Running Head: STUDENT VETERANS

Student Veterans Returning to a Community College: Understanding Their Transitions

Corey B. Rumann
Ph.D. Candidate, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
Iowa State University
924 Kellogg Avenue
Ames, IA 50010
307-272-3488
rumannc@gmail.com

Abstract

This research paper will present the findings of a qualitative research study investigating the transition experiences of student veterans who re-enrolled at a community college following a military war zone deployment. Implications for student affairs practice and recommendations for future research will also be discussed. Schlossberg's theory of transition served as the theoretical framework for this study.

Introduction

Higher education and the military have been formally linked since the Morrill Act of 1862 which mandated that land grant institutions of higher education had to offer military training as part of their curriculum (Abrams, 1989; Neiberg, 2000).   Then, with the introduction of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (popularly known as the GI Bill) after World War II, many veterans took advantage of the educational benefits it provided and entered or returned to college (Olson, 1973, 1974).   During the WWII era, institutions of higher education began to consider institutional preparedness for the entering student veteran population.   However, there is only a small body of information concerning the challenges, successes, and adjustments of war veterans through the years with respect to their transitions into college following military service.

Now, with the introduction of the Post 9/11 GI Bill which went into effect on August 1st, 2009 and the increasing numbers of student veterans returning to college, the higher education community is beginning to realize again the importance of understanding the war veterans' transition experiences into college and providing appropriate support programs (Cook & Kim, 2009).   However, the experiences of war veterans making the transition from servicemember to college student are not clearly

understood. To date only three research studies have explored this transition experience (Bauman, 2009; DiRamio, Ackerman, & Mitchell, 2008; Rumann & Hamrick, in press), and none focused on community college settings. Consequently, community colleges and other institutions of higher education may not possess the information necessary to assist these students effectively. More research will broaden the knowledge base in this area and ultimately inform effective institutional practice and policy making.

This research paper will present the findings and implications for practice of a qualitative research study investigating the transition experiences of six student veterans who re-enrolled at a community college following a military deployment overseas. Through data analysis and the theme development process four themes were identified that represented the participants' transition experiences. For the purposes of this paper, two of the four themes will be presented and discussed: (a) Purpose: Increased Maturity and Changes in Perspective and (b) Re-situating and Negotiating Identities. These two themes have been selected to provide a more focused discussion of participants' experiences related to perceptions of self and the meaning making process related to their acquisition of a veteran social identity.

Related Literature

Scholarly work focused on the returning veteran as a college student is limited (LaBarre, 1985). The majority of studies pertained to the post-WWII era and most focused on the scholastic achievement of veterans. However, some studies focused more narrowly on the adjustment and personal experiences of veterans enrolling in college. A handful of studies on academic achievement of WWII veterans revealed positive outcomes. WWII veterans consistently showed superior academic performance over their

non-veteran counterparts (Clark, 1947; Garmezy & Crose, 1948; Gowan, 1947; Hansen & Paterson, 1949; Love & Hutchison, 1946; Thompson & Pressey, 1948). Some research focused on academic adjustment issues of WWII veterans enrolled in college (Hadley, 1945; Kinzer, 1946). Kinzer (1946) and Hadley (1945) found that the veteran students reported feeling out of place, nervous, lacking in self-confidence and concerned about college success. However, these students also reported that the study skills course in which they were enrolled helped them to overcome many of those difficulties. Physical and mental health issues were typical concerns for WWII veterans (Hadley, 1945; Kinzer, 1946), and both studies noted both the college counseling needs of the veteran student population and recommendations to address these needs (Toven, 1945; Williamson, 1944). Scholars also expected that World War II veterans would bring a higher level of maturity, compared to their non-veteran peers (Shaw, 1947; Titus, 1944; Washton, 1945), which generally turned out to be the case (Toven, 1945). However, veterans' increased maturity could create a gap between veterans and non-veteran students, and change the face of the student population, thus altering students' expectations of the higher education system (Titus, 1944; Williamson, 1944). Unlike many non-veteran students, veterans entered college with more focus and sense of purpose and no-nonsense attitudes; because they had set very specific goals that they wanted to meet (Kinzer, 1946).

Vietnam War veterans returned to a much different set of circumstances than did veterans of previous wars, including college campuses, where opposition to the war was high and negative feelings toward veterans were evident (Horan, 1990b). For many Vietnam War veterans feeling unwelcome at home and on college campuses led to a feeling of unease during the collegiate experience. (Horan, 1990a, 1990b).

The psychological adjustment difficulties of returning Vietnam veterans have been well documented (Hendin & Hass, 1991; Horan, 1990a, 1990b), but little has been written about the experiences of Vietnam veterans coming to college. Confounding these individual problems was relatively low support for this group of students at college campuses from staff and administrators (Ackerman & DiRamio, 2009). The college completion rates of Vietnam War veterans initially were lower in comparison to non-veteran students (MacLean, 2005; Teachman, 2005). However, Vietnam veteran students academically outperformed non-veteran students, and veterans who had pre-war college experience—just like their WW II counterparts—did even better academically than they had prior to their active duty service (Joanning, 1975).

To date, only three studies have addressed the transition processes of contemporary student veterans who served in Kuwait, Iraq or Afghanistan, and enrolled or re-enrolled in college following their deployment (Bauman, 2009; DiRamio et al., 2008; Rumann & Hamrick, in press). DiRamio et al. (2008) interviewed 25 student veterans enrolled in one of three higher education institutions who either began or returned to college after active duty in Iraq or Afghanistan. Rumann and Hamrick (in press) conducted in-depth interviews with six student veterans about their transition experiences returning to college following their deployment. Both studies identified a number of challenges that student veterans faced going to college following their military service, such as concerns about inadequate funding for college or loan repayments, relationship difficulties with friends, family, and college peers upon their return, adjustment difficulties (such as having to re-learn study skills), ambivalence about being recognized for their service and shifting from the military environment to the less

structured college environment. Findings from Rumann and Hamrick's work also suggested that the student veterans engaged in processes of self re-identification and assessment, prompted by the perception that, in important ways, they were not the same people they had been prior to deployment. Participants in both studies also reported positive outcomes, such as increased maturity and focus on their academic pursuits, attributed wholly or in part to their military experience (DiRamio et al., 2008; Rumann & Hamrick, in press). The DiRamio et al. study included student veterans who were in college prior to deployment, as well as those enrolling in college for the first time after military service. Rumann and Hamrick focused on National Guard and Reserve members who were in college before being deployed and had subsequently re-enrolled. Both studies used theoretical frameworks associated with Schlossberg's adult transition theory (Goodman, Schlossberg, & Anderson, 2006) to explore and characterize these students' transitions. Rumann and Hamrick also used aspects of Abes, Jones, and McEwen's (2007) reconceptualization of the multiple identities model (Jones & McEwen, 2000) to help explain some of the identity re-identification issues student veterans in their study faced during their transition which proved to be an effective way to help conceptualize that process.

Contemporary transitions from being a soldier in a war zone to a college student can be difficult for many returning student veterans (Stringer, 2007; Zdechlik, 2005). A number of returning veterans encounter stress-related mental health issues as a result of their deployment and subsequent transition back to civilian life (Hoge, Auchterlonie, & Milliken, 2006), with depression and post traumatic stress disorder particularly being concerns (Hosek, Kavanagh, & Miller, 2006). Servicemembers returning from

deployment experienced a "range of problems when they returned from Iraq, including difficulty sleeping, strong reactions to loud noises, anger, excessive drinking, flashbacks to casualty situations and anxiety" (Hosek et al., 2006, p. 93).

The college environment is also very different from the military war zone environment, further complicating the transition process (Stringer, 2007). Soldiers in a war zone lead a more structured and routine life than most college students, and the loss of connections with military friends and peers can make student veterans feel out of place on college campuses upon their return (Rumann & Hamrick, in press). Student veterans may also encounter significant financial difficulties if their accrued educational benefits (e.g., the GI Bill) do not cover college costs (Farrell, 2005; Stringer, 2007). Other veterans, especially those with physical injuries suffered as a result of their wartime service, may experience additional transition challenges (Stringer, 2007). Traumatic brain injury (TBI) (Okie, 2005) and limbs or sight lost to improvised explosive devices (IED) (Gawande, 2004) are some of the more common physical injuries suffered by troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. Student veterans who have disabilities as a result of their wartime service bring into question colleges' and universities' preparedness for working with them (DiRamio et al., 2008).

Colleges and universities are beginning to plan and develop programs and services to support returning war veterans (Cook & Kim, 2009; Stringer, 2007). Some examples of the programs being developed are courses designed to assist returning Iraq war veterans with their transitions back to civilian life (Quillen-Armstrong, 2007) and veterans' groups on campus, (McDaniel, 2004; Summerlot, Green, & Parker, 2009). Federal programs are available for qualifying veterans, like Veterans Upward Bound

(established in 1965 as part of the Upward Bound Program), which provides support and transitional services to veterans who meet eligibility criteria (National Veterans Upward Bound Program, n.d.). Additionally, the Student Veterans of America (SVA) was created to bring student veterans together through dialogue and support (Student Veterans of America, 2008).

Sources focusing on the transition experiences of student veterans are limited, and deal primarily with academic adjustments and anecdotal reports of transitioning student veterans' needs. More systematic inquiries like the current study are needed to help inform the higher education community about the transition processes for student veterans, including relationships with students and faculty and integration into college environment.

Community Colleges

Since military operations began following the September 11th, 2001 attacks, approximately 80 percent of all colleges and universities, and 91 percent of public community colleges, have had students withdraw during an academic term upon activation for military service (Ashby, 2006). Large numbers of student veterans are enrolled in community colleges (Field, 2008), and many student veterans will re-enter or return to a community college following their tour of duty. Overall, student veterans tend to be more highly concentrated at two year colleges compared to all other institutional types (Radford, 2009).

Community colleges may offer student veterans a more appealing setting for higher education than do universities. Nationally, the community college population is becoming increasingly more diverse (Bragg, 2001). Student veterans are often married,

and usually older than the traditional college student (Field, 2008; Radford, 2009), and many community colleges gear services toward non-traditional students (Rosenbaum, Deil-Amen, & Person, 2006). Community colleges provide students relatively open access to flexible curricula at lower costs than most universities (Bragg, 2001) making community colleges a more viable financial option, since veterans' educational benefits are often not sufficient to cover the full costs of going to college—especially at private and public universities (Farrell, 2005; Field, 2008; Stringer, 2007). However, it is now more likely student veterans will be able to afford to attend public, four year institutions with higher tuitions since funding from the Post 9/11 GI Bill will cover tuition costs up to the most expensive public, state institution (Radford, 2009). In addition, the Yellow Ribbon Program further expands student veterans' enrollment options at private non-profit and for-profit institutions (Eckstein, 2009). On the other hand, community colleges have historically served more student veterans so they already have some of the infrastructure in place to support these students and may be better prepared to support contemporary student veterans (Eckstein, 2009; Moltz, 2009). Community college campuses are also often conveniently located (e.g., near military bases) (Field, 2008), and do not require relocation or long commutes, which may be especially important considerations for National Guard and Reserve servicemembers who must continue their National Guard or Reserve responsibilities following their deployments, and who cannot relocate without being assigned to a different unit. Community colleges are also taking the lead in providing education to student veterans through innovative distance education programs (Halligan, 2007) and courses designed to help student veterans transition back to civilian life (Quillen-Armstrong, 2007).

For these reasons, community colleges appear to be well prepared to help ease the transition of students, and community colleges possess a number of characteristics that make them geographically and financially appealing to veterans who re-enroll in college (Field, 2008). Choosing community colleges as the sites for this study was also practical, because larger numbers of veterans attend two year colleges than four year public or private non-profit institutions (Field, 2008; Radford, 2009).

Theoretical Framework

Schlossberg's theory of adult transition served as the primary framework for this research study (Goodman et al., 2006) as it has for two other studies of student veterans' transition experiences (DiRamio et al., 2008; Rumann & Hamrick, in press). Knowledge of Schlossberg's theory of transition is a useful tool for understanding individual transitions because it "provides insights into factors related to the transition, the individual, and the environment that are likely to determine the degree of impact a given transition will have at a particular point in time" (Evans, Forney, & Guido-DiBrito, 1998, p. 107). Based on the tenets of Schlossberg's theory, Goodman et al. (2006) described a transition as "any event, or non-event, that result in changed relationships, routines, assumptions, and roles" (p. 33) and events can be either anticipated or unanticipated (or a non-event). Finally, Schlossberg's theory described "moving in", "moving through", and "moving out" as key transitional processes (Goodman et al., 2006). This theoretical framework provided an initial sense of the factors and issues of which to be aware as I sought to understand the participants' experiences and perspectives

Goodman et al. (2006) adopted Schlossberg's theory to counseling settings and elaborated the four factors affecting how people are able to cope with transitions:

situation, self, support, and strategies (the four S's). The situation itself can impact the

degree to which the transition affects the person's functioning. The self refers to the

individual's personal coping mechanisms and how well the person is prepared to deal

with transitions based on personal characteristics such as resiliency and self efficacy.

Support is the outside resources an individual has in her or his life such as family,

relationships, friends, and community that make the transition more or less difficult to

handle. And finally strategies are the means by which the person faces and handles the

transition process itself and the tools she or he uses to cope with the situation. Goodman

et al. noted that "an individual's appraisal and reappraisal of a transition and of his or her

resources for coping can be examined in light of the 4 S's" (p. 58). The model's "four

S's" (situation, self, support, and strategies) guided the interviewing process, including

generation of interview questions, as well as some aspects of data analyses.

During the data collection and analysis processes participants' perceptions of their

identities based on their newly acquired veteran status emerged as a thematic finding.

Identity re-negotiations or re-examinations have been identified as a potentially

prominent factor for people who are experiencing life transitions (Goodman et al., 2006).

Therefore, Abes et al's (2007) multiple identities model—which is a reconceptualization

of Jones and McEwen's (2000) model—was also used to help understand participants'

experiences. This was also the case in Rumann and Hamrick's (in press) study of student

veterans' transitions where this model helped to conceptualize their participants'

transition experiences. Abes et al.'s model emphasizes individuals' meaning making

process and self perceptions of their concurrent social identities. These social identities

are "roles or memberships categories that a person claims as representative" (Deaux,

1993, p. 6). In this case, participants were negotiating how they envisioned their newly acquired social role of "veteran" with pre-deployment social roles such as "servicemember" and "college student". In addition, these social roles are more or less salient depending on environmental cues and social factors in the person's life along with external influences such as peers, stereotypes, and sociopolitical conditions (Abes et al., 2007).

The purpose of this study was to explore the transition experiences of student veterans who had re-enrolled at a community college following a military deployment to continue their academic pursuits. I wanted to understand these student veterans' experiences from their unique perspectives so I chose to use a qualitative, phenomenological research design using Schlossberg's theory of transition at the guiding theoretical framework.

Methodology, Methods, and Design

I selected a phenomenological methodology approach to investigate the nature of the students' transition experiences and the ways in which they ascribed meaning to the transition. According to Merriam (2002), "the defining characteristic of phenomenological research is its focus on describing the 'essence' of a phenomenon from the perspectives of those who have experienced it" (p. 93). This approach also allowed the participants to tell their stories from their unique perspectives and the meaning they made from those experiences. Interviewing was the primary data collection method which is a common method for data collection when conducting phenomenological research (Esterberg, 2002). A limited number of observations and occasional meetings

with the veterans' affairs certifying official (VACO) at each site served as supplementary sources of data.

Data collection

A series of three semi-structured interviews (Seidman, 2006) was held with each participant. All interviews were conducted in person and were audio taped with participants' consent. Each interview contact lasted between 60 and 90 minutes, and all interview tapes were transcribed verbatim for analyses. This approach allowed extended time for building rapport and trust with participants and permitted in-depth focuses on multiple aspects of participants' transitional experiences. The broad interview topical questions were designed with Schlossberg's 4 S's in mind and included focuses on participants' situations returning to college, their self assessments, support systems relevant to the transition, and the strategies they adopted to assist them through the transition itself.

This first interview was semi-structured to make the interview situation more open so the participants had more control over what they choose to share and how they answered the questions (Esterberg, 2002). Interviews also gave me the opportunity to use my abilities to ask follow up questions and probe in order to further clarify the participants' initial answers which produced more rich and thick data (Esterberg, 2002). During the initial interviews trust began to develop between me and the participants; however, building trust is a "*developmental* process" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 303) that takes time. One advantage of conducting a three interview series was more time to establish trust with the participants (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Following the first interview the participants were provided with a copy of their interview transcript and

asked to check the transcript for accuracy and to provide any feedback they deemed

necessary for clarification purposes. Participants were asked to clarify any points they

(or I) deemed necessary and make corrections or additions to the transcripts themselves.

These requests resulted in only a couple of the participants making minor corrections and

clarifications to their transcripts typically related to military lingo and/or their college re-

enrollment and deployment timelines.

The questions and issues addressed during the second interview arose from the

data gathered during the first interview with each of the participants, and it also provided

the participants with a face to face opportunity to clarify points from the first interview

and my preliminary analyses. Similarly to the first interview questions the questions

asked during the second interview were developed with Schlossberg's 4 S's in mind.

During the second interview I asked the participants to provide more detailed information

about their transition experiences (e. g., relationships with peers, family, and faculty) than

was the case in the first interview so that more descriptive data could be collected

(Seidman, 2006). Following the second interview participants were provided with a copy

of their interview transcript for their review and asked to make corrections and/or add

clarifications if necessary. Again, some of the participants made only minor changes and

corrections while others made none at all.

The third interview was less structured in nature than the previous two and was

conducted to address emerging themes and to clarify any points me and/or the

participants deemed necessary with regard to my data analyses. Building on the data

gathered during the previous two interviews I asked the participants to reflect on how

they make meaning of their transition experiences re-enrolling in college and how being

in the military interacts with their current situations being in college (Seidman, 2006).

Both the second and third interviews were opportunities to strengthen the member checking strategy (described in more detail later) employed for this study rather than relying solely on other sources of communication such as telephone and email correspondence. Member checking should be an ongoing process and can be "both formal and informal" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 314). During the interview process I initiated immediate member checking with the participants at various points during the interview itself as well as investigated participants' feelings and reactions regarding my data analyses and theme development in a more planned and systematic way (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Participant observations of participants in their community college settings supplemented the interview data and served as another way to build trust and rapport with the participants. For example, I observed Jeff as he gave a speech about the Marines during a speech competition at Dove Community College. I also observed Frank during a biology class at Killdeer Community college and Josh during one of his cooking classes where they were being taught to prepare a chicken dish.

Finally, meetings with the Veterans Affairs certifying officials (VACOs) at both research sites provided additional perspectives for understanding institutional contexts for participants' transition experiences as did participation in various college activities related to student veterans (e.g., Veterans Day activities and veterans organization events).

Research sites and participant selection

All participants were enrolled at one of two community colleges in the Midwest. Six student veterans, five men and one woman, were the participants for this study. The two colleges were the largest in the state in terms of overall student enrollment and had the highest number of student veterans enrolled in their colleges compared to all other state institutions including four year institutions. Initially, I planned to use only one research site, Dove Community College, for this study. However, due to the low number of student veterans I was able to recruit at that site who matched the eligibility criteria for this study a second research site was located. This difficulty was not due to a lack of responses from student veterans who were willing to participate in the study. Rather, the eligibility requirement (i.e., in college before being deployed *and* re-enrollment upon their return) for the study was the primary reason so few student veterans were initially recruited.

Potential participants were identified through purposeful and referral sampling (Esterberg, 2002). Selection criteria included participants' withdrawal from college upon activation and reenrollment in college upon their return. Two of the participants, both men, were enrolled at one of the research sites, Dove Community College, while the other four, three men and one woman, were enrolled at the other site, Killdeer Community College (pseudonyms). A more direct recruiting effort was employed at the second research site where the VACO at Killdeer Community College contacted participants via email she believed matched the eligibility criteria based on the type of GI Bill funding they were receiving. This resulted in a less challenging process identifying student veterans for the study.

Data analysis and trustworthiness

Data were open coded through a first review to identify initial topics followed by a more focused coding process to identify potential categories (Esterberg, 2002). Thematic findings were created following additional inductive analyses of categories and coded data that represented participants lived experiences. The themes that were identified were indicative of participants' meaning making process returning from an overseas deployment and reenrolling in college. I also looked for discrepancies in the data to identify issues and perspectives that may have differed among participants (Creswell, 2003). The data collection and analysis process continued until the point of saturation where no additional categories or emerging themes were being identified (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Observations and discussions with each site's VACO served as supplementary data.

Throughout the data analysis process member checking (Lincloln & Guba, 1985) was used to strengthen the credibility of the findings. Participants were provided with and asked to review their transcripts and were also provided with my interpretations and thematic findings throughout the course of the study for their feedback. In addition, using a three interview series and follow up contacts further strengthened the credibility of findings through prolonged engagement. Initial thematic findings were also reviewed by a peer debriefer and reviewed by one expert reviewer. All field notes, interview transcripts, researcher memos, and correspondence were organized and preserved, constructing an audit trail (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) that also assisted the researcher with reviewing evidence and findings.

Participants

Six student veterans, five men (pseudonyms of Jeff, Frank, Toby, Josh, and Matt) and one woman (pseudonym of Tanya) were the participants for this study ranging in ages from 22 to 28 years old. See Table 1 for summary information about participants. All of the participants self identified as white, except for Jeff, who identified himself as Latino. As would be expected, their family backgrounds were diverse. Jeff's and Frank's fathers had both served in the military. Participants also varied in their motivations to join the military, but only one, Frank, expressed financial assistance for college as the primary reason he initially joined. However, both Toby and Tanya stated that financial incentives were at least partly responsible for their decisions to re-enlist. One participant, Toby, had been deployed on two occasions, whereas the others had been deployed but once.

Table1. Participants

Name^	Academic Major	Age	Class Standing	Affiliation	Military Occupational Specialty (MOS)	Months Deployed	Semesters Re-enrolled*
Jeff	Political Science and International Studies	22	Sophomore	Marine Reserves	Infantry	12 months	1
Frank	Interdepartmental Studies	23	Junior	Air National Guard	Security Forces	7 months	7
Josh	Culinary Arts	21	Sophomore	Army National Guard	Administrative Specialist and Infantry	11 months	2
Tanya	Social Work	24	Sophomore	Army Reserve	Combat Medic	13 months	3
Matt	Fire Science	23	Sophomore	Army National Guard	Combat Engineer	13 months	2
Toby	Mechanical Engineering	28	Junior	Army National Guard	Communications[1] then Postal Specialty[2]	12 months[1] 11 months[2]	1

^Names are pseudonyms
*The number of semesters re-enrolled in college at time of data collection
[1] 1st deployment to Afghanistan; [2] 2nd deployment to Egypt

Researcher Positionality

In this qualitative research study I was the primary data gathering tool, and it was impossible to separate myself from the research process and presume objectivity (Esterberg, 2002; Merriam, 2002). As noted by Esterberg "who you are and what qualities you bring to your work matter" (p. 62). Consequently, I needed to identify, understand, and be aware of my positionality as the researcher throughout the course of the study.

My more than ten years of experience (six at a community college) as a professional student counselor provided me with relevant theoretical knowledge, improved interviewing techniques, and strong human relations skills. These skills were utilized in this study, and they have been a major focus of my counselor training and ongoing professional development. This strong foundation helped participants feel comfortable in interviewing situations and helped me listen more carefully to their responses and formulate appropriate follow up questions.

I have never served in the U. S. military. However, a number of my friends served in the National Guard, some of whom had been deployed in January 2004 to serve in Iraq, and others who were not deployed but lived with the possibility of being activated. As a community college counselor, I worked with college students who, when activated, had to withdraw from college, and I worked with some college students who were considering re-enrolling following their deployments. My relationships with people who have served or are currently serving in the military were beneficial because it gave me a sense of the student servicemembers' apprehensions and concerns about deployment and, in some of the same cases, re-enrollment in college. My own lack of military service may be viewed as a disadvantage since participants might not have felt

comfortable talking to someone without similar experiences or without a personal understanding of military culture. However, my honesty with participants about my own background and my motivations for undertaking this study, as well as my counseling skills helped offset this potential disadvantage.

Between June and December 2006 I interviewed six returning student veterans at a four year institution who had re-entered college following their earlier activation and deployment to Kuwait, Iraq, or Afghanistan. The findings from that study (Rumann & Hamrick, in press) helped me appreciate the sacrifices of these student veterans and the importance of universities providing appropriate support for returning veterans.

Finally, before data collection and throughout the course of the study I met with the VACO at both research sites. The VACOs are not directly affiliated with the Department of Veterans Affairs (DVA). However, they assist students in applying for educational benefits and act as a liaison between the student and the DVA. The VACOs and I discussed the transition issues they see veterans facing when they come to college. They also discussed their role in helping those veterans to access educational benefits information and receive support resources both within and outside the college. These meetings helped me understand the perspectives and insights of two student affairs professionals who work to support and assist student veterans.

Findings

The transition of returning to college and civilian life for the participants was an ongoing process, complete with successes, challenges and personal insights. During the transition participants also realized changes in themselves and began to process what being a veteran meant to them and their overall identity makeup. Two themes are the

focus of this paper: increased maturity and changes in perspective and re-situating and negotiating identities

Increased Maturity and Changes in Perspective

Participants shared that, following their deployment, they felt like they approached life with a more determined sense of purpose, which affected different areas of their lives: educational pursuits, relationships, and decisions about their future. Participants also described feeling more mature and intentional in their actions than their college peers, which they attributed at least in part to the "life experiences" of their overseas deployments.

Increased focus and heightened maturity. Many of the participants surmised that they felt more focused on their life goals, and looked more toward their futures. According to Jeff: "And after this deployment, I've realized that I need to be an adult, and start worrying about my future, and if anything happens, I can be financially stable." This increased focus included feeling more motivated in meeting their academic goals—a feeling Toby reinforced saying: "When I came back from Afghanistan I was driven and I was focused in classes, and like before I went, I'd go to class and I didn't care…I have a very, very, very strong desire to succeed." Some participants attributed this increased focus on obtaining their degrees to experiencing what it would be like to have to rely on being in the military full time. This realization translated to increased motivation for some of the participants. Frank noted: "I was definitely more motivated after seeing some the active duty guys with no education, or just if I didn't get an education what might happen." Toby felt similarly stating "I knew what I didn't want to be doing [was] working…for the Army in combat zones." However, while Frank and Toby

acknowledged experiencing certain military duties as motivation to get their degrees, they also noted that getting their college degrees meant they could be commissioned as an officer in the military. At the time of data collection, Toby was actively pursuing that route through the Army National Guard by joining ROTC, and Jeff and Frank were considering being officers in the military as possible career objectives. Other participants' career decisions were also influenced by their deployment experiences. For example, Tanya credited her deployment experiences with helping her to decide on a career field that gave her more of a reason to pursue her college degree:

> I'm definitely more focused now on my studies . . . previous to [my] deployment, I really didn't know what I wanted to do. And now, I definitely know what I want to do. I want to counsel veterans coming home from the combat zone. So, it's given me direction. And that's a great thing. I can concentrate more on my homework, and kind of apply it more, and I'm just getting a lot more out of school now, it seems.

Matt, on the other hand, did not make changes to his academic and career plans. However, he disclosed that, at times, he struggled with his motivation for college and that sometimes, "I stress out about it [college] too much," despite having a 3.14 GPA. On the other hand he noted, "The life experiences I learned definitely made it easier to come back to college and transition back into life, just because I was a little more aware of what I was doing, and what I wanted, and how I needed to go, and what I had to do." The importance of "life experiences" was expressed by other participants as well, and seemed to be closely related to their feelings of heightened maturity and having a focused life perspective—especially compared to their college peers.

Change in perspectives. Participants not only felt more mature as they transitioned back into the college environment, but also felt their perspectives had changed. Again, these changes were attributed at least in part to participants' life experiences during their military service. Jeff explained it this way:

> So it's like being mature, it's weird, being 23 and all the friends I've made here at [Dove Community College] are only 19 and 20. . . . But I mean, I don't know, it's nice . . . knowing that I've matured in that way. Knowing that I've done things that not everyone can do and can be like . . . if someone needs help with something, that they can call me and be like, "You know what? You've done things. Give us advice," and it's like, "Okay."

Jeff (and others) identified his age as being a factor in his perceptions of his increased maturity; however, participants also acknowledged that their life experiences in the military had changed their perspectives about what was important to them. Frank summed this change in the things he valued by saying, "And it's like, 'Why get worked up over all this little shit you know?' When you could be in 140 degree weather, working a b.s. post or, even worse, in Iraq getting an IED thrown at you." Many of the participants shared the belief that worrying about the little things in life was not something they found themselves doing so much after their deployments.

These changes in perspective also included a change in awareness and sensitivity to cultural differences. This was especially the case for participants who had more direct and sustained contact with people from ethnic backgrounds different from their own. For example, while in Iraq Josh befriended two young Iraqi boys who he "became friends with…. [It] kind of felt like they were my brothers kind of by the time I left." Similarly,

Toby "became friends with some Egyptians . . . even taking a couple trips to Cairo [and

had gone] to an Egyptian wedding." Before his deployment, Josh—who felt open-

minded before his deployment—was concerned that "I was afraid when I went over [that]

it was going to close my mind a little. I wasn't going to be able to see out of the box as

much, but actually [it] did the opposite of what I was thinking, actually opened it up

more." Jeff, on the other hand, went into the deployment with a much less open view of

the Iraqi culture. However, his experiences with the Iraqi people had a significant

influence on his attitudes toward them:

> It taught me that they're not, they're not all terrorists. I mean, when I went
>
> over there, all I heard were the stories of little kids, I mean, walking the streets
>
> with bombs on and just blowing up guys. Even moms and kids doing it, and it
>
> just made me upset, and when I got over there, that's all I saw them as, is
>
> "nothing"—they were like lower than me. And I just hated them because of
>
> 9/11 and everything else, and I was like, "Why would you do this?" But once
>
> I got to know them, I mean, they're just like me and you. . . . I grew to
>
> understand their way of living, their culture, how they're not like the terrorists
>
> are from 9/11. They're nothing like them.

Participants tended to be more appreciative of their privileges after their return.

Consequently, participants sometimes felt frustrated with other people, especially other

college students, who seemed to be concerned about minor issues, or who were closed-

minded about things going on in the world. Tanya saw this difference as being one of

priorities:

> The priorities are different, and I know sometimes I was like, you know, there

are more important things to worry about, there's people dying over there, and

you're worried about your outfit you're gonna wear out tonight, that kind of

thing. But then I'd have to step back and think to myself, you know this is

their life, you know, this is what's important to them right now, and they don't

know any different, you know?

So, as participants became more aware of these internal changes (i.e., increased

maturity and focus, increased openness and receptiveness to different perspectives), some

of them also became even more attuned to the problems resulting from people acting in

ways the participants perceived as being less mature. As Matt explained:

I came out of my shell more, just because of the life experiences, you know? I

mean, I'm older. I grew up a little bit. I've seen some stuff. I've definitely

experienced some stuff. So you come back and, yeah, you're different.

You're more open and you're just like, yeah, but at the same time, you know,

it's just the stupid things people do. It just drives you nuts. . . . Like the

people that speed around in their cars and dodge through traffic and almost

hitting people, and just don't care. You're just like, "What's wrong with you?

Overall, these new perceptions of themselves and others shaped the ways in

which participants felt different from many of their college peers. Participants did not

feel like typical college students, students who wanted to go out and party all the time.

Instead, they found themselves less concerned with having that type of lifestyle. As

Frank noted, "I rarely go out anymore." Or as Matt echoed, "I don't really want to go out

and drink and do all that." Toby even explained that he felt little concern with fitting in

with other college students.

Participants' perceptions that they felt differently about themselves than typical college students, and even other civilians do, go beyond lifestyle changes—especially since they were negotiating who they were as people now that they were veterans. This additional aspect to their identities affected their transition processes, as they figured out how being a veteran—with all the life experiences that went with that identity—shifted their identity as a whole. The following theme description explores this process.

Re-situating and Negotiating Identities

An important part of the transition process for participants was the process of re-situating their identities in light of their new status as veterans. A major factor in this process was their attempts to understand how their newly acquired veteran status impacted them as individuals, including their identity, their social roles, and their negotiations of their environments. Specifically, participants frequently expressed uncertainty regarding how to manage the feeling that they now existed in two worlds that did not seem to be readily straddled: the military world and the civilian world. As they transitioned back into their civilian and college student lives, participants realized that their veteran status had become part of their lives and personal identities, which created added responsibilities, newly acquired status, and the need to reflect on and understand how they and others saw themselves in the world. Throughout this process, participants also had to negotiate the impact of their veteran status on their re-enrollment in college and the meaning of their identity.

Re-situating their identities was an important aspect of the transition process for participants, since they experienced dissonance concerning who they were as people after they had returned. Matt explained that dissonance this way:

You kind of come back, you know, it's almost like you forget who you are

and what you kind of do. You got an idea, but it's like you're trying to

remember. And then just over time, you remember more and more. . . . It's

kind of something like that, to where you just feel yourself gradually changing

back.

Matt's explanation focused, then, trying to find his place in the world as the civilian he

was before he left.

However, nearly all the participants also seemed to find themselves within the

processes of both making meaning of their veteran identity and exploring how their

identity as a veteran affected their overall identity makeup. In other words, while they

were transitioning back to their civilian lives, they also recognized that their veteran

status was now a part of their overall identity makeup. This process of changing back,

then, involved negotiating how a new social identity of "veteran" fit into their lives.

Some participants saw their veteran role as being one of multiple social roles in their

lives. Jeff, for example, noted:

I don't look at us like, okay, someone looks up to me, "Oh, you're a veteran: I

have to give you all the respect in the world." I mean, I'm not just a veteran,

I'm a college student, I'm a brother, I'm a son [and] it's like the same thing as

everyone else does. It's just I have a deployment, and that was it.

Negotiating among being a veteran, a civilian and/or a college student was a

process of determining the most salient identity, depending upon participants' awareness

of context and situation. For example, as a civilian, Jeff's reactions to certain situations

were dependent upon the environment and his internalized sense of self—a dual

perception that the other participants shared. Tanya noted: "I was kind of caught between [the] civilian and military mindset[s] for quite awhile, I think. Once I got home, it was kind of like a battle . . . [I] had to constantly remind myself that I was a civilian." Toby further described this "battle" as trying to negotiate between two different lives: "I mean I'm trying to maintain two lives, two careers at the same time, you know, you're having your civilian education and life, and then you have your military on the other hand."

Moreover, finding ways to relieve this tension seemed to be part of the transition process, and participants were at different places—specifically concerning their understanding of the ways they enacted their social roles. For most of the participants a sort of duality emerged. On the one hand they saw their various roles as being separate and disconnected; on the other hand, they also grappled with integrating the roles into their personal identities.

Still, the need to live in two very different worlds—the civilian world and the military world—and the process of negotiating their different social identities was a common experience among the participants with their newly-acquired veteran status plus their service in a combat zone. Having served in a war zone deployment added a layer of role and identity complexity for participants as they struggled to decide when and how to disclose their veteran status and how to integrate their civilian, college student, and veteran identities. At times, participants preferred not to be recognized as veterans or military servicemembers, because they were not always sure how they would be received. In this way, the particular environments surrounding them influenced how they were negotiating and integrating their veteran status. Jeff noted that despite trying to conceal his veteran status by "growing out [his] hair and getting a goatee, and getting away from

it, and not wearing anything Marine Corps-related," he would still be identified easily by some people as a Marine. For example, he recounted being recognized as a Marine in the mall by a person who said he knew Jeff was a Marine simply by his demeanor and the way he carried himself. Jeff was concerned about people's general perceptions of servicemembers, because he did not want to be identified as being some sort of warmonger or war criminal. He noted:

> So, it's like sometimes you [want to] just cover it up, and just like get away from it, because it just bugs you, but then you kind of know that you can't get away from it. . . . So, I mean it's not like Vietnam or anything like that, I'm really happy for that, but. . . there's some people that just think negative[ly] about us.

Other participants also felt as though they were not easily recognized as veterans because, as Frank noted, "like you look at me and you don't see I'm in the military, you know, maybe with my haircut, but that's about it." Matt shared this sentiment, and mentioned that even he had difficulty identifying who was or was not a military servicemember. However, Matt and others did not necessarily mind being identified as veterans, and they would speak up in class or in other places to share their experiences if people seemed interested. According to Matt:

> It can be kind of a fun topic that comes up in class. Like the teacher asks something, and I'd be like, "Yeah, I've seen that." "Where?" "Iraq." "Oh, really?" Then, they start out asking questions, you know, and they're kind of surprised and stuff, but so I mean we don't stand out in any way. It's not stamped on my forehead.

Regardless of whether participants chose to disclose their veteran status, none of them wanted to be seen as flaunting their status. However, participants felt proud of being veterans and of being different in some ways from people who were not veterans. Josh explained, "I'm proud to be a veteran in the sense that I served my country." He went on to add, "It kind of seems you're more of a veteran if you [were] deployed." Other participants, like Toby, also recognized their relative uniqueness within the general population:

> One percent of the nation is serving in the armed forces, maybe, and even [a] smaller percentage of that is actually serving like in a combat zone or overseas, and that makes me [part of] a very small percent of the population that's doing this, which kind of, you know, it makes me proud that I'm able to do that.

Matt recognized the uniqueness of what he had done, as well: "It's [being a veteran] something that's really positive that's a smaller . . . percent of the population, so being a part of that is really cool." However, he also expressed wariness about broadcasting his status: "As far as being a veteran in general, you always got that little something, like not many people do that. So it's almost like you feel you got something on everybody else, but I don't get cocky about it." None of the participants wanted special treatment because of their veteran status. However, they unanimously agreed that they appreciated sincere gestures to recognize and thank them for their service. Frank said:

> Well, for me, this is just me personally, I'd just like to be treated like anyone else and . . . I think I also said that the only real acknowledgment that I would

like is just maybe indirect acknowledgment, you know, like having a student

veteran lounge or maybe, you know, if there was a campus movie theater

having benefits for veterans at a discounted rate . . . stuff like that.

Overall, while participants clearly delineated their various social identities, they

were also in the process of negotiating how all of their identities fit into their sense of self

and how their identities as veterans impacted their daily lives as civilians and college

students. This integration of veteran social identity into their lives was an ongoing

process for most, if not all, of the participants. As depicted above, participants' attempts

to define their identity were dependent upon many different factors including the

situation, people's reactions to their veteran status, and complications arising from living

in two worlds and enacting many different roles in their lives.

Limitations

A number of limitations must be considered with this study. First, the study's

small number of participants and their enrollment at two different community college

sites is an important limitation. As such, while the findings and implications may help to

inform the higher education community about student veterans' transition experiences,

the findings should not be generalized to other institutions, or even to other community

colleges.

Participants for the study were limited to student veterans who were enrolled in

college prior to their deployments and then re-enrolled following their return. In addition,

not all branches of the military were represented in the study which might be viewed as a

limitation. In addition, none of the participants reported mental or physical disabilities

related to their active duty. However, some participants disclosed some symptoms of

PTSD (e.g., startle response). In particular, Matt was initially diagnosed as suffering from PTSD, but his VA psychologist questioned the accuracy of the diagnosis.

Finally, even though all of the participants acknowledged that they felt comfortable talking to me about their experience, my own non-veteran, non-military status also could constitute a limitation; especially since participants disclosed that they felt more comfortable talking to their military peers and other veterans. I believe participants were open and honest with me about their experiences, especially since we focused on their transition experiences rather than their deployment experiences.

Discussion

As participants negotiated their transitions they realized internal changes in themselves that were different from what they had experienced prior to their deployments. According to Goodman et al. (2006), personal aspects serve as resources (e.g., psychological resources) that people in general, and participants in this specific transition, access as they manage their transitions. Goodman et al. go on to describe these types of characteristics as being "relevant for individuals as they cope with change" (p. 65). The participants in this study identified a number of personal factors that affected their transitions such as heightened feelings of maturity, changes in perspectives, increased awareness of and appreciation for cultural differences, and being in the process of negotiating what their veteran status will mean in terms of personal identity.

Maturity was a common and important point for the participants. They described feeling a heightened maturity on at least some level, and being unlike the "typical college student." Typically, participants felt older and more mature than most of their college student peers, and some felt like they had grown up quickly because of their deployment.

Along with heightened maturity, participants noted feeling more focused on, and motivated toward, their career goals, academic success and degree attainment—a perspective that is consistent with previous research (DiRamio et al., 2008; Kinzer, 1946; Rumann & Hamrick, in press; Toven, 1945). This increased focus and motivation was attributed at least in part to their deployment experiences. For many of the participants, this meant focusing strongly on long-term goals, which may not have been the case before they were deployed. For example, following his deployment, Jeff wanted to make sure he was prepared to take care of his family if the need arose. Others, like Toby, were determined (and hopeful) to complete their degrees before another deployment disrupted their academic pursuits. Or, as Tanya noted, her deployment had a direct and definitive influence on her career path decision, which resulted in her feeling more focused and motivated in college.

This increased motivation and focus on academics generally translated into many participants reporting higher grades than when they were enrolled in college before their deployment, a fact also found to be true for veterans of other wars (Hansen & Paterson, 1949; Joanning, 1975; Love & Hutchinson, 1946; Thompson & Pressey, 1948). For example, Toby earned significantly higher grades after he returned from Afghanistan, and performed well enough to be placed on the Dean's List, which had never happened to him in his pre-deployment academic experience.

Along with a change in perspective, many of the participants shared an increased awareness of, and appreciation for, cultural differences after having interacted with individuals of different cultures during their deployment. This finding is consistent with two previous studies that investigated transition experiences of student veterans

(DiRamio et al., 2008; Rumann & Hamrick, in press). This change in attitude seemed to be particularly strong for those participants who had more direct and sustained contact with different cultures (for example, Jeff and Josh in Iraq, and Toby in Egypt), but all participants noted being at least somewhat influenced by their experiences with local people. They felt an increased level of openness after they returned home, and less patience for the closed-minded attitudes of others.

These changes impacted the ways in which participants approached and experienced situations and relationships and how they managed their transitions. In other words, these personal changes served as personal resources that affected the participants' transition experiences overall and could be viewed as assets *and* liabilities depending on the circumstances. For example, participants' increased maturity helped them feel more focused on and motivated toward their academic pursuits; however, it also left them feeling alienated from their non-military college student peers in a number of instances.

In addition to recognizing these changes, participants also began to realize the ways in which their newly acquired status as student veterans affected them, particularly as they interacted with their environment and the people around them. Goodman et al. (2006) noted that questions about identity can play key roles in how people approach transitions. This question was evident for the participants as they negotiated their identities and asked themselves "Who am I again?" On the one hand, participants did not necessarily want to be seen by others as being connected to the military, while on the other, they were proud of their service and their veteran identity. Consequently, participants experienced some dissonance while trying to understand how their veteran

identity fit into their overall identity make-up, especially depending on the situation and/or the people with whom they interacted at the time.

At the time of data collection, participants seemed to be engaged in an ongoing process of discovering and negotiating how being a veteran changed the way people viewed them and how they viewed themselves. However, nearly all of the participants felt that being a veteran was something that made them unique: they had an identity and they had experiences that not many people share. Rumann & Hamrick (in press) also noted this process of re-identification among student veterans who had re-enrolled at a public, four-year university. They described the process in terms of Abes et al.'s (2007) multiple identities model and the way in which student veterans made meaning of their identity after they had returned from a deployment. This model is also helpful here as it helps explain a person's identity development in terms of multiple identities, context, and meaning making.

Participants in this study were involved in the process of identity development, and were actively "filtering" outside influences (Abes et al., 2007). They were still trying to figure out what their veteran status/identity meant to them while they negotiated the influences of outside factors (e.g., people's perceptions of veterans and the war). This process was not just about finding balance: participants also felt like they were different from who they were before they left and, consequently, they were actively engaged in understanding what that change meant to them. Matt described this process as "gradually changing back", while other participants saw it as a function of how each individual's circumstances impacted the roles they performed. Social roles tend to comprise how a person defines her or his identity (Deaux, 1993). In this case, those roles are defined by

society and the military, but the participants would not necessarily define it according to those terms. While they were aware of the influences that different environments or contexts had on their perspectives, they ironically thought of their identity as being separate or static, rather than being a holistic experience or the result of a fluid process (Abes et al., 2007). At the time of this study's data collection, most of the participants seemed still to be struggling with integrating their veteran social identity into their overall makeup. They saw their different identities as being separate from each other, rather than integrated. However, in some cases, participants were beginning to see more often how their veteran status was salient to their personal identity.

Overall, participants' changes in self influenced the ways in which they experienced and negotiated their transitions. In many ways these changes had a positive influence on the transition process. For example, participants found themselves more motivated toward college and completing their degrees. However, on the other hand, their increased maturity often made them feel disconnected from many of their college student peers. Also, participants struggled with integrating their newly acquired veteran status into their daily lives and interactions, and understanding how their social identity as a veteran affected their overall identity make up.

Implications for Practice

Individually and as groups, student veterans have much to offer any campus community. Opportunities should be available for them to become involved in campus activities and leadership positions, as well as to serve as role models for other students. While this study's participants wanted to be recognized for their service, they also wanted people to know that they were regular people who did not expect to be treated differently.

However, based on their life experiences, student veterans could also enrich their peers' education through sharing their stories and experiences. Additionally, their increased focus and motivation, along with their heightened maturity, might serve them well in roles as mentors to other students, or to help members of the campus community better understand what it means to be a student veteran.

It is worth noting that nearly all the participants in this study acknowledged that they, for the most part, felt comfortable sharing their stories, as long as the person who was listening was genuinely interested in what they had to share. However, this willingness to share may not be the case for *all* student veterans. Some student veterans may not feel comfortable talking to other people—especially non-military people—about their experiences, or may feel as though they are being asked to speak on behalf of all veterans. While this consideration should not discourage higher education professionals from asking student veterans about their experiences and needs, it is important to be aware of the possibility that some student veterans may not feel comfortable accepting such invitations.

Community colleges could offer campus-wide programs for all faculty, staff and students to increase the awareness of student veterans' needs as they return to college. Colleges might even consider asking student veterans to be part of the awareness raising process and encourage interactions of student veterans with students, faculty and staff. Student veterans could be asked to share their stories about their experiences returning to college and the civilian world, rather than focusing on their military experiences while deployed. For example, student veteran panel discussions could be organized to raise

awareness of the student veterans at the college and to address stereotypes people might hold about the military and about student veterans.

Furthermore, colleges could discuss and implement ways in which to show their support and appreciation for student veterans. They could create opportunities for faculty, staff and students to meet and interact with student veterans, and recognize their service in ways other than Veterans' Day activities. Expressing this appreciation does not have to entail establishing a veterans lounge, for which some colleges may not have the resources. Rather, support can be shown in many different ways, such as by incorporating military issues into the curriculum, offering scholarships for student veterans, or offering to help student veterans establish a student veterans group. In addition, colleges could implement a survey (e.g., needs assessment) of student veterans to (a) let them know their interests are being considered, and (b) identify student veterans' needs on their individual campuses. The report initiated by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) and other educational organizations is a good example of an assessment of the types of programs and services offered by colleges and universities (see Cook & Kim, 2009).

Recommendations for Future Research

Research opportunities investigating the lived experiences of student veterans abound. This study focused on the transition experiences of student veterans who had been enrolled in college *prior to* their deployments, and then re-enrolled in college upon their return. However, there are many other groups of student veterans who should be considered for study, including (a) student veterans who return to college but later withdraw, (b) student veterans who choose not to re-enroll upon their return, (c) graduate

student veterans, and (d) student veterans who enroll in college for the first time after active duty.

The number of student veterans with disabilities who enroll or re-enroll in college is expected to increase, making it critical for the higher education community to have a more complete understanding of the issues and concerns these students will bring with them to college (DiRamio & Spires, 2009). Student veterans who have been deployed to war zones may suffer from physical disabilities such as traumatic brain injury or loss of limbs, and/or mental health issues, like PTSD. The number of women student veterans enrolled in college is also expected to increase; yet, there have been few empirical studies investigating their experiences (Baechtoldt & De Sawal, 2009). Further research focusing on student veterans who are women is critical because of the additional gender-related stressors they might face as a result of returning from their deployment and enrolling in college (Baechtoldt & De Sawal, 2009).

This study fills a noticeable void in the research of contemporary student veterans in higher education: to date, only three other studies (Bauman, 2009; DiRamio et al., 2008; Rumann & Hamrick, in press) have investigated the transition experiences of contemporary student veterans. Also, previous research has typically focused on public, four-year institutions. Studies such as this one could be conducted at other institutional types to investigate the particular nature of student veterans' transition experiences at various types of colleges and universities. Private institutions would be ideal sites for study, for example, because they are expected to see a rise in the number of student veterans enrolling at their institutions because of changes in the new GI Bill benefits and the Yellow Ribbon program (Eckstein, 2009; Redden, 2009), which is designed to help

veterans cover the costs of attending a private or out of state college or university which may not be met by the new GI Bill provisions. Also, for-profit institutions that offer predominately online courses may be an attractive alternative for some veterans (Eckstein, 2009) and should be studied. The participants in this study noted a relatively smooth administrative, instrumental transition to school, which makes it worthwhile to consider the possibility that community colleges may be better prepared than other institutional types to support student veterans as they return to college. Community colleges may be well-suited for student veterans because they are geared toward serving non-traditional students (Rosenbaum et al., 2006), but more research is needed to further investigate this possibility.

References

Abes, E. S., Jones, S. R., & McEwen, M. K. (2007). Reconceptualizing the model of multiple dimensions of identity: The role of meaning-making capacity in the construction of multiple identities. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*, 1-22.

Abrams, R. M. (1989). The U. S. military and higher education: A brief history. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 502*, 15-28.

Ackerman, R., & DiRamio, D. (2009). Editor's notes. In R. Ackerman & D. DiRamio (Eds.) *Creating a veteran-friendly campus: Strategies for transition and success. New Directions for Student Services, no. 126* (pp. 1-3). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ashby, C. M. (2006). *Higher education: More information could help education determine the extent to which eligible servicemembers serving on active duty benefited from relief provided by lenders and schools. Report to congressional requesters* (Report No. GAO-07-11). Washington, DC: U. S. Government Accountability Office. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED494029)

Baechtoldt, M. & De Sawal, D. M. (2009). Meeting the needs of women veterans. In R. Ackerman & D. DiRamio (Eds.) *Creating a veteran-friendly campus: Strategies for transition and success. New Directions for Student Services, no. 126* (pp. 35-43). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bauman, M. C. (2009). *Called to serve: The military mobilization of undergraduates* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA.

Bragg, D. D. (2001). Community college access, mission, and outcomes: Considering intriguing intersections and challenges. *Peabody Journal of Education, 76*(1), 93-116.

Clark, E. L. (1947). The veteran as a college freshman. *School and Society, 66*(1707), 205-207.

Cook, B. J. & Kim, Y. (2009). *From soldier to student: Easing the transition of service members on campus*. Retrieved from the American Council on Education website: http://www.acenet.edu/AM/Template.cfm?Section=HENA&Template=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm&ContentID=33233

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

DiRamio, D. & Spires, M. (2009). Partnering to assist disabled veterans in transtion. In R. Ackerman & D. DiRamio (Eds.) *Creating a veteran-friendly campus: Strategies for transition and success. New Directions for Student Services, no. 126* (pp. 81-88). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

DiRamio, D., Ackerman, R., & Mitchell, R. L. (2008). From combat to campus: Voices of student-veterans. *NASPA Journal, 45*(1), 73-102.

Eckstein, M. (2009, April 17). Colleges cite inequities in new benefits for veterans. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://www.chronicle.com.

Esterberg, K. G. (2002). *Qualitative methods in social research*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., & Guido-DiBrito, F. (1998). *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Farrell, E. (2005, May 13). GI Blues. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/section/Home/5.

Field, K. (2008, July 25). Cost, convenience drive veterans' college choices. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 54. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/section/Home/5.

Garmezy, N., & Crose, J. M. (1948). A comparison of the academic achievement of matched groups of veterans and non-veteran freshmen at the University of Iowa. *Journal of Educational Research, 41*(7), 547-550.

Gawande, A. (2004). Casualties of war — military care for the wounded from Iraq and Afghanistan. *New England Journal of Medicine, 351*(24), 2471-2475.

Goodman, J., Schlossberg, N. K., & Anderson, M. L. (2006). *Counseling adults in transition: Linking practice with theory* (3rd ed.). New York: Springer

Gowan, A. M. (1947). Unique characteristics of freshman veterans at the Iowa State College with administrative implications. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Iowa State College, Ames.

Hadley, L. S. (1945). Scholastic adjustment problems of the returning veterans. *Educational Research Bulletin, 24*(4), 87-92+112.

Halligan, T. (2007). The student soldier. *Community College Journal, 78*(1), 22-25.

Hansen, L. M., & Paterson, D. G. (1949). Scholastic achievement of veterans. *School and Society, 69*(1786), 195-197.

Hendin, H., & Hass, A. P. (1991). Suicide and guilt as manifestations of PTSD in Vietnam combat veterans. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 148*(5), 586-591.

Hoge, C. W., Auchterlonie, J. L., & Milliken, C. S. (2006). Mental health problems, use of mental health services, and attrition from military service after returning from deployment to Iraq or Afghanistan. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 295*(9), 1023-1032.

Horan, M. (1990a). *Stepchildren of archaoes: An ethnography of a support group for Vietnam veterans at the Florida State University campus*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED347331)

Horan, M. (1990b). *The Vietnam era G. I. Bill in perspective, parts one to four*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. 347381)

Hosek, J., Kavanagh, J., & Miller, L. (2006). *How deployments affect service members*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Joanning, H. (1975). The academic performance of Vietnam veteran college students. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 16*(1), 10-13.

Jones, S. R., & McEwen, M. K. (2000). A conceptual model of multiple dimensions of identity. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*, 405-414.

Kinzer, J. R. (1946). The veteran and academic adjustment. *Educational Research Bulletin, 25*(1), 8-12.

La Barre, A. A. (1985). *Veterans as students: A review of the literature.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED263319)

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry* (1st ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Love, L. L., & Hutchison, C. A. (1946). Academic progress of veterans. *Educational Research Bulletin, 25*(8), 8-12.

MacLean, A. (2005). Lessons from the cold war: Military service and college education. *Sociology of Education, 78*, 250-266.

McDaniel, L. (2004). Campus veterans clubs boost camaraderie and careers. *VFW Magazine*. Retrieved March 18, 2010 from http://www.vfwmagazine.org/archives2004september.htm

Merriam, S. B. (2002). *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Moltz, D. (2009, August 28). Anticipating impact of new GI Bill. *Inside Higher Ed.* Retrieved from http://www.insidehighered.com/

National Veterans Upward Bound Program (n.d.). *Federal law and eligibility criteria*. Retrieved August 5, 2008 from http://www.navub.org/eligibility.htm

Neiberg, M. S. (2000). *Making citizen-soldiers: ROTC and the ideology of American military service*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Okie, S. (2005). Traumatic brain injury in the war zone. *New England Journal of Medicine, 352*(20), 2043-2047.

Olson, K. W. (1973). The G. I. Bill and higher education: Success and surprise. *American Quarterly, 25*(5), 596-610.

Olson, K. W. (1974). *The G. I. Bill, the veterans, and the colleges*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.

Quillen-Armstrong, S. (2007). Course to help transition veterans into civilian life. *Community College Times*. Retrieved December 4, 2007 from http://www.communitycollegetimes.com/article.cfm?ArticleId=417&PF=Y

Radford, A. W. (2009). *Military service members and veterans in higher education: What the new GI Bill may mean for postsecondary institutions*. Retrieved from American Council on Education website: http://www.acenet.edu/Content/NavigationMenu/ProgramsServices/CPA/Publications/MilService.errata.pdf

Redden, E. (2009, June 25). 700 colleges tied the yellow ribbon. *Inside Higher Ed.* Retrieved from http://www.insidehighered.com.

Rosenbaum, J. E., Deil-Amen, R., & Person, A. E. (2006). *After admission: From college access to college success*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Rumann, C. R. & Hamrick, F. A. (In press). Student soldiers in transition: Re-enrolling after war zone deployments. *The Journal of Higher Education*.

Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (3rd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Shaw, R. M. (1947). The G.I. challenge to the colleges. *Journal of Higher Education, 18*(1), 18-21.

Stringer, E. (2007). No soldier left behind: Veterans seek college education [Electronic Version]. *Association of College Unions International*. Retrieved November 1, 2007 from http://www.acui.org/publications/bulletin/article.aspx?issue=452&id=3494

Student Veterans of America (2008). *Student veterans establish national coalition*. Retrieved May 5, 2008 from http://www.studentveterans.org/media.html

Summerlot, J., Green, S. M., & Parker, D. (2009). Student Veterans Organizations. In R. Ackerman & D. DiRamio (Eds.) *Creating a veteran-friendly campus: Strategies*

for transition and success. New Directions for Student Services, no. 126 (pp. 71-79)*.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Teachman, J. (2005). Military service in the Vietnam era and educational attainment. *Sociology of Education, 78*(1), 50-68.

Thompson, R. B., & Pressey, S. L. (1948). An analysis of the academic records of 2,144 veterans. *College and University, 23*(2), 242-252.

Titus, C. H. (1944). The university and the new veteran. *Journal of Higher Education, 15*(2), 71-78+116.

Toven, J. R. (1945). College counseling for the war veteran. *Journal of Educational Sociology, 18*(6), 331-339.

Washton, N. S. (1945). A veteran goes to college. *Journal of Higher Education, 16*(4), 195-196+226.

Williamson, E. G. (1944). Counseling students in the postwar college. *Journal of Educational Sociology, 18*(2), 87-95.

Zdechlik, M. (2005). *Making the transition from combat to college*. Retrieved August 6, 2008 from National Public Radio Web site: http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=5006231