

High School Factors as Predictors for College Success:
Students' Satisfaction, Motivation, and Success

Submitted by
Laura Katherine Gonda
Communication

To
The Honors College
Oakland University

In partial fulfillment of the
requirement to graduate from
The Honors College

Mentor: Dr. Jacob Cayanus, Associate Professor of Communication
Department of Communication
Oakland University

February 15, 2017

Abstract

This study focused on evaluating and analyzing high school and demographic factors as accurate predictors for college success as well as considering other factors impacting students' motivation, success, and self-efficacy. Students' satisfaction with communication, mainly with high school and college advisors, was examined in order to discover what success means to college students and how their educational experiences could have been improved. Specifically, positive relationships were found between students' satisfaction with their college advisors and three other variables: motivation, success, and self-efficacy. Qualitative results revealed a majority of students' feeling that success means achieving goals, being happy, and having a career job. In addition, many students reported wishing they had learned more real-life skills and had better opportunities to explore career choices. There was no evidence supporting high school factors as accurate predictors of college success. The results from this study suggest that further analysis of students' satisfaction with communication could prove valuable for further research aiming to predict and improve students' success.

Keywords: motivation, satisfaction, self-efficacy, success

Literature Review

Introduction

The lack of preparedness for students transitioning from high school to college is an issue that has not gone unnoticed. For instance, Mangan (2015) draws attention to how large the gap is between students who graduate from high school and their actual readiness for college. She also points out how this is worrisome for educators because it seems that this is setting some students up for failure. In addition, Conley (2005) makes clear that college preparation classes taken in high school and high school grade point averages that are adequate for college admission are not factors that guarantee college success.

An article from almost a century ago points out that assessing how high schools prepare students for college is important for students' future success (Bowers, 1918). Studies from over fifty years ago have set out to improve the accuracy of predicting college success based on high school factors. In 1961, Bloom and Peters created a scale that adjusted to grading and curriculum differences across high schools. They were successful in improving the ability to predict college success (Hedges & Majer, 1976). However, since then, little has dramatically improved regarding accurate predictions of college students' success in relation to various high school and demographic factors. In addition, there is little research about students' satisfaction with the communication they experienced throughout their education and how this potentially impacts their success, motivation, and self-efficacy. The purpose of this research was to examine high school factors as predictors for college success. Additionally, it aimed to bring to light new factors relating to communication and satisfaction that may have a significant impact on students' education, motivation, success, and self-efficacy.

GPA & AP/Honors Courses: Predictors for Success and Contributors to Satisfaction

Two high school factors that are often considered when predicting students' college success are GPA and the number of AP/Honors courses they have taken. In thinking about methods for preparing students for college, Kuh (2007) notably points out that "success in college is strongly related to precollege academic preparation and achievement" (p 4). In analysis of college readiness, Kuh also mentions that habits begin during pre-college years and success and motivation are linked to these precursors of successful adjustment. Good habits in high school may include maintaining a high GPA and enrolling in honors and AP courses. Pike & Saupe (2002) found that, consistent with previous research, performance and courses taken in high school are notably related to first year college students' GPA. Considering performance in high school may reflect on a student's GPA, this factor could be taken into consideration when projecting college success.

Similarly, Abdel-Salam, Kauffmann, & Williamson (2005) found that high school GPA (HSGPA) is a more reliable predictor for college success than SAT scores. According to French, Homer, Popovici, & Robins (2015), "a 1-point increase in high school GPA doubles the probability of completing college" (p 383). On the other hand, a study by Warne, Nagaishi, Slade, Hermesmeier, & Peck (2014) found that HSGPA is not a sufficient factor when it comes to statistically predicting success in college. The authors also found that weighted HSGPAs are less accurate predictors than un-weighted HSGPAs. Additionally, Betts & Morell (1999) suggest that using GPA as a factor to predict college success could be improved by also measuring personal background and socioeconomic factors related to the student as well as resources available to the student during high school.

Further, because AP and honors courses may pose a greater challenge and learning experience for high school students, the amount of these classes taken may also help to predict success in college. According to Matteson (2013), students who took Advanced Placement courses as well as exceeded the minimum requirements for graduation felt that they had been given an edge to succeed in college. This leads to the notion that AP classes taken during high school may improve satisfaction with preparedness for college as well as increase the potential for success. However, because AP classes often come with a weighted GPA, and research points to this being an inaccurate measure of potential college success, an accurate prediction using these factors may prove unreliable.

In addition to satisfaction based on grades and courses, Goodboy, Martin, & Bolkan (2009) point out that communication is an important aspect when considering students' satisfaction with education. In developing a general student satisfaction scale, they also found that satisfying communicative events in the classroom are often associated with prosocial outcomes. These findings imply that further implementation of this scale and analysis of the subsequent research may be a promising way to more accurately assess students' satisfaction and work toward better strategies to improve communication between students and instructors. Besides academic success in high school, demographics like school size, socio economic status, and biological sex have also been considered when predicting students' college success in the past.

The Effects of School Size, Socio Economic Status, and Biological Sex

Findings from Betts & Morell (1999) suggest that teacher to student ratio, biological sex, and family income are connected to university GPA. The authors indicate that students from areas where a small percentage of adults have college degrees earn considerably lower GPAs in

college. This leads to the idea that socio economic class may have a significant effect on students' success in college.

In addition, Betts & Morell bring up how “women tend to obtain higher GPAs than men” (p 288). Considering this trend, biological sex also seems to have an effect on college success. Similarly, Wright, Jenkins-Guarnieri, & Murdock (2012) found that “being female was associated with higher odds of being academically successful” (p 303). Chee, Pino, & Smith (2005) propose that social capital plays a large part in the academic achievement of both men and women and note that the differences in social capital regarding one's biological sex have an effect on one's attitude to achievement. This could also lead to the notion that biological sex effects motivation to succeed. Further analysis of these factors and students' opinions about them may contribute to a better understanding of how they play a role in students' satisfaction with preparedness for college.

In addition to socio economic status, resources available to high schools seem like a relevant aspect when determining students' success. However, Hanushek (1997) found that there is little evidence to support a relationship between the resources available to a school and student performance. This suggests that individual differences of students relating to motivation and satisfaction are more accurate predictors for college success.

Many teachers assume the role of advisor, especially in smaller high schools where human resources are not readily available. Phillippo (2010) explains how her research shows that teachers with different levels of resources and experience often took different approaches when acting as advisors to students. For example, a teacher with high levels of resources reported wanting to help his students focus on themselves. On the other hand, a lower-resource teacher reported staying away from personal issues outside of education because she felt it was

inappropriate. Depending on students' expectations and individual needs, either of these approaches could become problematic and affect their satisfaction with education and level of preparedness felt for college.

In addition, once in college, students' involvement with college advisors is also an important factor when determining students' satisfaction and success. Sheldon, Garton, Orr, & Smith (2015) found that college advisors' skills, resources, and ability to encourage students to activate their own internal resources impacts students GPA. They also found that faculty advisors, like professors, often were more relied upon than professional advisors. Therefore, students who form relationships with their professors during college and think of them as an advisor, rather than trying to schedule a meeting with a busy professional advisor, may get more out of the mentorship and be more optimistic about their education.

Further, Bahr (2008) found that students who are not prepared upon beginning college often reap greater benefits from advising versus their peers who are college-ready. Bahr's findings contradicted previous studies, like that of Clark (1960), which proposed that academic counseling could have a negative impact on the chances of a student achieving their goals because of the way some counselors use a 'cooling out' process to lead students away from goals that seem out-of-reach or unachievable. Instead, Bahr found that in almost all cases, advising is beneficial to students to increase the chances of attaining their goals. However, if students do not feel that they are gaining anything from speaking with advisors, they might be discouraged from meeting with them again. This could set the student on a wrong or difficult track and have effect on their success. Because this issue may stem from lack of communication or dissatisfaction with communication with college advisors, students' satisfaction with communication with their advisors should have an impact on their success. In addition to the level of preparedness

provided, motivation is also a key factor worthy of further analysis that relates to overall college success and students' satisfaction with their education.

Students' Motivation to Succeed

Rabideau (2005) explains how mastery orientations, like learning a skill, create a setting where achievement is a challenge which sparks excitement and enables intrinsic motivation (the enjoyment of and interest in an activity for its own sake). On the other hand, extrinsic motivation, triggered from external aspects like maintaining a reputation, is seen as less productive and, therefore, digresses from potential success. Students with a more intrinsic motivation beginning in high school may have a better outlook and be more satisfied with their college education because of their internal desire to learn. Other students who are motivated because they see success as getting a degree or settling with a career may find college less satisfying.

Taylor, Jungert, Mageau, Schattke, Dedic, Rosenfield, & Koestner (2014) similarly found that across their studies, "intrinsic motivation was the only motivation type to be consistently positively associated with academic achievement over a one-year period" (p 355). However, Eccles & Wigfield (2002) point toward extrinsic motivation still being relevant because of the importance for future goals and to instill pride in one's parents which they say is a key factor when determining success in school. Lin, McKeachie, & Kim (2003) provide evidence for a moderate level of extrinsic motivation combined with a high level of intrinsic as the most likely grouping to achieve academic success in college students. This finding also indicates that the two types of motivation can be compatible. Further analysis of students' motivations for doing well in college relating to advice they receive from advisors may help guide high school and college

educators as they try to prepare students for success. Motivation and advice from counselors may also affect a student's self-efficacy.

Self-Efficacy and Students' Identification with Academics

Self-efficacy is one's belief in their capability to perform a task (Bandura, 1986). Walker, Greene, & Mansell (2006) suggest that the more self-efficacy students feel, the more they will seek challenges, stick with the challenge over time, and effectively apply strategies to combat challenges faced. When it comes to taking on the challenge of college, a higher sense of self-efficacy may be affected by the confidence one feels after communicating with advisors, and the level of motivation felt to achieve goals.

Students' identification with academics is also a factor relating to students' success. Osborne (1997) explains how identification with academics is described as the amount of self-esteem that individuals base on outcomes related to their academic achievements. Thus, those students who identify with academics and feel that they belong in their field or school are more likely to be motivated to succeed in their academic setting. This could also tie in to how satisfied students are with their level of preparedness to join their college-level academic field and how satisfied they were once they became involved. Students who are not able to identify with academics are often predicted to be less invested in their success, therefore, having lower levels of motivation and weaker performance levels related to grades and achievements which sometimes results in withdrawal from school all together (Voelkl 1997).

The level of self-efficacy students have may stem from the way they were taught throughout school. Greene & Miller (1996) found, consistent with previous research, "that perceived ability and student learning goal scores are positively related to reports of meaningful

cognitive engagement” (p 188). They also propose that teaching strategies that lean toward important cognitive engagement will better affect students who are confident in their learning abilities. Students who feel like the work they are doing is meaningful may develop better learning habits which could have an impact on their motivation and success. In addition to teachers, high school and college advisors could also convey the same sense of meaningfulness into students’ work which has the potential to contribute to students’ satisfaction with communication. Further research and analysis into the factors that affect self-efficacy in college students may help to reveal more prominent indicators of students’ success as well as other factors that cause students to diverge from their educational track.

Summary

Although there is a substantial amount of research about high school factors affecting students’ success in college, there are few studies that interpret students’ satisfaction with this preparation, in addition to examining other factors that could play a part in students’ success. The idea of students’ satisfaction with communication leading to motivation, self-efficacy, and success is still an understudied concept. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to evaluate and analyze high school factors as accurate predictors for college success, as well as consider other factors that have an impact on students’ overall educational experience, mainly, students’ satisfaction with the communication they experienced with high school and college advisors. This posed the following research questions:

RQ1: How can college students’ success in relation to high school factors, or other factors, be more accurately predicted?

RQ2: To what extent do students feel satisfied with the preparedness for college they were provided in high school?

RQ3: What affects college students’ motivation to succeed?

RQ4: What does 'success' mean for college students?

Method

Participants

The participants were 90 students (31 males, 59 females) enrolled in various Communication Studies courses at a mid-Western university. The courses were electives for the Communication Studies major, however, the courses are open to students from all colleges of the university. The mean age of the participants was 22.21 (SD=4.10). Data collection occurred near the end of the semester.

Procedures and Measurement

Each of the participants completed a survey packet that included measures for various demographic and high school factors. These included high school GPA = 4 (2.1-2.5), 16 (2.6-3.0), 39 (3.1-3.5) 29 (3.6-4.0), 1 (4 +), number of AP courses taken during high school = 32 (0), 12 (1), 20(2), 9 (3), 7 (4), 4 (5), 2 (6), 4 (6+), high school population = 19 (<500), 19 (501-1000), 14 (1001-1500), 17 (1501-2000), 21 (2000+), and socio economic class = 7 (low), 73 (mid), 10 (high). Other measures included satisfaction with high school advisors as well as college advisors, situational motivation, perceived success in college, and general self-efficacy. In addition, students were asked to provide short-answer responses to three open ended questions: 1) What does success mean to you? 2) Do you feel that you are actually successful? 3) What things do you think could have been done differently to help you prepare you to be successful in terms of the education system you experienced?

Scale Development

The scale to measure satisfaction was developed from the Student Communication Satisfaction Scale (SCSS) Short Form originally developed by Goodboy, Martin, & Bolkan

(2009). This scale is an abbreviated form of the Student Communication Satisfaction Scale (SCSS) and uses a 7-point Likert scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (7) strongly agree. While the original scale inquired about students satisfaction with their teacher, this study substitutes teacher with both high school advisors and college advisors each in two different survey sections, respectively, in order to discover potential relationships between students satisfaction will college and the advice they received from both high school and college advisors. In this study the scale had a reliability of .89 ($M = 33.45$, $SD = 12.22$).

In order to measure student motivation, a scale was developed from The Situational Motivation Scale (SIMS) originally developed by Guay, Vallerand, & Blanchard (2000). The original scale was broken into sections used to measure Intrinsic motivation, Identified regulation, External regulation, & Amotivation. Each section used the term ‘this activity’ to indicate the situational behavior. This study substitutes ‘college’ in place of ‘this activity’ in order to determine the type of motivation behind the reasons students are attending college ‘right now’. This scale used a 7-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). In this study the scale had a reliability of .89 ($M = 33.45$, $SD = 12.22$).

The scale to measure students’ perceived success was developed from the Criteria of Career Success originally created using results from a study by Zhou, Sun, Guan, Li, & Pan (2012). This study uses the 8 items relating to “intrinsic fulfillment” as well as three additional items relating to physical and mental health. Items were phrased as follows, “One’s talents and potential capacities are fully utilized in his or her career”. In order to relate the items to this study, this same item was rephrased as “My talents and potential capacities are fully utilized.” In addition, the directions asked students to think about their experiences in college so far in order to determine to what extent students feel that they are successful in college. This scale used a 7-

point Likert scale ranging from completely disagree (1) to completely agree (7). In this study the scale had a reliability of .89 ($M = 33.45$, $SD = 12.22$).

Lastly, the scale to measure self-efficacy was borrowed from the New General Self-Efficacy (NGSE) Scale developed and used by Chen, Gully, & Eden (2001). This scale used a 5 point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5) in order to discover students confidence in themselves regarding their capabilities and success. In this study the scale had a reliability of .89 ($M = 33.45$, $SD = 12.22$).

Results

Independent t tests were conducted with biological sex and the variables of high school advising satisfaction, college advising satisfaction, motivation, success, and self-efficacy. For high school advising satisfaction, there was no significant difference $t(89) = .60$, $p > .05$ between men's scores ($M = 34.42$, $SD = 11.64$) and women's scores ($M = 32.81$, $SD = 12.61$). For college advising satisfaction, there was no significant difference $t(89) = .61$, $p > .05$ between men's scores ($M = 42.87$, $SD = 9.59$) and women's scores ($M = 41.50$, $SD = 11.10$). For motivation, there was no significant difference $t(89) = -1.73$, $p < .05$ between men's scores ($M = 73.68$, $SD = 11.86$) and women's scores ($M = 81.28$, $SD = 12.21$). For success, there was no significant difference $t(87) = -.56$, $p > .05$ between men's scores ($M = 54.50$, $SD = 11.12$) and women's scores ($M = 55.95$, $SD = 11.01$). For self-efficacy, there was no significant difference $t(87) = .77$, $p > .05$ between men's scores ($M = 33.23$, $SD = 5.10$) and women's scores ($M = 33.73$, $SD = 5.12$).

One-way ANOVAs were conducted to compare the effect of GPA on the variables of satisfaction with high school advisors, satisfaction with college advisors, motivation, success, and self-efficacy. For satisfaction with high school advisors, results indicated no significant

differences $F(4, 85) = 1.73, p > .05$. For satisfaction with college advisors, results indicated no significant differences $F(4, 85) = .70, p > .05$. For motivation, results indicated no significant differences $F(4, 85) = .022, p > .05$. For success, results indicated no significant differences $F(4, 84) = .47, p > .05$. For self-efficacy, results indicated no significant differences $F(4, 84) = .52, p > .05$.

One-way ANOVAs were conducted to compare the effect of AP/Honors courses on the variables of satisfaction with high school advisors, satisfaction with college advisors, motivation, success, and self-efficacy. For satisfaction with high school advisors, results indicated no significant differences $F(7, 82) = .94, p > .05$. For satisfaction with college advisors, results indicated no significant differences $F(7, 82) = 1.35, p > .05$. For motivation, results indicated no significant differences $F(7, 82) = 1.0, p > .05$. For success, results indicated no significant differences $F(7, 81) = 1.16, p > .05$. For self-efficacy, results indicated no significant differences $F(7, 81) = 1.29, p > .05$.

One-way ANOVAs were conducted to compare the effect of high school population on the variables of satisfaction with high school advisors, satisfaction with college advisors, motivation, success, and self-efficacy. For satisfaction with high school advisors, results indicated no significant differences $F(4, 85) = .36, p > .05$. For satisfaction with college advisors, results indicated no significant differences $F(4, 85) = .20, p > .05$. For motivation, results indicated no significant differences $F(4, 85) = .87, p > .05$. For success, results indicated no significant differences $F(4, 84) = .75, p > .05$. For self-efficacy, results indicated no significant differences $F(4, 84) = .34, p > .05$.

One-way ANOVAs were conducted to compare the effect of socio economic status on the variables of satisfaction with high school advisors, satisfaction with college advisors,

motivation, success, and self-efficacy. For satisfaction with high school advisors, results indicated no significant differences $F(2, 87) = .51, p > .05$. For satisfaction with college advisors, results indicated no significant differences $F(2, 87) = .32, p > .05$. A. For motivation, results indicated no significant differences $F(2, 87) = .09, p > .05$. For success, results indicated no significant differences $F(2, 86) = .01, p > .05$. For self-efficacy, results indicated no significant differences $F(2, 86) = .90, p > .05$.

In order to determine if relationships existed among satisfaction with high school advising, satisfaction with college advising, motivation, success, and self-efficacy, Pearson Correlations were run. Results indicate no relationship with high school advising satisfaction and self-efficacy ($r = -.04, p > .05$), success ($r = .01, p > .05$), motivation ($r = .01, p > .05$), or college advising satisfaction ($r = .01, p > .05$).

However, positive relationships emerged from the data between college advising satisfaction and self-efficacy ($r = .30, p < .01$), college advising satisfaction and success ($r = .50, p < .001$), college advising satisfaction and motivation ($r = .56, p < .001$), motivation and self-efficacy ($r = .35, p < .01$), success and self-efficacy ($r = .60, p < .001$), and motivation and success ($r = .45, p < .001$). *See Figure 1 below.

*Figure 1

		Correlations				
		Hsadvising	cadvising	motivation	success	self efficacy
hsadvising	Pearson Correlation	1	.20	.09	.10	-.04
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.06	.42	.36	.70
	N	90	90	90	89	89
cadvising	Pearson Correlation	.20	1	.56**	.49**	.30**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.059		.000	.000	.005
	N	90	90	90	89	89
motivation	Pearson Correlation	.09	.56**	1	.45**	.35**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.421	.000		.000	.001
	N	90	90	90	89	89
success	Pearson Correlation	.10	.50**	.45**	1	.60**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.356	.000	.000		.000
	N	89	89	89	89	89
self efficacy	Pearson Correlation	-.04	.30**	.35**	.60**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.695	.005	.001	.000	
	N	89	89	89	89	89

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Qualitative Results

In response to the first question, “What does success mean to you?” 27 out of the 90 participants used the word ‘goal’ in their answer, mainly about achieving them. In addition, 25 out of the 90 participants mentioned ‘happy’ or ‘happiness’ in their answer, and 24 mentioned ‘career’ or ‘job,’ mainly attaining and maintaining one. Other trends were feeling that success meant being financially stable, or living a comfortable lifestyle, as well as being on good terms with, and able to take care of their family. This suggests that students are motivated by these factors in order to attain their definition of success.

Answers to the second question, “Do you feel that you are actually successful?” varied however the most common responses were either yes, or tended to relate to students feeling that

they are not successful yet, but they will be soon, or are successful so far, but still working toward it. Other trends included 'sometimes' or 'kind of.' For example one student writes, "I feel like there are aspects in my life I am successful at and other areas I can still work on." Another student writes "I am successful thus far, but I have a long way to go." There were also 12 that answered "no." This suggests that many students do not feel that just getting to college is success, rather, it is establishing the life after graduation that they will feel they are successful.

The last question, "What things do you think could have been done differently to help prepare you to be successful in terms of the education system you experienced?" elicited the most diverse responses. For example, some responses reported wishing that high school had prepared them with classes that had more real world applications like finance, or other life skills. One student answered, "Setting up highschool classes & exams to be of a similar format of those in college, and for college classes to be a more accurate representation of real world scenarios." In addition, several answers reported wishing that communication had been better with advisors. A few responses also brought up financial issues, for example, "If it was less expensive, going to start a hole and have to climb out." Another response was, "My high school advisors were rude, uninspiring, and made students feel they weren't good enough unless I went to U of M or MSU. They talked down on community college and made fun of it even though it's a great financial option." This is an interesting response because of the potential stigma attached to a 'community college' verses a 'university.' This may have worked to decrease this student's communication satisfaction with this advisor.

In addition, some students reflected on wishing they had taken more AP and honors courses during high school. Others wished they had been more involved on campus and that they would have had more opportunities to explore career options. These findings suggest that

students are unhappy with the course content in high school, and might have been better prepared for college if they had learned more real life skills, and had better opportunities to explore career choices in both high school and college courses. A significant number of students reported that they felt adequately prepared for college.

Discussion

The findings of this study are consistent with Conley (2005), suggesting that high school factors like classes and grade point average are not accurate predictors for college success. Instead, these findings suggest that college advising is an important factor when considering students satisfaction, motivation, and success. Students that had higher levels of satisfaction with the advising they received in college showed higher levels of motivation, felt more successful, and felt a stronger sense of self-efficacy. This supports the implications of Goodboy, Martin, & Bolkan (2009) because the use of the SCSS scale for this study provided useful results in order to examine factors affecting students' success.

This also supports the findings from Sheldon, Garton, Orr, & Smith (2015) in that college advisors do have an impact on students' GPA, which could arguably be a sense of success for students, therefore improving their motivation and self-efficacy. Students' satisfaction with the communication they have with their college advisors may also be related to the extent that students identify with academics (Osborne, 1997). If a student gets satisfaction from talking with their college advisor, this may lead to them feeling that they belong at the college and, therefore, cause them to be more motivated to succeed. While many colleges do offer substantial advising opportunities, the findings from study lead to the idea that college advising may be an influential factor on students' road to success.

Another finding was the strong relationship between the higher levels of perceived success leading to higher self-efficacy. Because perceived success could stem from students' college experiences, this could also be related to the advising they received in college which would then lead them to do better in their college courses, and eventually feel that they are able to do more things. Students' with higher motivation also showed higher self-efficacy and perceived success. This supports findings from Walker, Greene, & Mansell (2006) who suggest that higher self-efficacy leads to the likeliness of students taking on challenges and succeeding in them. Motivation could arguably be connected to satisfaction with college advisors as well, therefore, further pointing to the idea that emphasis should be put on increasing students' satisfaction with their college advisors and encouraging student to communicate with them more.

It is important to note that this study found no significant relationship pointing to high school factors being accurate predictors for college success. Though the qualitative results revealed that students wished they had been offered more courses in high school that would have better prepared them for college and taught them life skills in general, the other data pointed to satisfaction with college advising being a more important factor when considering students' success. In addition, the qualitative results also brought to light some negative associations with high school advisors because they have the possibility to taint students' opinions about college, which students revealed is an important factor when considering what success means to them. The qualitative results revealed a consistent theme with Matteson (2013) because of the number of students who felt that if they had taken more AP courses in high school, they would have had a better chance of succeeding in college.

The results of this study suggest a need for further analysis of the way that students' satisfaction with communication throughout their educational experience affects their success,

motivation, and self-efficacy. Though academic factors like GPA and AP/Honors courses can still be beneficial for students to feel successful, communication with advisors, and the satisfaction that students' feel with these experiences, may prove to be an important area of study when predicting and pushing students toward success. Students who finish high school and enter college are known to react differently to the new educational setting. However, results from this study suggest that by increasing the chances that students will be satisfied with the communication they experience with their advisors in college, the more motivated they will be, the more successful they will feel, and the more confidence they will have in believing that that they can accomplish the challenges before them. This study revealed the significance of satisfaction with communication with college advisors. However, the SCSS may prove valuable when developed for a wide variety of educational and communication settings in order to learn more about how to predict students' success as well as increase the chances of students succeeding in life.

Limitations

Firstly, a limitation of this study may be that it offered no base line for ideas of success in high school verses college. Students were asked what success means to them, but this offered no insight into what success meant to them while they were attending high school or specific success in college. This may have been the reason for most responses revolving around overall success in life rather than success in the educational setting. Results did not lead to a better understanding of what students feel are important educational goals which may have helped to shed light on why or why not students feel successful. Secondly, the correlation data does not provide causation. So, although these variables were related, results did not show that one variable caused the other which may have led to stronger findings.

Future Research

This study revealed the potential value that the SCSS scale has when used to examine students' communication satisfaction with college advisors. Future research should aim to bring to light factors that have not been previously examined and determine if they will help college students succeed. Findings from future research may prove to be important for educators in order to more fully understand the role of communication and students' satisfaction with the communicative events they experience in order to provide a better educational environment and help college students succeed.

References

- Abdel-Salam, T., Kauffmann, P., & Williamson, K. (2005). A case study: Do high school GPA/SAT scores predict the performance of freshmen engineering students? *Frontiers in Education Conference*.7-11.
- Bahr, P. R. (2008). What is the effect of academic advising on students' chances of success? *Research in Higher Education*, 49(8), 704-732.
- Betts, J. R. & Morell, D. (1999). The determinants of undergraduate grade point average: The relative importance of family background, high school resources, and peer group effects. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 34(2), 268-293.
- Bloom, S., & Peters, F. (1961). *The use of academic prediction scales for counseling and selecting college entrants*. New York, NY: Free Press of Glencoe.
- Bowers, R. (1918). How should the high school prepare for college? *The Journal of Education*, 87(5), 117-118.
- Chee, K. H., Pino, N. W., & Smith, W. L. (2005). Gender differences in the academic ethic and academic achievement. *College Student Journal*, 39(3), 604+.
- Chen, G., Gully, S. M., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a new general self-efficacy scale. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4(1), 62-83.
- Clark, B. R. (1960). The 'cooling-out' function in higher education. *American Journal of Sociology*, 65, 569-576.
- Conley, D. (2005). Align high school with college for greater student success. *Education Digest*, 71(2), 4-12.

- Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2002). Motivational beliefs, values, and goals. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*, 109–132. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135153
- French, M. T., Homer, J. F., Popovici, I., & Robins, P. K. (2015). What you do in high school matters: High school GPA, educational attainment, and labor market earnings as a young adult. *Eastern Economic Journal, 41*, 370-386.
- Goodboy, A. K., Martin, M. M., & Bolkan, S. (2009). The development and validation of the student communication satisfaction scale. *Communication Education, 58*(3), 372-396.
- Greene, B. A., & Miller, R. B. (1996). Influences on achievement: Goals, perceived ability, and cognitive engagement. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 21*, 181-192.
- Guay, F., Vallerand, R. J., & Blanchard, C. (2000). On the assessment of situational intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: The situational motivation scale (SIMS). *Motivation and Emotion, 24*(3), 175-213.
- Hanushek, E. A. (1997). Assessing the effects of school resources on student performance: An update. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 19*(2), 141-164.
- Hedges, L., & Majer, K. (1976). An attempt to improve prediction of college success of minority students by adjusting for high school characteristics. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 36*, 953-957. Retrieved from <http://epm.sagepub.com.huaryu.kl.oakland.edu/content/36/4/953.full.pdf+html>
- Kuh, G. (2007). What student engagement data tell us about college readiness. *Peer Review, 9*(1), 5-8. Retrieved from

<http://search.proquest.com/openview/5ba5a91c9be45673e082bd3b61789788/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=26636>

Lin, Y., McKeachie, W. J., & Kim, Y. C. (2003). College student intrinsic and/or extrinsic motivation and learning. *Learning and Individual Differences, 13*, 251-258.

Mangan, K. (2015). High-school diploma options multiply, but they may not prepare students for success in college. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 62*(9), A23.

Matteson, S. (2013). College students' perceptions of college preparedness. Available from *ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global*. (1317602639). Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.huaryu.kl.oakland.edu/docview/1317602639?accountid=12924>

Osborne, J. W. (1997). Identification with academics and academic success among community college students. *Community College Review, 25*(1), 59-67.

Phillippo, K. (2010). Teachers providing social and emotional support: A study of advisor role enactment in small high schools. *Teachers College Record, 112*(8), 2258-2293.

Pike, G. & Saupe, J. (2002). Does high school matter? An analysis of three methods of predicting first-year grades. *Research in Higher Education, 43*(2), 187-207.

Rabideau, T., S. (2005). Effects of achievement motivation on behavior. *Rochester Institute of Technology*. Retrieved from: <http://www.personalityresearch.org/papers/rabideau.html>

Sheldon, K. M., Garton, B., Orr, R., & Smith, A. (2015). The advisor quality survey: Good college advisors are available, knowledgeable, and autonomy supportive. *Journal of College Student Development, 56*(3), 261-273.

Taylor, G., Jungert, T., Mageau, G., Schattke, K., Dedic, H., Rosenfield, S., & Koestner, R.

(2014). A self-determination theory approach to predicting school achievement over time: the unique role of intrinsic motivation. *Contemporary Education Psychology, 39*, 342-358.

Voelkl, K. E. (1997). Identification with school. *American Journal of Education, 105*(3), 294-318.

Walker, C. O., Greene, B. A., & Mansell, R. A. (2006). Identification with academics, intrinsic/extrinsic motivation, and self-efficacy as predictors of cognitive engagement. *Learning and Individual Differences, 16*(1), 1-12.

Warne, R., Ngaishi, C., Slade, M., Hermesmeyer, P., & Peck, E. (2014). Comparing weighted and unweighted grade point averages in predicting college success of diverse and low-income college students. *NASSP Bulletin, 98*(4), 261-279.

Wright, S. L., Jenkins-Guarnieri, M. A., & Murdock, J. L. (2012). Career development among first-year college students: College self-efficacy, student persistence, and academic success. *Journal of Career Development, 40*(4), 292-310.

Zhou, W., Sun, J., Guan, Y., Li, Y., & Pan, J. (2012). Criteria of career success among Chinese employees: Developing a multidimensional scale with qualitative and quantitative approaches. *Journal of Career Assessment, 21*(2), 265-277.