formal advice, and to perceive the career center as having a better reputation than men were. In contrast, there was no evidence that women and men differed on seeking informal advice or reported barriers.

Year in School. Similarly to gender, there were no significant main effects of year in school on any of the general perception scales: public stigma, self-stigma, values, and self-efficacy (see top half of Table 4). However, there were main effects of year in school for four of the seven Local Career Service scales: Announcements, Awareness/Use, Advice- Formal Sources, and Barriers- Low Priority (see bottom half of Table 4 for M, SD's, and F statistics). Tukey b *post hoc* analyses for all of these main effects indicated that, in comparison to upper division students, both semesters of first year students were significantly <u>less</u> likely to see announcements, be aware of/use the career center services, seek formal advice, and report barriers of low priority. In contrast, no significant differences by year in school were found for seeking informal career advice or perceiving Negative Expectations barriers.

The Career Center Reputation scale was the only scale from the series of eleven ANOVAs to produce an interaction effect between year in school and gender, $F(2, 233) = .033, p < .05$, signifying that men and women's perception of the career center's reputation differed based on year in school. In lieu of *post hoc* analyses, the interaction will be described: in the fall semester of their first-year, Women ($M= 8.40, SD=1.82$) rated the career center more positively than Men ($M=7.71, SD=1.68$). This pattern persisted in the spring semester of their first year (Women: $M= 8.80, SD= 1.98$; Men: $M=7.45, SD=1.62$). However, among upper division students, Women ($M=8.07, SD= 1.66$) rated the career center less positively than Men ($M=8.24, SD=1.76$), although means of reputation were still high.

Ethnicity. I ran a parallel series of eleven univariate of 2 (ethnicity) x 3(year in school) ANOVAs for all general perception and local service scales. There were no significant findings involving ethnicity. Thus, no evidence of differences between Caucasian and MALANA students were evident on any of the general or local scales.

Individual Item Analyses: Local Career Center Scales. Because item-level responses have practical implications for career center functioning, descriptive analyses were conducted of individual items. For clarity, individual item results are presented at the level of only the overall mean. Where gender or year in school differences had potentially meaningful implications, those are highlighted for the reader.

Announcements. Students reported fairly low awareness of career center announcements (M=1.18 to 2.92 on the 5 point scale; See Table 5). Emails (M= 2.92, SD= 1.26) and posters (M = 2.91, SD = 1.22) were the most frequently seen announcements, but they were still only "sometimes" seen. Conversely, social media announcements on Facebook (M = 1.50, SD = .97) and Twitter (M = 1.18, SD = .58) were the least frequently seen announcement types. Interested readers are referred to supplementary Table A-1 in the Appendix for item analyses by year in school.

Awareness and Use. Items were analyzed as the percent of students that were (a) *not aware* of a career service at all, (b) *aware* of the service but had not used it, (c) or had *used* the service (see Table 6). The results showed that a substantial proportion of students (25%-45%) were unaware of specific services. Consistent with previous research (e.g., Fouad et al., 2006) proportions of students who were aware of services substantially exceeded the percentage of students who had used services. More specifically, while 40%- 60% of students had awareness of the specific career center services, proportions who had actually used specific services ranged from only 3% to 22%. For example, around 60% of the respondents were aware of both mock interview services and career fairs, yet fewer than 15% of students had used either service. Speakers/workshops (22.1%), internship search assistance (15.4%), and job/internship fair

preparation (15.0%) had been used by the greatest proportion of students. Graduate school advising (2.9%) was the least used service in this sample.

It should be noted that upper division students were more aware of services and had used them far more than first years, which is probably not surprising due to first year students' limited time on campus. First year students' utilization percentages (ranging from 1-15%) are compared to upper division use percentages (from 7-38%) in the last column of Table 6. The reader is referred to supplementary Table A-2 in the Appendix for an even more detailed item analyses by year for school.

Career Advice Subscales. As shown in Table 7, the most frequently used resources for advice about careers were family, close friends, and classmates. The means of these top resources (M's = 2.68 to 3.84) correspond to being used "sometimes"; thus, there were no sources participants sought out with means of "frequently" or "very frequently." The least used resource was the career center (M = 1.73 or "not often"). Of note, the frequency of seeking advice via the career center was the lowest resource for both upper division (*M*= 1.91, *SD*= .96) and 1st year students (*M*= 1.65, *SD*=.96), while family was the most frequently used resource for both upper division students (*M*=3.75, *SD*= 1.00) and 1st year students (*M*= 3.88, *SD*= 1.09). See supplementary Table A-3 in the Appendix for resources used by year.

Barriers. For ease of understanding, the twelve possible barriers have been grouped into three groups; highest perceived barriers, moderately perceived barriers, and least perceived barriers (Table 8). The highest perceived barriers reflect low priority of seeking career center services, including being too busy to seek services, no need for services, and that advice was available elsewhere (M = 2.28 to 3.04). The least reported barriers reflect very low levels of negative reactions such as feeling that counseling is portrayed in society as negative, personal

experiencing a negative situation at the career center, and hearing of others' negative career center experiences (M = 1.20 to 1.57). Follow up analyses by year in school suggested that first year and upper division students had similar ratings of barriers, with most reported barriers centered on the fact that seeking services was a low priority. Interested readers are referred to Table A-4 in the Appendix.

Discussion of Study 1

The goals of Study 1 were to investigate the student body's general perceptions of career counseling and their specific perceptions of the local campus career center. Hypotheses and exploratory analyses focused on (a) correlational analysis, (b) hypothesis driven analyses of group differences, and (c) exploratory individual item analysis.

Stigmas, Values, and Use. As hypothesized based on prior research, there was a positive correlation between public and self-stigma, such that presence of public stigma was associated with presence of self-stigma (Ludwikowski et al., 2009). Results were also consistent with past studies on the association between stigmas and the perceived value of career counseling, such that the presence of stigma would be associated with less value of career counseling (Di Fabio & Bernard, 2008). However, overall reports of stigmas perceived by students were very low; suggesting that liberal arts students neither feel substantial personal stigma nor that campus society negatively judged students who partake in career services.

The exploratory correlations between levels of stigmas and patterns of use tended to be low and not significant. This could be because stigma is, in reality, not associated with usage of a campus career center. There was, however, restriction of range on both stigma variables and the awareness/use scales (relatively low scores on all three measures). Because restriction of range is known to attenuate correlations, there could have been associations that could not be detected in

the current study. Regardless, given the low levels of public and self-stigmas, a focus on identifying specific barriers may be more effective than asking about general stigmas.

Gender, Year in School, and Ethnicity effects. Interestingly, there was no evidence that general perceptions of career counseling (e.g., stigmas, values, CDSE) differ by gender, year in school, or ethnicity. The finding of similar general perceptions is encouraging, because it indicates that all students felt positively toward the possibility of seeking career related help, with all groups reporting low levels of stigma, moderate value of career counseling, and moderate to high levels of career decision self-efficacy. There were group differences in perceptions of the local career center. Women were more engaged and receptive than men toward frequency of seeing announcements, using the career center, reputation of the career center, and perceiving fewer barriers to seeking help. Even when there were differences between genders however, the group means were still within similar ranges. For example, women were never on the high extreme of ratings while men were at the very negative extreme, which would have indicated a pervasive trend that would require more immediate attention from career staff. Instead, differences between genders were small enough to consider, but may not warrant major changes in career center programming strategy. Minor adjustments, such as targeting men through career center brochures (Rochlen & Blazina, 2002) may be worth considering.

There were also differences in perceptions of the local career center services based on year in school. As expected, there were differences in use, frequency of announcements, and use of formal advice resources with older students reporting higher scores than first years. It seems developmentally appropriate because upper division students should be putting more consideration into their future plans than first year students. Upper division students also reported significantly more "low priority" barriers to the career center than did first year

students. This could indicate that upper division students may be cognizant that they *should* be seeking career services, but that other demands are given higher priority.

There was no evidence of any differences on any scales between Caucasian students and minority students. However, the conclusion that on the campus there are no ethnicity differences in perceptions of career services would be premature. Given the relatively low numbers of students that self identified as an ethnic minority, MALANA participants were combined into one group, which were unequal proportions of African American, Hispanic, and Asian American students. From the prior literature, African American students reported substantially lower use of the career services than Hispanic and Asian American students (Fouad et al., 2006). Thus, possible differences in perception career center services may have been masked in the current analyses since they were not conducted by individual minority groups.

Descriptive Analyses of Individual Items. Results from descriptive analyses for the individual items were in line with prior literature. Announcement styles that are easily viewed without extra effort on the part of students may be seen more frequently (Rakes, 1994). The current study supported this, because the more effective announcements were posters and emails delivered from the career center. Granted, the frequency with which these announcements were seen was not high, but they were still the most reported. With these announcements, students do not have to go out of their way to discover information from the career center because the information is presented to them publicly. Public announcements may also help to dispel stigmas because the public display makes the career services seem open to all in an encouraging way. Unfortunately, career announcements in the campus newspaper and social media were not very successful. A career center could decide to increase their efforts in these areas to increase amount of viewing, or decide to reallocate their time and efforts away from social media outlets. More

time could be spent developing even more sophisticated posters and emails due to their higher success. However, social media is an enticing area because the vast majority of students have personal social media webpages.

Prior research on awareness and use levels showed that while up to two-thirds of students are aware of services offered, but less than 15% of students tend to use any specific services (Fouad et al., 2006). Similarly, in the current study awareness was moderate (20%- 50% aware), yet use was much lower (first year 1-15%, upper division 7-38%). The career center could interpret these results in two ways; they could strengthen the more successful services or pour in even more time to strengthen the less known used services. This would be a choice determined in part by current resources of career center staff.

One suggestion to increase awareness of service would be to target first year students, since that demographic had the smallest reported awareness of career services. A pay off to enhancing marketing towards first years is that although in the initial year at school students may not need career services, once those aware students progress through college they have knowledge of available career center services for when they need it. A suggested method would be that career center staff visit required first year courses, especially those that focus on introducing students to college expectations (e.g., first year seminars). If career center staff were unable to give brief presentations, the student assistants from the career center could possibly handle the presentations. Using students assistants to present is advantageous because it would be an efficient use of career center resources, and also because the student assistants could be seen as role models to the first year students.

Results indicated that participants sought out informal resources more often than formal resources, a finding that fits with prior research (Carter et al., 2003). Family, close friends, and

classmates were the most frequently used resources, the middle tier of resources included websites and professors, and the least sought resources included books and the campus career center. There are several implications from these results.

First, while the career center was reported as the *least* used career information resource, it should be noted that there is a difference between quantity and quality of advice resources. This study assessed only frequency with which the sources of advice were sought, and not about the quality of the advice. For example, a student may discuss career plans with family several times in a week, yet the student may not be making any career decisions. With one or two visits per semester to the career center though, the student may gain far more knowledge than in informal discussions. Future research assessing quality or effectiveness of sources of advice is needed.

Second, students' frequent use of informal sources provides an interesting area for the career center staff to consider. Due to family being such a frequently reported resource, career centers could try to publicize services to parents, possibly through newsletters or programming during parent weekends on campus. This way, when students discuss their thoughts about their future plans with family, the parents will be able to encourage students to use the career center's services.

Third, correlational analyses indicated students who reported more use of informal or formal resources had increased career decision self-efficacy. Thus, students willing to seek out help and information on their own may be more likely to organize and execute steps towards their career-related goals, which suggests that advice may be a valuable complement to career center services.

Analyses of the Barrier items indicated that students at this liberal arts college perceive that other priorities prevent their use of the career center, rather than feelings of negative

experiences. Thus, career center staff might focus on finding ways to show students that they can make using the career center services a priority. One method could be to provide more information to students when they are in the first year of college, and express to them how the career center services can be beneficial to them during each of their years on campus. Career center student assistants could come into classrooms, as described earlier, and this would introduce students to the new resource. More career information could also be distributed during academic major advising sessions within the student's major.

On the other hand, two limitations of the study were that the questionnaire was self-report and data were purely correlational. Future research might gather ongoing data by recording number of times students sought resources and changes in their level of career confidence.

Study 2- Evaluations of Local Career Center Services

The goal of the second study was to investigate attitudes of students who actually used the local campus career center's services. This study assessed students' satisfaction with the service, subsequent confidence for executing subsequent career related steps, and future interest in career center services.

Participants

Participants were 477 students that used the local university career center services, in either individual sessions ($N = 195$), group sessions services ($N = 171$), or drop-in hours ($N = 65$). No identifying information was collected to maintain respondent anonymity. Anonymity was important for this study because it may have encouraged participants to disclose their responses more honestly without the fear of harming their personal relationship with career center staff. The compensation was a small piece of candy left out by the survey collection box.

Procedures

The local career center staff distributed a brief feedback form developed for this study to all students receiving the career center services between late October and Mid-March during the 2012-2013 academic school year. Prior to the start of Study 2, career center staff were trained on data collection procedures (See Appendix for copy) designed to protect participant anonymity and minimize pressure to answer with a pro-career center bias. Per the guidelines established by this study, only full-time career counselors were approved to distribute feedback forms. In addition, the students were directed to complete the feedback form in a location out of sight from the staff and drop it into a sealed box at the exit of either the career center or the location of the workshop/seminar. Next to the collection box were small pieces of candy for the participants to take as compensation. The survey collection boxes with the completed surveys were collected at least weekly from the career center and the data were entered in a location that ensured data confidentiality.

Measures

A brief feedback form was constructed for this project with guidance from the local career center staff members. Participants were asked which service they attended (e.g., individual, group, or drop- in hours) followed by six items that asked about the participant's experience with the career center service (see Appendix for copy of measure). All six questions were scored on a Likert scale, from 1=not at all to 6= very much. Three subscales scores were computed: satisfaction; self-efficacy; and future intentions. The Satisfaction subscale (α=.87) was comprised of two items that assessed the level of satisfaction with the service (e.g., "Did this visit accomplish what you wanted?"). The Self-efficacy subscale (α=.89) had three items that assessed perceived change in confidence to take the next needed career steps as a result of the

service (e.g., "Do you feel more prepared to take the next needed steps on your career path?").

The Future Intentions subscale was a single item that asked "How likely is it that you will seek

out local career center services again?"

The feedback form contained three optional open ended questions designed to elicit

student evaluations of the *most* useful aspects of their visit, the *least* useful aspects, and which

career services might be of interest in the future.

Results

Satisfaction, Self-Efficacy, and Future Intentions. Three one-way analyses of variance

(ANOVAs) were conducted to test for differences between types of career service (individual

counseling, group service, drop-in hours) on each of the three different ratings (satisfaction, self-

efficacy, future intentions). See Table 9 for complete findings. Ratings of satisfaction differed

significantly depending on type of career service events, $F(2, 428) = 7.53$, $p = .001$. Tukey b

post hoc comparisons indicated that students attending drop-in hours ($M = 5.58$, $SD = .63$) and

individual sessions ($M = 5.56$, $SD = .71$) were significantly more satisfied than students who

attended group services ($M = 5.29$, $SD = .76$).

Students' ratings of self-efficacy also differed across the three service types, $F(2,428) =$

19.47, $p = .000$. Post hoc Tukey b tests indicated that students attending the individual sessions

($M = 5.49$, $SD = .69$) and drop-in hours ($M = 5.34$, $SD = .78$) reported significantly more positive

change in self-efficacy than did students who attended group services ($M = 4.99$, $SD = .88$).

Students' intention to use the career center services again differed as a result of the three

service types, $F(2,428) = 3.35$, $p = .036$. *Post hoc* Tukey b tests indicated students attending

individual sessions ($M = 5.70$, $SD = .71$) and drop-in hours ($M = 5.72$, $SD = .52$) were

significantly more likely to report intention to use future services than group services ($M =$ 5.52, $SD = .84$) .

Open Ended Questions. Three optional open ended questions were included in the form asking what the most useful aspect to the visit was, the least useful aspect, and specifically any future services of interest. Participant responses to these open ended items were analyzed as follows: (a) all 447 responses to the three qualitative questions were read to identify common themes, and (b) each response was re-read and coded for presence of those themes. The majority of the coding was done by the author and two research assistants. Although a portion of the data were double coded and coding conflicts were resolved, a formal evaluation of inter-rater reliability was not conducted.

Most Useful. The first reading of all 447 responses yielded twelve general themes which were then collapsed into one of four broader themes regarding most useful aspects of the service: "Receiving Specific Help/Content Information" (66.0% of students), "Increased Self Knowledge and Empowerment" (14.1% of students), and "Receiving Individual Attention" (8% of students). See Table 10 for complete findings. The "Receiving Specific Help/Information" theme responses included resume/personal statement writing assistance, practice interviews, or new information about majors or careers. The "Increase Self-Knowledge and Empowerment" theme responses included feeling more prepared to take their next needed career path steps or gaining confidence due specifically to the career center staff's encouragement. The "Receiving Individual Attention" theme responses included satisfaction of receiving individualized focus and feedback.

Least Useful. Students responses regarding the least useful aspect of the career center services clustered around four themes: (a) nothing/ effective, (b) irrelevant information, (c) specific complaint, or (d) time concerns. See Table 10 for complete findings. The most frequent

responses were that "nothing was least useful" (47.7%), or students left the section blank (37.6%), which for at least some students may have meant the students had no complaints. Some students did cite that the information or presentation was too vague or irrelevant (8.7%); or had a specific complaint about the event (i.e. video technology problems; 6.7%), or the event was either too quick or too slow (4%).

Future Intention. Students expressed interest in multiple future services, with six general types emerging. The most frequently requested services included resume writing assistance (27.7%), individual sessions (22.2%), and practice interviews (22.3%), while the least mentioned service was speakers and seminar (4.7%). Other services included internship search assistance, or career/grad school (future) planning. Due to students being able to write in multiple services, some of these "themes" were counted twice, so the percentage total equals over 100%. To see all of the percentages and frequencies, see Table 10.

Discussion of Study 2

One of the most noteworthy findings of Study 2 was that participants had extremely positive experiences with the career center. Mean levels for satisfaction, perceived increases in self-efficacy, and intention to use future services were extremely high (M= 4.99 to 5.72 on a 6-point scale). Students attending individual based services (e.g., individual counseling, drop-in hours) rated the services significantly more highly than did student attending group services (e.g., speakers, seminars, career fairs). This pattern was consistent for all three measures: more satisfaction, higher change in reported self-efficacy, and more intention to use future services. Thus, despite high evaluations for all services, the career center services were perceived even more positively for where the student was able to have personalized attention from staff.

It is a successful starting point for the career center to have students' high levels of satisfaction immediately after the event. Possibly contributing to the overall high levels of satisfaction was an increased perception of career decision self-efficacy; given that students did report that as a result of the service they felt more prepared to continue on a career path. The satisfaction with the services and increased perception of CDSE will possibly lead to more usage when students talk among their peers and describe the experiences in a positive way. This may lead to more services being used in the future, and students reported many services of interest in the future. This could be a surprising result from the individual session participants, because the participants from individual career counseling could have fulfilled all of their needs in that one session, but instead desire further services. The participants from the group services also wanted additional services, frequently requesting individual career counseling. This could be problematic for the career center if these participants really request individual sessions, because the local career center staff likely cannot accommodate seeing every enrolled student multiple times for individual appointments. One possible solution would be adding a small-group session after a group service, so that career center staff would be on hand to answer questions on a more individual level.

There were limitations to this study. First, it is possible that students who were unsatisfied never filled out the survey since it was optional. Career center staff did not have any way to track which students opted out of answering, because anonymity was emphasized. Second, demographics were not collected to assume anonymity. There could have been significant differences in evaluations of services among gender, year in school, ethnicity, or major. Demographic questions could be added to a future study to permit these analyses.

A third limitation area was that the survey only assessed immediate self-reported perceptions; there were no follow up questionnaires or objective measures of change. Participants may have indicated a change in CDSE for example, but results do not reveal whether there were genuine increases of skill. Follow up studies with an experimental design would be beneficial. Students could be randomly assigned to attend one of the three types of services and complete outcome measures immediately after the event, as well as in the future. Results over time and from more objective measures could identify changed levels of satisfaction, true increased skill for self-efficacy, and if any additional career services were used.

A fourth limitation was that demand characteristics could have influenced results. Participants may have found the career center staff to be very kind, and due to this halo effect students may have wanted to please the staff and report more positive reactions. Several procedures were used to minimize demand characteristics such as the sealed box the surveys were placed in, having participants fill out the survey out of sight from the career center staff, and omitting demographic questions from the surveys. However, it is unknown if any students still felt pressured to respond in a more positive way. Despite the criticisms which are common in service evaluation studies, the results strongly suggest that the career center is on a successful path.

Conclusion

Career centers are potentially impactful resources for college students. However, research showed that students' awareness of services was low, and their usage of the services was even lower (Fouad et al., 2006). The two studies reported here were conducted to evaluate student perceptions of career counseling services on a liberal arts college campus. The goals for the first study were to compare perception levels of general career counseling and perceptions of local

career center services, while also investigating differences between genders, year in school, and ethnicity. The goals for the second study were to assess the responses of students who had used individual-based services or group services from a local campus career center.

Because the specific findings of both studies have been summarized and discussed already, I will conclude with a list of more general implications and recommendations for career center staff and university personnel at selective liberal arts campuses.

1. Overall, awareness of career center services appear to be low to moderate (20-40%), with utilization of services even lower (<15%). Awareness can be increased through easily viewed announcements like posters and emails. Efforts to increase awareness could be focused on targeting men and first year students, because they reported the least awareness/use of services. Since social media publicity seemed to be inefficient, efforts could instead be directed towards short in-class presentations in first year seminar classes. By introducing information when students are first years would prepare them with knowledge about the career center services when they express greater need as upper division students. It is important to not assume the underutilization is originating from negative attitudes, however, because the Negative Expectations Barriers were very low in this sample.

2. It is important to keep identifying reasons for students seeking outside career advice resources. Advice seeking is correlated positively with CDSE, so an indicator of students who are successful on their career path probably sought out advice as a career step. Future research would be interesting to look at the quantity versus quality of advice that students seek; talking to parents (most frequent resource from data) everyday about career goals and concerns may not be as beneficial on a career path as one or two career

center visits. A second recommendation would be to send career center information directly to parents, so that when students speak to their parents, the parents will guide the student towards career center services. A third interesting area with advice is that between first years and upper division students, the only area of advice that changed substantially is seeking advice from professors. This could leave a place for professors to encourage their students to seek career center services and potentially be a liaison between the career center and students.

3. It is important to continue to identify barriers that are stopping students from attending career center services. From this sample's responses, students did not appear to hold high levels of stigma, yet utilization of services is still low. The underutilization came from somewhere for these participants, and one strong possibility is that career services were a low priority for students. Instead, future research could look at differences in barriers between different student groups (i.e., athletes, academic majors, social groups).

4. Repeating this study more in-depth is another recommendation. This sample had predominately first year students, so it would be beneficial to repeat the study with a large sample of upper division students. Ethnicities in this study did not show any significant differences between Caucasian students and minority students. However, this study did not analyze individual ethnicities, so future studies could assess whether different individual ethnicities showed differences among general and specific perceptions of career counseling. If a study were to find significant differences, then career center staff could focus on why programming was not reaching some ethnicities but not others. Different publicity methods could be used to make sure that staff stay attuned to cultural preferences and attempt to decrease any biases.

5. Individual services were rated more positively than group services, but all participants who attended career center services were pleased with the experience. The participants reported changed levels in career confidence. Many services were reported that they would be of interest in the future. Follow up studies and experimental designs are recommended to see if students would have repeated career center visits, or if the survey results from this study were too overly positive. It is a recommendation to provide services that focus on individualized attention, as the results from the most, least, future intention aspects showed. Examples include more programming on assistance writing resumes, individual career counseling, and practice interviews.

6. A final recommendation is that results from this study should be marketed to students and faculty as a useful assessment of where the college's career center is viewed among students. University personnel and students alike will be able to benefit if students begin to use the career center more to prepare them for their future. The primary focus of liberal arts university students is to focus on developing the life of the mind; however students facing the job market or graduate school can cope with the post-grad transition easier with the assistance of career center staff and services.

References

Betz, N. E., Klein, K. L., & Taylor, K. M. (1996). Evaluation of a short form of the career

decision-making self-efficacy scale. *Journal of Career Assessment, 4,* 47-57. doi:

10.1177/106907279600400103

Betz, N. E. & Klein Voyten, K. (1997). Efficacy and outcome expectations influence career

exploration and decidedness. *The Career Development Quarterly, 46,* 179-189. doi:

10.1002/j.2161-0045.1997.tb01004.x

Brotheridge, C. M., & Power, J. L. (2007). Are career centers worthwhile? A program evaluation

of a public agency career center. *Academy of Management, 13,* 480-496. doi:

10.5465/AMBPP.2007.26508072

Buff., C.L. & O'Connor, S. (2012). Marketing career speed networking: A classroom event to

foster career awareness. *Marketing Education Review, 22,* 77-82. doi:

10.2753/MER1052-8008220113

Bullock-Yowell, E., Andrews, L., & Buzzetta, M. E. (2011). Explaining career-decision-making

self-efficacy: Personality, cognitions, and cultural mistrust. *The Career Development

Quarterly, 59,* 400-411. doi: 10.1002/j.2161-0045.2011.tb00967.x

Carter, R. T., Scales, J. E., Juby, H. L., Collins, N. M., & Wan, C. M. (2003). Seeking career

services on campus: Racial differences in referral, process, and outcome. *Journal of

Career Assessment, 11,* 393-404. doi: 10.1177/1069072703255835

Di Fabio, A. & Bernard, J. L. (2008). The help-seeking in career counseling. *Journal of*

Vocational Behavior, 72, 60-66. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2007.10.006

Flores, L. Y., & Heppner, M. J. (2002). Multicultural career counseling: Ten essentials for

    training. *Journal of Career Development, 28,* 181-202. .doi:10.0894/8453020300/01810

Fouad, N. A., & Byars-Winston, A. (2005). Cultural context of career choice: Meta-analysis of

    Race/Ethnicity differences. *Career Development Quarterly, 53*, 223-233. doi:

    10.1002/j.2161-0045.2005.tb00992.x

Fouad, N. A., Guillen, A., Harris-Hodge, E., Henry, C., Novakovic, A., Terry, S., & Kantamneni,

    N. (2006). Need, awareness, and use of career services for college students. *Journal of*

    Career Assessment, 14, 407-420. doi: 10.1177-1069072706188928

Garner, N. E., Rintz, C. E., and Valle, B. E. (2011). The practice of career development in

    private and public colleges and universities. In Samide, J. L., Eliason, G. T., Patrick, J.

    (Eds.), *Career Development in Higher Education* (pp. 91-117). USA: IAP Information

    Age Publishing.

Garver, M. S., Spralls III, S. A., & Divine, R. L. (2009). Need-based segmentation analysis of

    university career services: Implications for increasing student participation. *Research in*

    Higher Education Journal, 3, 1-27.

Gloria, A. M. H., Jeffrey S. (1999). Influences of ethnic and nonethnic variables on the career

    decision-making self-efficacy of college students. *Career Development Quarterly, 48*,

    157-174. doi: 10.1002/j.2161-0045.1999.tb00282.x

Junn, E. N., Fuller, C. B., & Derrell, S. (1996). Students' perceptions of services on campus: Sex,

    ethnicity, & class standing differences. *College Student Journal, 30,* 146-157.

    doi:10.463934.507498847

Komiya, N., Good, G. E., & Sherrod, N. B. (2000). Emotional openness as a predictor of college

students' attitudes toward seeking psychological help. *Journal of Counseling Psychology,*

47, 138-143. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.47.1.138

Lewis, J. (2001). Career and personal counseling: Comparing process and outcome. *Journal of*

Employment Counseling, 38, 82-90. doi: 10.1002/j.2161-1920.2001.tb00834.x

Ludwikowski, W. M. A., Vogel, D., & Armstrong, P. I. (2009). Attitudes toward career

counseling: The role of public and self-stigma. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 56,*

408-416. doi:10.1037/a0016180

O'Brien, K. M. (2003). Measuring career self-efficacy: Promoting confidence and happiness at

work. In S. Lopez and R. Snyder (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Psychological Assessment*

(pp. 109-126). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Osborn, D. S. and LoFrisco, B. M. (2012). How do career centers use social networking sites?

The Career Development Quarterly, 60, 263-272. doi: 10.1002/j.2161-

0045.2012.00022.x

Peterson, S. L. (1993). Career decision-making self-efficacy and institutional integration of

underprepared college students. *Research in Higher Education, 34,* 659-685. doi: 0361-

0365/93/1200-0659/07.00/0

Pope, M. (2000). A brief history of career counseling in the United States. *The Career*

Development Quarterly, 48, 194-211. doi: 10.1002/j.2161-0045.2000.tb00286.x

Rakes, T. D. (1994). Career outreach on the college campus. *Journal of Career Development, 21,*

155-159. doi: 10.1177/089484539402100212

Reese, R. J., & Miller, C. D. (2006). Effects of a university career development course on career

decision-making self-efficacy. *Journal of Career Assessment, 14,* 252-266. doi:

10.1177/1069072705274985

Rochlen, A. B., Blazina, C., & Raghunathan, R. (2002). Gender role conflict, attitudes toward career counseling, career decision-making, and perceptions of career counseling advertising brochures. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 3*, 127-137. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.3.2.127

Rochlen, A. B., Milburn, L., & Hill, C. E. (2004). Examining the process and outcome of career counseling for different types of career counseling clients. *Journal of Career Development, 30*, 263-275. doi: 10.1177/089484530403000403

Rochlen, A. B., Mohr, J. J., & Hargrove, B. K. (1999). Development of the attitudes toward career counseling scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 46*, 196-206. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.46.2.196

Schaub, M. (2012). The profession of college career services delivery: What college counselors should know about career centers. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 26,* 201-215. doi:10.1080/87568225.2012

Shivy, V. A., & Koehly, L. M. (2002). Client perceptions of and preferences for university-based career services. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 60*, 40-60. doi:10.1006/jvbe.2001.1811

Sutton, G., & Gifford, R. (2011). Career counseling centers at the college level. In Samide, J. L., Eliason, G. T., Patrick, J. (Eds.), *Career Development in Higher Education* (pp. 119-135). USA: IAP Information Age Publishing.

Vogel, D. L., Wade, N. G., & Haake, S. (2006). Measuring the self-stigma associated with seeking psychological help. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*, 325-337. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.53.3.325

Whiston, S. C. (2003). Career counseling: 90 years old yet still healthy and vital. *Career Development Quarterly, 52*, 35-42. doi: 10.1002/j.2161-0045.2003.tb00625.x

Table 1

Demographics and Demographics: Number and Percent within Subsamples

Demographic	N (%)
Year in School	
First Years	164 (68.3)
Sophomore	47 (19.6)
Junior	12 (5.0)
Senior	17 (7.1)
Modified Year in School Groups for Analysis	
1st Semester First Years	90 (37.5)
2nd Semester First Years	74 (30.8)
Sophomores, Juniors, & Seniors	76 (31.7)
Gender	
Male	106 (44.2)
Female	134 (55.8)
Ethnicity	
Caucasian	113 (47.1)
MALANA	61 (25.4)
Majors	
Undecided	41 (17.0)
Natural Sciences (biology, chemistry, physics)	40 (16.7)
Business	37 (15.4)
Arts	31 (12.9)
Double Major	25 (10.4)
Liberal Arts/Social Science	22 (9.2)
Math and Computer Science	15 (6.3)
Other	15 (6.3)
Psychology	14 (5.8)

Note. Year in school $N = 240$, Modified year in school $N = 240$, Gender $N = 240$, Ethnicity $N = 174$, Majors $N = 240$

Career Confidence, Stigmas, and Perception of Career Center Services

Table 2
Correlations of the Scales with Each Other

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
General Perceptions Scales										
1 Self-Stigma	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2 Public Stigma	.40**	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3 ATCC	-.48**	-.27**	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4 CDSE	-.10	.01	.01	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Local Services Scales										
5 Announcements	-.01	-.06	.11	.12	1	-	-	-	-	-
6 Use	-.14*	-.03	.12	.09	.46**	1	-	-	-	-
7 Advice Informal	-.08	-.10	.00	.15*	.09	-.03	1	-	-	-
8 Advice Formal	-.04	-.01	.10	.26**	.43**	.37**	.27**	1	-	-
9 Barriers Negativity	.51**	.35**	-.39**	-.13*	.06	-.00	.02	.02	1	-
10 Barriers Low Priority	.33**	.17**	-.34**	-.01	-.08	-.12	.11	.02	.50**	1

*$p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

Table 3
Gender Main Effects for all Scales: Means, Standard Deviations, and F tests

Scale	Gender M(SD)		F (1,234)
	Men	Women	
General Perceptions			
Self Stigma	1.95 (.72)	1.82 (.75)	.90
Public Stigma	1.52 (.54)	1.45 (.55)	2.34
ATCC	3.58 (.50)	3.59 (.49)	.00
CDSE	3.60 (.64)	3.50 (.66)	1.21
Local Career Center Scales			
Announcements	1.94 (.73)	2.18 (.71)	7.73**
Awareness/Use	1.68 (.62)	1.96 (.60)	15.08**
Career Advice			
Informal	3.13 (.79)	3.27 (.88)	1.60
Formal	2.13 (.75)	2.39 (.73)	8.1*
Barriers			
Negativity	1.45 (.62)	1.47 (.56)	.14
Low Priority	2.43 (.88)	2.47 (.89)	.13
Reputation	7.78 (1.70)	8.40 (1.82)	7.19*

*p <.05 **p <.001
Notes. Scales 1, 4-10, ranged from 1= not at all to 5=very frequently
    Scales 2, 3, ranged from 1=strongly disagree to 4=strongly agree
    ATCC: Attitudes Toward Career Counseling (Rochlen et al., 1999)
    CDSE: Career Decision Self-Efficacy (Betz & Taylor, 2000)

Table 4

Year Main Effects for all Scales: Means, Standard Deviations, and F tests

Scale	Year M(SD)			$F_{(2,234)}$
	Fall Sem 1st Year	Spring Sem 1st Year	Upper Division	
General Perceptions				
Self-Stigma	1.80 (.63)	1.88 (.75)	1.97 (.83)	1.03
Public Stigma	1.51 (.55)	1.36 (.45)	1.53 (.61)	2.17
ATCC	3.64 (.47)	3.61 (.47)	3.59 (.54)	1.99
CDSE	3.49 (.65)	3.50 (.67)	3.67 (.63)	1.97
Local Career Center Scales				
Announcements	1.95 (.66)a	1.94 (.69)a	2.34 (.77)b	8.11*
Awareness/Use	1.68 (.46)a	1.73 (.53)a	2.13 (.77)b	13.98**
Career Advice				
Informal	3.20 (.83)	3.22 (.92)	3.20 (.79)	.08
Formal	2.16 (.68)a	2.18 (.75)a	2.50 (.78)b	4.86*
Barriers				
Negativity	1.38 (.52)	1.47 (.67)	1.56 (.58)	2.26
Low Priority	2.33 (.85)a	2.37 (.95)a	2.68 (.83)b	4.23*
Reputation	8.16 (1.79)	8.07 (1.90)	8.14 (1.70)	.07

*$p < .05$ **$p < .001$

Note. Means with same subscript in row do not differ significantly-Tukey's B.

Table 5

Item Analysis: Announcements

Announcement Type	M (SD)
Career Center emails	2.92 (1.26)*
Posters	2.91 (1.22)*
Career Center webpage	2.04 (1.08)*
Career Center in campus newspaper	1.93 (1.08)
Facebook	1.50 (.97)
Twitter	1.18 (.58)

Note. *Indicates top three highest areas
Scale ranged from 1=not at all to 5=very frequently

Table 6

Item Analysis: Percent of Students Not Aware of, Aware of, and Using Career Services

Service	Not Aware %	Aware %	Used %	Used % By Year First Year/Upper Division
Mock Interview	31.3	62.1*	5.8	1.8/14.5
Internship Search	25.4	58.3*	15.4*	10.4/26.3
Resume	30.4	58.3*	10.8	3.7/26.3
Job /Internship Fair	28.8	55.8	15.0*	4.9/36.8
Grad School advising	42.9*	54.2	2.9	1.2/6.6
Speakers/Workshop	31.3*	45.8	22.1*	14.6/38.2
Individual Sessions	45.4*	41.3	13.3	7.3/26.3

Note. *Indicates top three highest areas

Scale ranged from 1=not aware, not used, 2= aware, but not used, 3= used

1st years N =164, upper division N =76

Table 7

Item Analysis: Advice and Mentoring Resources

Service	Mean (SD)
Family	3.84 (1.06)*
Close friends	3.11 (1.01)*
Classmates at IWU	2.68 (1.01)*
Websites	2.67 (1.08)
Professors	2.56 (1.08)
Books	2.15 (1.03)
Career Center	1.73 (.96)

Note. *Indicates top three highest areas

Means are from a scale 1=not used at all to 5= frequently used, midpoint is 3.

Table 8
Item Analysis: Barriers to Using the Career Center

Service	Mean (SD)
Other commitments have priority	3.04 (1.25)
Too busy to seek services	2.86 (1.31)
No present need for service	2.85 (1.44)
Advice/mentors available elsewhere	2.28 (1.20)
No friends have used the services	2.08 (1.26)
Lack desire to focus on future	2.05 (1.15)
Inconvenient to use services	2.00 (1.17)
Feelings of anxiety around seeking help	1.91 (1.14)
Belief that services would NOT be useful	1.57 (.91)
Seeking help is negative in society	1.36 (.76)
I had a previous negative experience at career center	1.28 (.66)
Heard of negative experience from others at career center	1.20 (.55)

Note: *Indicates top three highest areas
      Scale range was 1=no reluctance felt (no barriers) to 5= very much reluctant

Table 9

Student Evaluations of Career Center Services: Satisfaction, Self-Efficacy, and Future Intentions

	Service Type- M (SD)			
Scale	Individual	Drop In	Group	F (2,428)
Satisfaction	5.56 (.71)$_a$	5.58 (.63)$_a$	5.29 (.76)$_b$	7.53 **
Self-Efficacy	5.49 (.69)$_a$	5.34 (.78)$_a$	4.99 (.88)$_b$	19.47 **
Future Intention	5.70 (.71)$_a$	5.72 (.52)$_a$	5.52 (.84)$_b$	3.35*

*p < .05 **p < .001

Note. Means with same subscript in row do not differ significantly-Tukey's B.

Table 10

Most Useful Aspects, Least Useful Aspects, and Future Service Interest

	Theme	Percent (N)
Most Useful Aspect		
	Specific Help/Content	66.0% (295)
	Self-knowledge and empowerment	14.1 (63)
	Individual attention	7.8 (35)
	Did not answer	12.1 (54)
Least Useful Aspect		
	Nothing-everything *was* useful	42.7 % (191)
	Irrelevant information/too vague	8.7 (39)
	Specific complaint	6.7 (30)
	Time concerns	4.0 (18)
	Did not answer	37.6 (168)
Future Interest		
	Resume/cover letter	27.7% (124)
	Individual sessions	22.2 (99)
	Practice interview	22.3 (100)
	Internship search	18.5 (83)
	Career planning/grad school applications	14.9 (67)
	Speakers and seminars	4.7 (21)
	Did not answer	18.3 (82)

Appendix

Campus Stigma Regarding Career Counseling Scale

Adapted from Komiya, N., Good, G. E., Sherrod, N. B. (2000). Emotional openness as a predictor of college students' attitudes toward seeking psychological help. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47,* 138-143.

Please indicate with how strongly you agree or disagree with each item, with 1=strongly disagree to 4=strongly agree.

1. Seeing a career counselor for emotional or interpersonal problems carries social stigma on the IWU campus.
2. IWU students seem to believe that it is a sign of personal weakness or inadequacy to see a career counselor for emotional or interpersonal problems.
3. IWU students will see a peer in a less favorable way if they come to know that he/she has seen a career counselor.
4. It is advisable for an IWU student to hide from on-campus peers that he/she has seen a career counselor

Personal Stigma About Career Counseling Scale

Adapted from Vogel, D. L., Wade, N. G., & Haake, S. (2006). Measuring the self-stigma associated with seeking psychological help. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53,* 325-337.

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each item, with 1= strongly disagree, to 3= agree and disagree equally, to 5= strongly agree.

1. If I went to a career counselor, I would be less satisfied with myself.
2. I would feel inadequate if I went to a career counselor for career related help.
3. It would make me feel inferior to ask a career counselor for help.
4. I would feel worse about myself if I could not solve my own problems
5. Seeking career center help would make me feel less intelligent.
6. My self-confidence would NOT be threatened if I sought career center help.
7. I would feel okay about myself if I made the choice to seek career center help.
8. My self-confidence would remain the same if I sought professional help for a problem I could not solve.
9. My view of myself would not change just because I made the choice to see a career center counselor.
10. My self-esteem would increase if I talked to a career center counselor.

Attitudes Toward Career Counseling Scale

Rochlen, A. B., Mohr, J. J., & Hargrove, B. K. (1999). Development of the attitudes toward career counseling scale. *Journal of Career Counseling, 46,* 196-206.

Below are statements pertaining to career counseling. Read each statement carefully and indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree by using the following scale: 1= disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3= somewhat agree, and 4= agree.

1. If a career related dilemma arose for me, I would be pleased to know that career counseling services are available.
2. Career counseling is a valuable resource in making a career choice.
3. I could easily imagine how career counseling could be beneficial for me.
4. With so many different ways to get help on career related decisions, I see career counseling as relatively important.

<u>The Career Decision Self-Efficacy Scale</u>

O'Brien, K. M. (2003). Measuring career self-efficacy: Promoting confidence and happiness at work. In S. Lopez and R. Snyder (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Psychological Assessment* (pp. 109-126). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

For each statement listed below, indicate your degree of confidence in your ability to accomplish each task or activity. Use the following scale to indicate your confidence:

1=No confidence at all, 2=Very little confidence, 3=Moderate Confidence, 4=Much Confidence, 5=Complete Confidence

1. Use the Internet to find information about occupations that interest you
2. Select one major from a list of potential majors you are considering
3. Make a plan of your foals for the next five years
4. Determine the steps to take if you are having academic trouble with an aspect of your chosen major
5. Accurately assess your abilities
6. Select one occupation from a list of potential occupations you are choosing
7. Determine the steps you need to take to successfully complete your chosen major
8. Persistently work at your major career goal even when you get frustrated
9. Determine what your ideal job would be
10. Find out the employment trends for an occupation over the next ten years
11. Choose a career that will fit your preferred lifestyle
12. Prepare a good resume
13. Change majors if you did not like your first choice
14. Decide what you value most in an occupation
15. Find out about the average yearly earnings of people in an occupation
16. Make a career decision and then not worry about whether it was right or wrong
17. Change occupations if you are not satisfied with the one you enter
18. Figure out what you are and are not ready to sacrifice to achieve your career goals
19. Talk with a person already employed in the field you are interested in

20. Choose a major or career that will fit your interests

21. Identify employers, firms, and institution relevant to your career possibilities

22. Define the type of lifestyle you would like to live

23. Find information about graduate and professional schools

24. Successfully manage the job interview process

25. Identify some reasonable major or career alternatives if you are unable to get your first choice.

Perceptions of the Local Career Center Services at IWU

Developed to measure IWU student use and attitudes related career center services; developed by Linda Kunce, Department of Psychology, Anna Woodruff, Senior in Psychology, on the basis of the research literature and in consultation with IWU Career Center staff

I.   Career Center Announcements

How often do you notice career center services announcements delivered through:

1. Facebook   1-not at all to 7- very frequently
2. Twitter   1-not at all to 7- very frequently
3. Emails sent from Career center   1-not at all to 7- very frequently
4. Career center webpage on iwu.edu   1-not at all to 7- very frequently
5. Posters and flyers around campus   1-not at all to 7- very frequently
6. The Argus (campus) newspaper   1-not at all to 7- very frequently

II.   Awareness and Use of Career Center Services

Please tell us if you are aware of and have used these IWU Career Center services.

0 = not aware & have not used, 1= aware, but have not used, 2 = have used 1 time, 3 = have used 2 – 4 times, 4 = have used 5 or more times

1. Speaker /workshop
2. Resume help
3. Help finding an internship
4. Job/internship fair
5. Mock interview
6. General career assessment/counseling
7. Graduate school advising

Have you used any *other* Career Center services?

[ ] No [ ] Yes, please specify _____

III.   Career Advice and Mentoring

How frequently do you get career advice/mentoring from-

Classmates at IWU	1-not at all to 7- very frequently
Close friends	1-not at all to 7- very frequently
Family	1-not at all to 7- very frequently
IWU Career Center	1-not at all to 7- very frequently
Professors	1-not at all to 7- very frequently
Books	1-not at all to 7- very frequently
Websites	1-not at all to 7- very frequently

Other important source (please specify) _____ 1-not at all to 7- very frequently

IV.   Barriers to Using Career Center Services

Students may be aware of Career Center services but be *reluctant* to use them for many different reasons. Which of the following are true for you?

Feelings of anxiety around seeking help	1-not at all to 7- very frequently
No present need for the services	1-not at all to 7- very frequently
No friends/peers have used the services to get feedback from	1-not at all to 7- very frequently
Do not believe that the services would be beneficial	1-not at all to 7- very frequently
Too busy to seek CC services	1-not at all to 7- very frequently
Other commitments are higher priorities	1-not at all to 7- very frequently
It is inconvenient to use the CC services	1-not at all to 7- very frequently
Advice/mentoring is available elsewhere	1-not at all to 7- very frequently
Do not desire to focus on the future / career right now	1-not at all to 7- very frequently
Previous experiences with the CC was negative	1-not at all to 7- very frequently
Heard of negative experiences with the CC	1-not at all to 7- very frequently
Seeking counseling is portrayed in society as negative	1-not at all to 7- very frequently
Other (please specify _____)	1-not at all to 7- very frequently

V.   Perceived Reputation Item

What kind of overall reputation does the IWU Career center have among students? Please respond on a scale ranging from 0 = Very negative to 50 = neutral to 100-very positive.

Hart Career Center Feedback Form

1. What service did you receive today?
[ ] Individual Session   [ ] Skills Workshop   [ ] Speakers/Seminar
[ ] Drop-in Hours   [ ] Practice Interview   [ ] Other _____

2. Please answer the following based on your experience today.

	Not at All				Very Much	
Did this Hart Career Center visit/event accomplish what you wanted?	1	2	3	4	5	6
Do you feel more prepared to take the next needed steps on your career path?	1	2	3	4	5	6
Are you more confident that you *can* take those next steps?	1	2	3	4	5	6
Are you more confident that you *will* take those next steps?	1	2	3	4	5	6
What was your overall satisfaction today with the career center visit/event?	1	2	3	4	5	6
How likely is it that you will seek out Hart Career Center services again?	1	2	3	4	5	6

3. What was *most* useful about the Hart Career Center services you received today?

4. What was *least* useful?

5. Which Hart Career Center services are you interested in seeking in the future?

Thank you! Please fold this form and drop it in the box before you leave.

Protections for Participant Anonymity Form:
Researcher-Hart Career Center (HCC) Staff Document of Understanding

We, the undersigned HCC staff and psychology department researchers, will use the following guidelines and procedures to protect the participants' anonymity and right to decline participation.

1. We understand that students are completing the survey anonymously and we will make all efforts to protect that anonymity. At no point will we try to discover a participant's identity.
2. We understand that participation is fully voluntary. No pressure will be put on students to participate. A decision not to participate will not jeopardize the student's relationship with the Hart Career Center.
3. Procedures
    a. Surveys will be handed out by HCC staff at the end of a service (e.g., workshop, individual session). As this is done HCC staff will
        i. Mention that the HCC is collaborating on a research study to assess their services
        ii. Participation is completely voluntary and anonymous.
        iii. If the student would like to participate, they should complete the survey and drop it in the sealed box [give location]
    b. HCC staff will ensure that they cannot see student responses as the form is completed. Specifically,
        i. *For individual meetings:* Students will be asked to complete survey *after they leave the individual HCC staff member's office but before they leave the career center (e.g., at the open tables or at the counter near the entrance).*
        ii. *For group meetings/workshops:* HCC staff will hand out surveys and stand at a distance (e.g., front of room) where they cannot see students' responses.
    c. After completing the surveys, students will drop their own questionnaire in a sealed box as they exit the career center or group meeting/workshop.
        i. Hart Career Center staff will not monitor whether or not a specific student puts the survey in the sealed box.
        ii. The box will be kept in an accessible yet secure place (e.g., at the "entrance" desk in the Career Center, on a table near the exit of the room in which a workshop is held).
        iii. Robyn Walter and Warren Kistner will ensure that all HCC staff know that the sealed box is not to be opened.

      d. Surveys will be picked up from the Career Center by either Anna Woodruff or Linda Kunce.

4. Data Analysis: HCC staff may be present during data analysis (i.e., Robyn Walter or Warren Kistner), however the researchers will take responsibility for storing the completed questionnaires and resulting data sets.   Because no personal information will be collected, it will be impossible to identify any specific participants in the digital data set.

Table A-1

Item Analysis: Announcement Means by Year and Gender

Announcement Type	M (SD) by Year	
	First Year	Upper Division
Posters/flyers	2.78 (1.25)*	3.51 (1.20)*
Career Center emails	2.65 (1.20)*	3.17 (1.13)*
Career Center webpage	1.95 (1.04)*	2.23 (1.16)*
Campus newspaper	1.87 (.99)	2.05 (1.12)
Facebook	1.36 (.83)	1.82 (1.16)
Twitter	1.11 (.47)	1.32 (.75)

	M (SD) by Gender	
	Women	Men
Posters	3.15 (1.22)*	2.56 (1.17)*
Career Center E-mails	3.10 (1.21)*	2.64 (1.29)*
Career center webpage	2.08 (1.08)*	1.92 (1.07)*
The Argus newspaper	1.95 (1.09)	1.79 (0.98)
Facebook	1.54 (1.02)	1.45 (0.92)
Twitter	1.23 (0.70)	1.10 (0.34)

Note. *indicates top three highest means, not necessarily in rank order
Scale range was on a 1=not many to 5=very frequently

Table A-2

Item Analysis: Percent of Students Not Aware of, Aware of, and Using Career Services by First Year and Upper Division

Service	Not Aware %	Aware %	Used %
Individual Sessions			
1st years	51.2	41.5	7.3
Upper division	32.9	40.8	26.3
Job /Internship Fair			
1st years	32.3	62.2	4.9
Upper division	21.1	42.1	36.8
Resume			
1st years	32.9	62.8	3.7
1st yeapper division	25.0	48.7	26.3
Internship Search			
1st years	27.4	61.6	10.4
Upper division	21.1	51.3	26.3
Mock Interview			
1st years	34.1	62.8	1.8
Upper division	25.0	60.5	14.5
Speakers/Workshop			
1st years	34.1	50.0	14.6
Upper division	25.0	36.8	38.2
Grad School advising			
1st years	45.1	53.7	1.2
Upper division	38.2	55.3	6.6

Note. Scale ranged from 1=not aware, not used, 2= aware, but not used, 3= used
1st years N =164, upper division N =76

Table A-3
Item Analysis: Advice and Mentoring Resources Means by Year

Service	Mean (SD)	
	1st years	Upper Division
Family	3.88 (1.09)	3.75 (1.00)
Close friends	3.10 (1.05)	3.13 (.94)
Classmates at IWU	2.66 (1.03)	2.71 (.96)
Websites	2.65 (1.03)	2.70 (1.19)
Professors	2.31 (.99)	3.11 (1.08)
Books	2.09 (1.02)	2.30 (1.06)
Career Center	1.65 (.96)	1.91 (.96)

Note. Scale range was 1=not used at all to 5= frequently used, midpoint is 3

Table A-4

Item Analysis: Barriers to Using the Career Center by Year in School

	Mean (SD)	
Service	1st Years	Upper Division
Other commitments have priority	2.88 (1.24)	3.38 (1.20)
No present need for service	2.87 (1.53)	2.81 (1.24)
Too busy to seek services	2.77 (1.35)	3.04 (1.22)
Advice/mentors available elsewhere	2.14 (1.14)	2.59 (1.29)
Lack desire to focus on future	2.09 (1.15)	1.97 (1.17)
No friends have used the services	2.08 (1.29)	2.09 (1.21)
Feelings of anxiety around seeking help	1.87 (1.12)	2.00 (1.19)
Inconvenient to use services	1.87 (1.12)	2.28 (1.23)
Belief that services would NOT be useful	1.44 (.79)	1.84 (1.10)
Seeking help is negative in society	1.35 (.78)	1.38 (.73)
I had a previous negative experience at career center	1.27 (.69)	1.30 (.61)
Heard of negative experience at career center	1.18 (.57)	1.25 (.49)

Note. Scale range was 1=no reluctance felt (no barriers) to 5= very much reluctant