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Purpose of Study

Explore an alternative assessment approach based on a hypothesized relationship between:

- Campus program participation
- Student self-efficacy
- Student dispositions toward aspects of mental health and substance abuse

Background of Study

- Accountability & assessing student life programs
- Student learning outcomes (traditional)
- Alternative assessment approaches
Background of Study (cont’d)

Bandura’s Socio-Cognitive Theory of Perceived Self-Efficacy

- Low sense of control → At risk of increased anxiety, feelings of depression, and substance abuse

**Hypothesis**

- Campus Involvement → More sense of control → Higher self efficacy & less risk of mental health issues and substance abuse

---

Background of Study (cont’d)

**Student Mental Health Today**

- Prevalence
- Pressure
- Priority
Background of Study (cont’d)

Legal Implications for the Profession

- Case law

  - Jane V. Iowa vs. Schieszler V. Ferrum College Shin V. M.I.T.

Methodology

- Participants
  - 888 surveys returned (nearly 10% of “underclassmen”)
  - Orientation course participants
  - Residential students (n=3,045)

- Activities and Attitudes Survey
  - Tested for differences between groups of students (ANOVA and t-tests)

- 3 Composite Variables
  - "Self-efficacy" (Bandura)
  - "Disposition toward Mental Health" (ACHA)
  - "Disposition toward Substance Abuse." (ACHA)
Methodology (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong academics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in academically oriented classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disliked foreign language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disliked foreign language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disliked foreign culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disliked foreign culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disliked foreign language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disliked foreign culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results

- Our Hypothesis and the “file drawer”
- Compounding alpha p < .01
- Survey performed well (factor analysis & correlations)

Interesting finding: Disposition toward Substance Abuse
  - Career Development Services and Study Partners (vs.)
  - Supplemental Instruction and Orientation classes
From the paper...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>t-test or ANOVA Significance?</th>
<th>Results of mean (M) inspection or Tukey HSD testing, includes brief comment of interpretation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disposition toward Substance Abuse</td>
<td>Participation in Career Development Svs. (CDS) event</td>
<td>Yes (t = 3.440, p &lt; .001)</td>
<td>$M_{CD(20)} &lt; M_{CD(20)}$ Students who participated in at least one CDS event expressed a favorable disposition toward substance abuse than those who did not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposition toward Substance Abuse</td>
<td>Participation in Study Partners</td>
<td>Yes (t = 2.607, p = .008)</td>
<td>$M_{Study Partners} &lt; M_{Study Partners}$ Students who participated in Study Partners expressed a favorable disposition toward substance abuse than those who did not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposition toward Substance Abuse</td>
<td>Participation in Supplemental Instruction</td>
<td>Yes (t = 3.402, p = .001)</td>
<td>$M_{Supplemental Instruction} &gt; M_{Supplemental Instruction}$ Students who participated in Supplemental Instruction expressed a less favorable disposition toward substance abuse than those who did not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposition toward Substance Abuse</td>
<td>Participation in Orientation Classes</td>
<td>Yes (t = 4.458, p &lt; .001)</td>
<td>$M_{Orientation class} &lt; M_{No orientation class}$ Students who took at least one orientation class expressed a less favorable disposition toward substance abuse than those who did not take any orientation class.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results (cont’d)

- "Self-Efficacy" and "Disposition toward Mental Health” for the Orientation classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>t-test or ANOVA Significance?</th>
<th>Results of mean (M) inspection or Tukey HSD testing, includes brief comment of interpretation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Participation in Orientation Classes</td>
<td>Yes (t = 4.936, p &lt; .001)</td>
<td>$M_{Orientation class} &lt; M_{No orientation class}$ Students who took at least one orientation class expressed lower self-efficacy than those who did not take any orientation class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposition toward Mental Health</td>
<td>Participation in Orientation Classes</td>
<td>Yes (t = 2.883, p = .004)</td>
<td>$M_{Orientation class} &lt; M_{No orientation class}$ Students who took at least one orientation class expressed a less favorable disposition toward mental health than those who did not take any orientation class.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results (cont’d)

Intramural Sports: "Self-Efficacy" and "Disposition toward Substance Abuse"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>t-test or ANOVA</th>
<th>Significance?</th>
<th>Results of mean (M) inspection or Tukey HSD testing. Includes brief comment of interpretation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Participation in Intramurals</td>
<td>Yes (t = 2.659, p = .008)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$M_{\text{no intramurals}} &lt; M_{\text{intramurals}}$ Students who did not participate in intramurals expressed lower self-efficacy than those who did</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Results in the shaded area are significant at the p &lt; .05 level, but not significant at p &lt; .010 when considering compounding alpha error.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposition toward Substance Abuse</td>
<td>Participation in Intramurals</td>
<td>Yes (t = 2.396, p = .017)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$M_{\text{intramurals}} &gt; M_{\text{no intramurals}}$ Students who participated in intramurals expressed a less favorable disposition toward substance abuse than those who did not participate in intramurals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results (cont’d)

Intramurals

“No drugs – drinking yes! I love intramurals. I am also involved in many clubs relating to my major and it helps a lot!” [394]
Results (cont’d)

- General activity level with "Disposition toward Mental Health" and "Self-Efficacy"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>t-test or ANOVA</th>
<th>Results of mean (M) significance or Tukey HSD testing, includes brief comment of interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disposition toward Mental Health (in general)</td>
<td>Participation in Activities</td>
<td>Yes (F(2,20) = 3.872, p = .021)</td>
<td>Students who reported low or no participation (0 to ~2 activities) expressed a favorable disposition toward mental health than those reporting moderate (~3 to 4 activities).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Participation in Activities (in general)</td>
<td>Yes (F(2,20) = 3.543, p = .029)</td>
<td>Students who participated moderately in campus programs (~3 to 4 activities) expressed lower self-efficacy than those with low or no participation (0 to ~2 activities).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results (cont’d)

- 80+ surveys mentioned Greek Life

“I am involved in a sorority which has really helped me feel ‘in touch’ with (the university). They also have helped me owkr on keeping my grades up as well as make many new friends.”
Conclusion

- Alternative assessment

- Working paper and slides available at

  http://highereddata.org/