

AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENT, FACULTY, AND COUNSELOR  
PERCEPTIONS OF REGISTRATION AND  
ADVISEMENT PROCEDURES AT  
TULSA JUNIOR COLLEGE

By

JERRY DALE CARROLL

Bachelor of Arts in Education  
Northeastern Oklahoma State University  
Tahlequah, Oklahoma  
1963

Master of Education  
Northeastern Oklahoma State University  
Tahlequah, Oklahoma  
1971

Submitted to the Faculty of the  
Graduate College of the  
Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for  
the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION  
May, 1982



AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENT, FACULTY, AND COUNSELOR  
PERCEPTIONS OF REGISTRATION AND  
ADVISEMENT PROCEDURES AT  
TULSA JUNIOR COLLEGE

Thesis Approved:

*Wayne B. James*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Thesis Adviser

*John L. Baird*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
*Ernest W. Duggan*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Joseph M. Zuck*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Norman N. Durham*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean of the Graduate College

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The researcher is grateful for the assistance and encouragement provided by the many friends and associates who assisted in the completion of this project.

This researcher wishes to express his appreciation to committee members Dr. John Baird, Dr. Jack Zucker, and Dr. Cecil Dugger. Special thanks is given to Dr. Wayne James, committee chairman and dissertation adviser, who provided the guidance and support that was most important for the successful completion of this study.

Appreciation is extended to the administration of Tulsa Junior College for their cooperation, without which this study would not have been possible. A special thanks is extended to the Tulsa Junior College Computer Service Center for their assistance provided for this study.

A note of thanks to my family, Janice, Justen, and Jayme, who were with me through all the classes, studying, and in writing this study.

A special thanks to Mrs. Helen Barlow whose assistance and encouragement contributed tremendously to this study.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Need for the Study . . . . .	2
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	3
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	4
Assumptions of the Study . . . . .	5
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	5
Definitions . . . . .	6
Organization of the Study . . . . .	7
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	9
Trends in Junior Colleges . . . . .	9
Registration in General . . . . .	11
Kinds of Registration . . . . .	12
Telephone Registration . . . . .	12
Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration . . . . .	13
Counselor-Assisted Registration . . . . .	15
Self-Advisement Registration . . . . .	16
III. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	19
Statement of Hypotheses . . . . .	19
Instrumentation . . . . .	24
Collection of Data . . . . .	25
Analysis of Data . . . . .	26
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA . . . . .	29
Profile of Students . . . . .	29
Analysis of Student Advisement Surveys . . . . .	31
Analysis of Faculty/Counselor Advisement Surveys . . . . .	73
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS . . . . .	87
Summary . . . . .	87
Conclusions . . . . .	89
Student Advisement Survey . . . . .	89
Faculty/Counselor Advisement Survey . . . . .	93

Chapter	Page
Implications for Practice and Research . . . . .	94
Recommendations for Practice . . . . .	94
Suggestions for Further Research . . . . .	96
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	98
APPENDIX A - STUDENT ADVISEMENT SURVEY . . . . .	101
APPENDIX B - FACULTY/COUNSELOR ADVISEMENT SURVEY . . . . .	104
APPENDIX C - KRUSKAL-WALLIS ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE . . . . .	107
APPENDIX D - MANN-WHITNEY U TEST . . . . .	109
APPENDIX E - PROFILE OF STUDENTS . . . . .	111

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. List of Classes that Returned Completed Student Advisement Surveys . . . . .	23
II. Mean Ranks of Total Questionnaire Scores by Registration/Advisement Process . . . .	33
III. Mean Rank and Distribution of Responses About "Sufficiency of Information" by Registration Procedure . . . . .	35
IV. Mean Rank and Distribution of Responses About "Additional Advisement" by Registration Procedure . . . . .	37
V. Mean Rank and Distribution of Responses About "College Personnel Available" by Registration Procedure . . . . .	39
VI. Mean Rank and Distribution of Responses About "College Personnel Courteous" by Registration Procedure . . . . .	41
VII. Mean Rank and Distribution of Responses About "College Personnel Indicated Interest in Helping" by Registration Procedure . . . . .	42
VIII. Mean Rank and Distribution of Responses About "Program Planning Help" by Registration Procedure . . . . .	44
IX. Mean Rank and Distribution of Responses About "Transfer to a Four-Year College" by Registration Procedure . . . . .	47
X. Mean Rank and Distribution of Responses About "Information on Course Scheduling" by Registration Procedure . . . . .	49

Table	Page
XI. Mean Rank and Distribution of Responses About "Clear Directions" by Registration Procedure . . . . .	51
XII. Mean Rank and Distribution of Responses About "Convenient Hours" by Registration Procedure . . . . .	53
XIII. Mean Rank and Distribution of Response About "Selection of Major Courses" by Registration Procedure . . . . .	56
XIV. Mean Rank and Distribution of Responses About "Selection of Elective Courses by Registration Procedure . . . . .	57
XV. Mean Rank and Distribution of Responses About "Selection of Day-Time Classes" by Registration Procedure . . . . .	59
XVI. Mean Rank and Distribution of Responses About "Selection of Evening Classes" by Registration Procedure . . . . .	61
XVII. Mean Rank and Distribution of Responses About "Chosen Method Efficient" by Registration Procedure . . . . .	62
XVIII. Responses to Question Concerning Best Liked Items About Telephone Registration . .	64
XIX. Responses to Question Concerning Best Liked Items About Faculty Advisor- Assisted Registration . . . . .	65
XX. Responses to Question Concerning Best Liked Items About Counselor-Assisted Registration . . . . .	65
XXI. Responses to Question Concerning Best Liked Items About Self-Advisement Registration . . . . .	66
XXII. Responses to Question Concerning Least Liked Items About Telephone Registration . .	67
XXIII. Responses to Question Concerning Least Liked Items About Faculty Advisor Assisted Registration . . . . .	68

Table	Page
XXIV. Responses to Question Concerning Least Liked Items About Counselor- Assisted Registration . . . . .	68
XXV. Responses to Question Concerning Least Liked Items About Self- Advisement Registration . . . . .	69
XXVI. Responses to Question Concerning Suggestions to Improve Telephone Registration . . . . .	70
XXVII. Responses to Question Concerning Suggestions to Improve Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration . . . . .	71
XXVIII. Responses to Question Concerning Suggestions to Improve Counselor- Assisted Registration . . . . .	72
XXIX. Responses to Question Concerning Suggestions to Improve Self- Advisement Registration . . . . .	73
XXX. Responses to Question Concerning Use of Same Registration Method Again . . . . .	74
XXXI. Responses to Question Concerning Method as Efficient Way to Register . . . . .	76
XXXII. Responses to Question Concerning Most Satisfactory Method of Registration . . . . .	77
XXXIII. Responses to Question Concerning Positive Comments About Telephone Registration . . . . .	77
XXXIV. Responses to Question Concerning Negative Comments About Telephone Registration . . . . .	79
XXXV. Responses to Question Concerning Positive Comments About Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration . . . . .	79
XXXVI. Responses to Question Concerning Negative Comments About Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration . . . . .	81
XXXVII. Responses to Question Concerning Positive Comments About Counselor-Assisted Registration . . . . .	81



Table	Page
XXXIX. Responses to Question Concerning Positive Comments About Self-Advisement Registration . . . . .	82
XL. Responses to Question Concerning Negative Comments About Self-Advisement Registration . . . . .	83
XLI. Responses to Question Concerning Suggestions to Improve Telephone Registration . . . . .	83
XLII. Responses to Question Concerning Suggestions to Improve Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration . . . . .	85
XLIII. Responses to Question Concerning Suggestions to Improve Counselor-Assisted Registration . . . . .	85
XLIV. Responses to Question Concerning Suggestions to Improve Self-Advisement Registration . . . . .	86

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Methods used by students to enroll in colleges and universities have recently attracted the widespread attention of the college and university community. Procedures are being reformed because of a growing awareness that existing academic advisement may not be meeting the needs of the students who are now attending colleges and universities. At this time there are few guidelines for those institutions currently re-examining their enrollment procedures (Aitken and Conrad, 1977).

There is a variety of registration procedures used by institutions. At Tulsa Junior College, there are four ways a student may register for classes: (1) Telephone Registration, (2) Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, (3) Counselor-Assisted Registration, and (4) Self-Advisement Registration. These are the registration/advisement processes that have been evaluated in this study.

Since registration is related to advisement, a mention of the history of advisement is appropriate. The formal advising system has its roots in the nineteenth century. In his history of American higher education, Rudolph (1962) discusses the beginning of a formal advising system.

The creation of a system of faculty advisors at Johns Hopkins and Harvard in 1889 was apparently the first formal recognition that size and the elective curriculum required some closer attention to undergraduate guidance that was possible with an increasingly professionally oriented faculty (p. 460).

The days when colleges were dedicated to only the young adult student are basically over (Wilkes and Rosengren, 1977). A new group of students has emerged and this group consists of returning women and older male part-time students. Because these students have spent years dealing with commercial enterprises such as banks and department stores, they expect to get what they want quickly and immediately. They present different expectations and skills, so their movement through institutions is different from the full-time resident student; therefore, more appropriate methods of advisement and registration should be considered for them.

#### Need for the Study

Tulsa Junior College (TJC) began the use of telephone registration for part-time (eleven or fewer hours) students in 1976. The use of the telephone to register for credit classes was initiated for several reasons, the most obvious one being the nature of the student body. Over the years, the average age of TJC's students has increased from 26 years of age to 28.5 years of age (Philips, 1982). Also, approximately 85 percent of the student body works either full or part-time and over 50 percent of the student body

is married or has a family. Due to the variety of classes and programs offered by the college, many of the currently employed students are in need of only a portion of a program offering to upgrade their skills in a profession. The traditional method of enrollment was reviewed and telephone registration was instituted to assist (1) the older adult, (2) the student who had previously attended another college, (3) the part-time student who would complete his educational objective by taking only a few courses, and (4) the student who already knows what he wants to enroll in at the college.

Even though an increasing number of TJC's students now register for credit classes each semester by using the telephone, it is not known how these students view Telephone Registration. The institution has used Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration since the college opened in 1970. Faculty members were assigned advisees who had a declared major that matched their major field of instruction. Over the years the administration has developed a high regard for this method of registration. Counselor-Assisted Registration is available to students and has also been used by the institution since 1970. In 1977 Self-Advisement Registration was begun. This procedure allows a student who knows what he wants to enroll in the ability to select his own classes.

#### Statement of the Problem

It is not known how students who register for classes at the institution evaluate the procedure they used. Nor is

it known if these registration/advisement procedures are meeting the needs of the TJC students.

### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to analyze the perceptions of the students who used Telephone-Assisted Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement at an urban junior college. This study sought to answer the following questions:

1. How do students who register by telephone perceive the process?
2. How do students who register via an advisor perceive the process?
3. How do students who register via a counselor perceive the process?
4. How do students who register by self-advisement perceive the process?
5. What significant differences exist between the perceptions of each group?
6. How do faculty members and counselors perceive the different registration processes?
7. What recommendations can be made to improve the registration processes so that they better meet the needs of the student body?

### Assumptions of the Study

The study made the following assumptions:

1. Students involved in this study are representative of future students who will enroll at the college.
2. The registration/advisement procedures used by each group are different with respect to the amount of advisement received.
3. Students who register for classes by Telephone Registration and Self-Advisement Registration would benefit from more advisement.
4. Students who enroll for classes using Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration would recommend methods to improve the process.

### Limitations of the Study

The study had the following limitations:

1. Implications of this study may not be applicable to other junior colleges who do not register students with the same procedures.
2. Students who register by telephone and self-advised students may have received advice from other sources.
3. No attempt was made to break down responses by ethnic group.
4. There was no attempt made to separate day from evening students.

5. The variability of the individual student backgrounds was not considered in this study.

### Definitions

The following is a list of terms that are used throughout this study:

Telephone Registration - A method that allows a student to register for credit classes by using the telephone.

Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration - A method that allows a student to receive assistance from an assigned advisor (full-time faculty).

Counselor-Assisted Registration - A method that allows a student to seek and receive assistance from a professional counselor.

Self-Advisement Registration - A method that allows a student to select classes without the help of college personnel.

Full-Time Student - A student who is enrolled in 12 or more credit hours.

Part-time Student - A student who is enrolled in 11 or fewer credit hours.

Evening Student - A student who traditionally attends classes after 5:00 p.m. or on Saturday morning.

Day Student - A student who traditionally attends classes from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Monday through Friday.

Community College, Junior College, Community-Junior College - Institutions of higher education authorized to offer courses no higher than sophomore level. These two-year programs would normally include transfer, vocational, remedial, adult, and continuing education (Price, 1981, p. 6).

### Organization of the Study

Chapter I introduces the study; presents the need for the study; gives a statement of the problem; presents the purpose of, the assumptions of, and the limitations of the study; gives definitions; and gives the organization of the study.

Chapter II includes a review of the related literature focusing on (1) Trends in Junior Colleges, which includes a discussion of states that have taken the lead and how the movement has spread to other sections of the country; (2) Registration in General, which discusses how registration procedures are facing changes because of the variety of students being served; (3) Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, which discusses challenges that faculty advisors face in view of the increased number of students and the variety of their backgrounds; (4) Counselor-Assisted Registration, which discusses how the pure counseling function is changing and emphasis is being placed on how counselors work with advisement; (5) Self-Advisement Registration, which discusses a new method of advisement/registration that meets the needs of the new student; and (6) Summary, which provides an overview of registration/advisement procedures.



Chapter III reports the selection of the subjects, development of the instrument, collection of the data, and analysis of the data. Chapter IV includes the presentation of findings and a discussion of the findings. Chapter V includes a summary of the study, statement of the conclusions, and implications for refinement and further research in the area.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The literature is presented in four sections of information related to the central theme of this study.

These sections are presented as follows:

1. General information on trends in junior colleges
2. Registration in general
3. Specific kinds of registration
  - a. Telephone Registration
  - b. Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration
  - c. Counselor-Assisted Registration
  - d. Self-Advisement Registration
4. Summary

#### Trends in Junior Colleges

In the early 1960's the spread of community colleges throughout the United States began. California and Florida took the lead. In 1967 the state legislature in Florida stated that they had achieved their goal of placing community colleges within commuting distance of 99 percent of the citizens in the state. Florida was the first state to make these services available to the entire state. Twenty-eight community colleges were located throughout Florida

from Miami to Jacksonville to Pensacola (Gleazer, 1968). In California there are 80 junior colleges and 75 percent of all full-time, lower-division students attending a public college in California are in a junior college.

"In October, 1967, more than nine hundred junior and community colleges enrolled 1,700,000 students" (Gleazer, 1968, p.7). These figures reflect the public sector. In 1979, there were 1,044 public junior and community colleges reported with an enrollment of 4,334,344. These figures represent a trend of increased enrollment in the two-year institutions.

Only once in the past 20 years has this growth pattern been interrupted. Fall, 1978 enrollment was down one percent, perhaps only a pause in the continued interest in and growth of community-based, life long education (Gilbert, 1980 p.2).

The new community college has developed into a comprehensive institution with a variety of programs to match the cross section of students represented in the community. In order to meet the needs of the variety of students, the community college must prepare students for immediate employment as well as transfer to four-year colleges.

The comprehensive community college exists to give students opportunities beyond the high school to find suitable lines of educational development in a social environment of wide range of interests, capacities, aptitudes, and types of intelligence (Gleazer, 1968, p.28).

In some states the comprehensive junior college has replaced many functions of the specialized vocational and technical schools. One of the groups which has encouraged

this move is the Governor's Commission on Education Beyond the High School in North Carolina.

We believe that the industrial education centers and the community colleges will tend to become more alike; that the perpetuation of two increasingly similar but separate systems of post-high school institutions of two-year grade cannot be justified either on educational or on economic grounds; and that state-level supervision of the two systems by different agencies will lead to undesirable competition, lack of effectiveness and efficiency, and economic waste. We recommend that the State develop one system of public two-year post-high school institutions offering college parallel, technical-vocational-terminal, and adult education instruction tailored to area needs; and that the comprehensive community colleges be subject to state-level supervision by one agency. (Education Beyond the High School, 1962, p. 19).

Each state and each community that has a community or junior college located within is aware of the trends that have developed over the last 20 years. Each administrator responsible for those institutions is also aware of the needs of the student not only in terms of academic programs provided, but also in student services available. The manner in which students register for classes needs to be evaluated and perhaps changed or updated to meet the needs of the students.

#### Registration in General

Registration in the broadest sense normally includes the development of a good curriculum with classes distributed equally throughout the hours of the day and days of the week, along with the development of an advisement system that meets the needs of the students. The techniques used

will vary from institution to institution, as will the type and variety of students being served. Four-year institutions' registration systems and advisement systems vary from the systems established by two-year institutions. Normally, two-year institutions such as community and junior colleges with large numbers of part-time and evening students must combine registration and advisement into one quick, easy step. These types of institutions, operating under an open door policy, must gear their systems to students who vary a great deal in age and skill and maturation and who may simply pick up a telephone or walk on campus unannounced to be registered and advised. Because of these factors, registration and advisement procedures should be flexible and accomplish the task with minimal effort and in a short amount of time (Quann, 1979).

### Kinds of Registration

#### Telephone Registration

Many colleges and universities have turned to the telephone to assist the new breed of students who are entering their institutions. Many colleges and universities are reviewing their own information findings which tend to corroborate the evidence of recent studies exploring difficulties encountered in registration by differing socioeconomic classes. Botsman, (1975, p.7), in his study of Ithaca's blue collar workers, found "too much red tape in getting enrolled" more significant as a "perceived barrier to learning" than the availability of child care.

In looking for a solution, the airline industry was reviewed. The airline industry has had years of experience gathering information from passengers, changing schedules, and working with individuals by use of the telephone. The computerized phone reservation process seemed to be an appropriate model. The information the airlines sought from the customers was generally the same: names, addresses, phone numbers, flight times, and destinations. This information was basically the same needed to register a student for a class (Wilkes and Rosengren, 1977).

The development of Telephone Registration has varied with each institution based on its philosophy and available resources. Basically, the Telephone Registration system registers a student who knows the courses needed and is not seeking advice in the selection of these courses. Telephone Registration systems are geared to collect the base information needed to register. If a student seeks additional information about the institution or advisement, the telephone registration terminal operator refers the student to one of the other staff members or transfers the call to the appropriate office.

#### Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration

This procedure is a formal advising system in which full-time faculty members are the major components of the system. Students are assigned full-time faculty members as their advisors and this assignment is made based on the major chosen by the student. The basic philosophy is to

utilize the expertise of the professional instructor to assist the student who is majoring in his field. Thus, advising requires faculty members to assume responsibilities outside the traditional role of teacher or scholar.

Institutions of higher learning are becoming more individualized, and requirements for degrees grow more flexible as exceptions to existing requirements become more numerous (Aitken and Conrad, 1977). Those institutions using the faculty advisor system should be aware that the system is under review and has received some criticism. "One explanation is that reward structures for faculty members seldom provide incentive for them to devote much effort to advising" (Levine and Weingart, 1973, p.x). If an incentive is involved it usually is in the form of reduced class load instead of salary increase.

Another reason for inadequacies in the faculty advisement system is that attempts to improve institutional efficiency have frequently resulted in heavier advising loads for many faculty members. This problem has been further exacerbated by a substantial growth in the number of students in the major academic areas (Garner and Dalton, 1975).

The faculty advisement system, then, should be evaluated because many schools have enjoyed an increase in enrollments and faculty advisors have received an increase in their advisee load; therefore, faculty advisors may be forced to advise students in academic areas where

they do not have expertise because of the expanded curriculum fields available to students at most colleges.

One method of assisting the advisor is to provide him with the necessary tools to make recommendations outside his own specialty in order that he can advise the student on the totality of his degree program and not just in the student's major area (Aitken and Conrad, 1977, p. 116).

According to a survey prepared by Bounds (1979), faculty advising ranked fair to good. However, this category ranked next to last in the survey. "Student comments focused on the poor availability of faculty advisors and their lack of interest and information" (Bounds, 1979, p. 19).

#### Counselor-Assisted Registration

Professional counseling came into being in the public secondary schools and was first focused tightly around vocational education, career decision making, and placement (Goodman, 1980). Over the years, like many other aspects of education, the counseling functions have changed.

One of the changes or new functions performed by the counselor in an urban junior college is the performance of advisement. This is not to say that advisement has not always been a part of his role. However, there is a push to distinguish advisement from counseling. Advisement, in the true sense, is to provide a student with information that is necessary to successfully complete a pre-determined curriculum offered by that institution. If the student is in need of additional information or services he is referred



to the appropriate area. The trend appears to be in the direction of less need for clinical counseling and more need for academic advising.

At Tulsa Junior College, full-time professional counselors perform a variety of tasks ranging from career guidance to assisting students with advisement. Students who are assigned counselors as advisors make appointments and receive advisement assistance.

#### Self-Advisement Registration

Self-Advisement Registration is a procedure developed by many colleges to better meet the needs of the students they serve. In this procedure a student reviews curriculum patterns, college catalogs, and other material that allows him to select the desired courses.

The need for this type of registration procedure has developed because of the new breed of students that institutions are serving, for example, the person who has previously received a baccalaureate degree at another institution and is in need of an additional course or courses for his profession, or for his own avocation. Recently, approximately fifteen percent of each semester enrollments have earned a baccalaureate or higher degree.

## Summary

One of the most important responsibilities of educators in the United States is to determine the direction of the community and junior colleges. Based on the record over the past twenty years, the community college and junior college will continue to develop at a tremendous rate. The community college is necessary to our society as demonstrated by the continued growth.

Tulsa Junior College began the 1981-82 school year with an enrollment in credit classes of 13,751, which made TJC the largest two-year college in Oklahoma; it ranks third in size in terms of total individual student enrollment among the remaining colleges and universities in the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education. This was a 14.5 percent increase in enrollment over the preceding year (Philips, 1981).

As has been noted, students who are enrolling in these institutions are not the traditional students of the past. Now the students are older and attending part-time classes and have an entirely different set of needs and goals. Educators today must be attuned to these new students and must provide services to help the new breed of students accomplish their goals.

As the term "registration" is reviewed, the same information on the type of students who are attending colleges should be given consideration. Registration covers a large area of services that, to some degree, includes advisement.

Because of this, registration and advisement go hand in hand; and in the future, these two functions should and must work closely together.

The kinds of registration/advisement systems that are reviewed in this study are: Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration. Telephone Registration and Self-Advisement Registration are relatively new on the college campuses. Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration and Counselor-Assisted Registration have been utilized for several years on community and junior college campuses.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

This chapter details the procedures for collecting data relevant to the purpose of the study outlined in Chapter I. Included are: (1) a statement of the hypotheses, (2) a description of the population and sample, (3) a description of the data collection instruments, (4) a description of the collection of the data, and (5) a description of the procedures for analyzing the data.

#### Statement of Hypotheses

The basic research questions in this chapter considered whether there is a difference in student perceptions of the advisement process based on the registration/advisement method used. The students were grouped by their method of registration/advisement into four categories: Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration. To investigate the basic question, sixteen hypotheses were formulated.

1. There are no significant differences among mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-

Advisement Registration, either on questionnaire total scores or by each questionnaire item.

2. For questionnaire item "sufficient information," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.
3. For questionnaire item "additional advisement," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.
4. For questionnaire item "college personnel available," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration and Self-Advisement Registration.
5. For questionnaire item "college personnel courteous," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.
6. For questionnaire item "college personnel indicated interest in helping," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.
7. For questionnaire item "program planning help," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.

8. For questionnaire item "transfer to a four-year college," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.
9. For questionnaire item "information on course scheduling," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.
10. For questionnaire item "clear directions," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.
11. For questionnaire item "convenient hours," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.
12. For questionnaire item "selection of major courses," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.
13. For questionnaire item "selection of elective courses," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.
14. For questionnaire item "selection of day-time classes," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone

Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.

15. For questionnaire item "selection of evening classes," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.
16. For questionnaire item "chosen method efficient," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.

### Sample

The population from which the sample was drawn consisted of both day and evening students and both part-time and full-time students. The sample of students was selected from the spring semester enrollment, 1982. The spring 1982 student enrollment for credit classes was 12,646 individuals. Included in this figure were enrollments at all TJC satellite locations and both of the TJC campus locations--Metro Campus and Northeast Campus.

The population of classes selected for this study included both college parallel classes and those designed for specific two year programs. Day and evening classes were surveyed. Classes held on both the Metro Campus and the Northeast Campus were surveyed. Table I shows the classes surveyed listed by discipline. Meeting days and times, official student enrollment of each class, and the number

TABLE I  
LIST OF CLASSES THAT RETURNED COMPLETED  
STUDENT ADVISEMENT SURVEYS

Course	Time of day	Day of week	Enrollment	Number Completed
ENG 1083 <sup>a</sup>	12:00 p.m. - 12:50 p.m.	M, W, F	8	7
ENG 1113	8:00 a.m. - 8:50 a.m.	M, W, F	25	18
ENG 1213	9:00 a.m. - 9:50 a.m.	M, W, F	15	12
GEO 1014 <sup>b</sup>	9:30 a.m. - 10:50 a.m.	T, Th	13	13
GEO 1014	11:00 a.m. - 11:50 a.m.	M, W, F	43	39
GEO 1014	5:30 p.m. - 8:20 p.m.	T, Th	10	8
GEO 2153	9:00 a.m. - 9:50 a.m.	M, W, F	11	10
GER 1225 <sup>c</sup>	11:00 a.m. - 11:50 a.m.	M, T, W, Th, F	7	5
GER 1225	7:00 p.m. - 8:20 p.m.	T, Th	15	13
GER 2113	1:00 p.m. - 1:50 p.m.	M, W, F	6	4
MAT 2326 <sup>d</sup>	11:00 a.m. - 12:50 p.m.	M, W, F	18	14
MTH 1073 <sup>e</sup>	5:30 p.m. - 6:50 p.m.	M, W	24	19
MTH 1115	11:00 a.m. - 11:50 a.m.	M, T, W, Th, F	6	6
MTH 1213	9:00 a.m. - 9:50 a.m.	M, W, F	24	21
MTH 1323	8:00 a.m. - 8:50 a.m.	M, W, F	6	5
MTH 1363	7:00 p.m. - 9:50 p.m.	T	22	14
MTH 1415	11:00 a.m. - 11:50 a.m.	M, T, W, Th, F	9	9
MTH 1513	8:00 a.m. - 9:20 a.m.	T, Th	10	7
MTH 1513	9:00 a.m. - 9:50 a.m.	M, W, F	29	21
MTH 2193	9:30 a.m. - 10:50 a.m.	T, Th	10	8
MTH 2193	7:00 p.m. - 9:50 p.m.	T	14	12
POS 1113 <sup>f</sup>	8:00 a.m. - 8:50 a.m.	M, W, F	25	21
POS 1113	9:30 a.m. - 10:50 a.m.	T, Th	19	16
POS 1113	11:00 a.m. - 11:50 a.m.	M, W, F	30	21
POS 1113	11:00 a.m. - 12:20 p.m.	T, Th	18	18
POS 1113	12:30 p.m. - 1:50 p.m.	T, Th	19	16
POS 1113	7:00 p.m. - 9:50 p.m.	T	30	19
WEL 1313 <sup>g</sup>	1:00 p.m. - 2:20 p.m.	T, Th	20	3
WEL 1313	5:30 p.m. - 8:20 p.m.	Th	22	3
WEL 1326	11:30 a.m. - 3:20 p.m.	M, W, F	11	3
WEL 1326	5:30 p.m. - 9:20 p.m.	M, T, W	6	3
WEL 1336	11:30 a.m. - 3:20 p.m.	M, W, F	8	7
WEL 1336	5:30 p.m. - 9:20 p.m.	M, T, W	10	4
WEL 2326	8:00 a.m. - 11:50 a.m.	M, W, F	10	3
WEL 2343	9:30 a.m. - 12:20 p.m.	T, Th	15	6
WEL 2343	5:00 p.m. - 10:50 p.m.	Th	14	3
WEL 2356	8:00 a.m. - 11:50 a.m.	M, W, F	7	4
TOTAL			589	415

<sup>a</sup>ENG - English<sup>b</sup>GEO - Geology<sup>c</sup>GER - German<sup>d</sup>MAT - Machinist Technology<sup>e</sup>MTH - Mathematics<sup>f</sup>POS - Political Science<sup>g</sup>WEL - Welding



of responses received from each class are included. The percentage of student surveys that were completed and returned is 70.46 percent. There were 37 classes surveyed, 18 of which were afternoon and evening classes and 19 of which were conducted during the morning hours.

### Instrumentation

The data collection instruments used in this study were developed to survey students, faculty members, and counselors. In the development of the instruments, suggestions were sought from faculty members, counselors, administrators, and students. The questionnaires were self-explanatory.

The student questionnaire (see Appendix A) contained the following components:

1. Instructions for completing the questionnaire and questions to obtain demographic information.
2. A listing of 15 statements for student response.
3. Three questions soliciting comments and suggestions.
4. One final question asking the student if he would use the same registration/advisement method in the future.

A first draft of the student questionnaire was developed and then administered to a Freshman Composition I class located on the Metro Campus and an American Federal Government class located on the Northeast Campus. These two classes were selected because they are beginning classes

and the majority of students in them would have been subjected to a registration/advisement procedure at the same entry level.

The faculty and counselor questionnaire (see Appendix B) contains thirteen questions. No demographic information was requested and persons completing the form were not asked to sign their names. The questionnaire contained the following components:

1. Four statements asking for a response concerning the effectiveness of each method of registration/advisement
2. A question asking which is the most effective method of registration/advisement
3. Eight questions asking for comments on and suggestions for improvement of the four different registration/advisement methods.

The first draft of the faculty questionnaire was developed and administered to five faculty members from the Metro Campus and five faculty members from the Northeast Campus. These faculty members were selected because of their knowledge and background in the registration/advisement systems used by the college. Counselors from both campuses were also asked to evaluate the original questionnaire.

#### Collection of the Data

The data for the student responses used in this study was gathered during the first three weeks of the spring

semester, 1982. At this time in the semester the students had recently had an opportunity to utilize a registration/advisement procedure at the beginning of the spring semester. Also, if they were returning from the fall semester, they had already had another opportunity to use one of the registration/advisement methods. The academic deans were asked to allow faculty members to assist in handing out and collecting the questionnaires and to allow students to complete the questionnaires in class. The student questionnaires were distributed and collected by individual instructors in the selected classes and returned in person to the researcher's office. The questionnaires for faculty and counselors were hand delivered and returned in person to the researcher's office.

Questions that required a written response from students and faculty were analyzed in a narrative form. Narrative responses from both students and faculty were grouped in common categories.

#### Analysis of Data

The research design for this study considered the nature of the information being sought and the results of student evaluations of the methods used to register/advise in an urban junior college. In the design of the study, consideration was given to the measurement level of the data to be analyzed. Questions on the survey form completed by students were rated on a "Likert Scale" with

five increments ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." The type of data was considered to be of ordinal strength. A non-parametric design treatment was used on the collected data.

As treatment of the data required the consideration of independent variables and because the data has more than two samples, the Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance (see Appendix C) was chosen. The Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance is used if there are no differences among the independent variables; then, when all scores are ranked, the average sum of ranks for each group should be comparable. If there are significant differences among the groups, then a disparity among the group's average sums of ranks may exist (Popham and Sirotnik, 1973). The sums of ranks are placed in a formula that yields a value known as "H".

Siegel (1956) states the following:

The Kruskal-Wallis test seems to be the most efficient of the nonparametric tests for k independent samples. It has a power-efficiency of 95.5 percent when compared with the F-test, the most powerful parametric test (p. 194).

A follow-up test of the data in this study was made by using the Mann-Whitney U Test (see Appendix D). Huck, Cormier, and Bounds (1974) state the following:

The most frequently reported follow-up test for the Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance of ranks is the Mann-Whitney U Test . . . Correction for ties increases the calculated value . . . and tends to make the result more significant than it would have been if not corrected. In other

words, when a researcher does not correct for ties, the test is considered more conservative (p. 216).

Since N 20, the Z Table of Critical Values used to report results of the Mann-Whitney U Test was used. The four respondent groups are listed below:

<u>Group</u>	<u>Registration Format</u>	<u>Assessment</u>
Group I	Telephone Registration	Student evaluations
Group II	Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration	Student evaluations
Group III	Counselor-Assisted Registration	Student evaluations
Group IV	Self-Advisement Registration	Student evaluations

The five categories of responses were coded as follows:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Code</u>
Strongly Agree	1
Agree	2
No Opinion	3
Disagree	4
Strongly Disagree	5

The analysis was performed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences, Version 9, available in the Tulsa Junior College Data Processing Center.

## CHAPTER IV

### PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter is organized to present a description of the respondents of the survey and how they felt about the registration/advisement procedure they used. This chapter presents the mean scores of the 15 individual questionnaire statements that the students ranked. Suggestions and comments are categorized and results are shown. This chapter also presents the responses of faculty members and counselors to the faculty/counselor questionnaire. The material is organized as follows: (1) a profile of the students, (2) an analysis of the responses to the student questionnaire, and (3) an analysis of the responses to the faculty/counselor questionnaire.

#### Profile of Students

The Student Advisement Survey provided information on the profiles (see Appendix E) of the students who returned the survey. The raw data compiled on each of the 415 students who returned the survey consisted of sex, student status (full-time or part-time), age, and employment status. In the study there were 173 women and 242 men who completed the survey for a total of 415 students.

In the Telephone Registration group there were 20 male students and 21 female students surveyed. In the Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration group 26 males and 14 females were surveyed. The Counselor-Assisted Registration group had 53 males and 27 females. In the Self-Advisement Registration group there were 143 males and 111 females surveyed.

In the Telephone Registration group three responses were those of full-time students, 36 were those of part-time students, and two responses did not indicate student status. In the Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration group, 24 full-time students were surveyed and 16 part-time students were surveyed. The Counselor-Assisted Registration group had responses from 58 full-time students and 22 part-time students. In the Self-Advisement Registration group there were responses from 150 full-time students and 102 part-time students. Of the responses in the Self-Advisement Registration group, two did not indicate student status.

In the Telephone Registration group there was one respondent in the age group Under 18, there were eight in the age group 18-21, there were seven in the age group 22-24, there were 17 in the age group 45-59, and there was one respondent in the age group 60 and Over. In the Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration group there were three responses from students in the Under 18 age group, 16 from students in the 18-21 age group, five from students in the 22-24 age group, nine from students in the 25-34 age group, six from students in the 35-44 age group, and one from a

student in the 45-59 age group. In the Counselor-Assisted Registration group there were four respondents in the Under 18 age group, 43 in the 18-21 age group, five in the 22-24 age group, 22 in the 24-24 age group, and six in the 34-44 age group. In the Self-Advisement Registration group there were seven respondents in the age group Under 18, there were 145 in the age group 18-21, there were 26 in the age group 22-24, there were 45 in the age group 25-34, there were 18 in the age group 35-44, there were 10 in the age group 45-49, and there were three in the age group 60 and Over.

In the Telephone Registration group 26 respondents were employed full-time, five were employed part-time, seven were homemakers, and two were unemployed. In the Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration group 16 respondents were employed full-time, 19 were employed part-time, one was a homemaker, and five respondents were unemployed. The Counselor-Assisted Registration group had 22 respondents that were employed full-time, 36 that were employed part-time, eight that were homemakers, and 14 that were unemployed. In the Self-Advisement Registration group 79 respondents were employed full-time, 98 were employed part-time, six were retired, 16 were homemakers, and 55 were unemployed.

#### Analysis of Student Advisement Surveys

The basic research questions in this study considered the difference between the results of student evaluations of the registration/advisement method used by them. The



students were grouped into Telephone Registration. Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, or Self-Advisement Registration.

Table II shows the mean rank scores of all 15 questionnaire items by the total response of each registration group. The Counselor-Assisted Registration group ranked the 15 items highest followed by the Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration group, the the Telephone Registration group. The Self-Advisement Registration group ranked the 15 questionnaire items lowest. The Mann-Whitney U Test was used to examine the differences existed between the Telephone Registration group and the Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration group and the Self-Advisement Registration group. There were significant differences between the Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration group and the Self-Advisement group and between the Counselor-Assisted Registration group and the Self-Advisement Registration group.

The overall hypothesis developed for this study was:

There is no significant differences among mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration, either on questionnaire total scores or by each questionnaire item.

Table II also includes the results of the Kruskal-Wallis test on the mean rank scores of all 15 questionnaire items by responses from each group. The Chi Square value of

TABLE II  
MEAN RANKS OF TOTAL QUESTIONNAIRE SCORES  
BY REGISTRATION/ADVISEMENT PROCESS

	Mean Rank
Telephone Registration N=41	213.62 <sup>a</sup>
Faculty -Assisted N=40	193.19 <sup>a</sup>
Counselor-Assisted N=30	168.63 <sup>a</sup>
Self-Advised N=254	228.12

Kruskal-Wallis  
Chi Square Value = 24.279\*

Level of Significance = 0.000

\*Significant Difference

<sup>a</sup>There is a significant difference in using the Mann-Whitney U Test (at the .05 level) between Telephone Registration and Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Telephone Registration and Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Telephone Registration and Self-Advisement Registration; between Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration and Self-Advisement Registration; and between Counselor-Assisted Registration and Self-Advisement Registration

24.279 resulted in a level of significance of 0.000 which was sufficient to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance.

Data in Table III shows the mean rank scores for each of the four groups for the questionnaire item "sufficiency of information." The four groups perceived this item in the following order: The Counselor-Assisted Registration group ranked this item highest followed by Faculty-Assisted Registration, then Telephone Registration. The Self-Advisement Registration group ranked it lowest. The distribution of responses by group shows a high number of respondents of the Faculty Advisor-Assisted and Counselor-Assisted Registration groups either strongly agreed or agreed with the question. The Mann-Whitney U Test was used to examine differences between respondent groups. Significant differences existed between the Telephone Registration group and the Counselor-Assisted Registration group and significant differences also existed between the Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration group and the Self-Advisement Registration group.

The hypothesis developed for this questionnaire item was:

For questionnaire item "sufficient information," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.

Table III also includes the results of the Kruskal-Wallis test on the mean rank scores for the questionnaire item

TABLE III  
MEAN RANK AND DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES ABOUT "SUFFICIENCY  
OF INFORMATION" BY REGISTRATION PROCEDURE

	Mean Rank	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Response
Telephone Registration N=41	218.66 <sup>a</sup>	5	21	8	5	2	0
Faculty Assisted N=40	167.49 <sup>a</sup>	4	33	1	1	1	0
Counselor Assisted N=80	191.24	13	48	7	8	4	0
Self-Advised N=254	217.94	25	133	68	23	4	0

Kruskal-Wallis  
Chi Square Value = 10.139

Level of Significance = 0.017

\*Significant Difference

<sup>a</sup>There is a significant difference using the Mann-Whitney U Test (at the .05 level) between Telephone Registration and Counselor-Assisted Registration and between Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration and Self-Advisement Registration.

"sufficiency of information." The Chi Square value of 10.139 resulted in a level of significance of 0.017 which was sufficient to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance.

Data in Table IV show the mean rank score for each of the four groups for the questionnaire item "additional advisement." The four groups perceived this item in the following order: the Self-Advisement Registration group felt the greatest need for additional advisement followed by Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, and Counselor-Assisted Registration. The distribution of responses by group shows a high number of responses by all groups in the "No Opinion" column.

The hypothesis developed for this questionnaire item was:

For questionnaire item "additional advisement," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.

Table IV also includes the results of the Kruskal-Wallis test on the mean rank scores for the questionnaire item "additional advisement." The Chi Square value of 2.235 resulted in a level of significance of 0.525 which failed to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance.

TABLE IV  
MEAN RANK AND DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES ABOUT "ADDITIONAL  
ADVISEMENT" BY REGISTRATION PROCEDURE

	Mean Rank	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Response
Telephone Registration N=41	209.95	7	11	16	6	1	0
Faculty- Assisted N=40	207.07	5	14	15	6	1	0
Counselor- Assisted N=80	191.21	15	27	25	9	3	1
Self-Advised N=254	213.12	36	76	96	43	3	0

Kruskal-Wallis  
Chi Square Value = 2.235

Level of Significance = 0.525

Data in Table V show the mean rank scores for each of the four groups for the questionnaire item "college personnel available." The four groups perceived this item in the following order: Counselor-Assisted Registration ranked this item the highest followed by the Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration group. The distribution of responses by group reflects that a large number of respondents in all four groups either strongly agreed or agreed that "college personnel were available."

The hypothesis developed for this questionnaire item was:

For questionnaire item "college personnel available," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.

Table V also includes the results of the Kruskal-Wallis test on the mean rank scores for the questionnaire item "college personnel available." The Chi Square value of 7.271 resulted in a level of significance of 0.064 which failed to reject the null hypothesis of the .05 level of significance.

Data in Table VI show the mean rank scores for each of the four groups for the questionnaire item "college personnel courteous." The four groups perceived this item in the following order: The Counselor-Assisted Registration

TABLE V

MEAN RANK AND DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES ABOUT "COLLEGE  
PERSONNEL AVAILABLE" BY REGISTRATION PROCEDURE

	Mean Rank	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Response
Telephone Registration N=41	210.80	7	24	5	2	1	2
Faculty- Assisted N=40	211.94	8	25	6	0	1	0
Counselor- Assisted N=80	179.71	25	46	4	4	0	1
Self-Advised N=254	215.84	50	155	23	22	3	1

Kruskal-Wallis  
Chi Square Value = 7.271

Level of Significance = 0.064



group ranked this item highest followed by the Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, the Telephone Registration and the Self-Advisement Registration groups. The distribution of responses by groups shows that a high number of respondents from all four groups marked "strongly agree" or "agree" for this item. The Mann-Whitney U Test was used to examine differences between respondent groups. Significant differences existed between the Counselor-Assisted Registration group and the Self-Advisement Registration group.

The hypothesis developed for this questionnaire item was:

For questionnaire item "college personnel courteous," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.

Table VI also includes the results of the Kruskal-Wallis test on the mean rank scores for the questionnaire item "college personnel courteous." The Chi Square value of 9.330 resulted in a level of significance of 0.025 which was sufficient to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance.

Data in Table VII show the mean rank scores for each of the four groups for the questionnaire item "college personnel indicated interest in helping." The four groups perceived this item in the following order: The Faculty

TABLE VI  
MEAN RANK AND DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES ABOUT "COLLEGE  
PERSONNEL COURTEOUS" BY REGISTRATION PROCEDURE

	Mean Rank	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Response
Telephone Registration N=41	200.40	13	22	4	2	0	0
Faculty Assisted N=40	187.67	15	20	3	1	1	0
Counselor- Assisted N=80	182.81 <sup>a</sup>	28	44	5	2	0	1
Self-Advised N=254	220.36	60	143	39	10	1	1

Kruskal-Wallis  
Chi Square Value = 9.330\*

Level of Significance = 0.025

\*Significant Difference

<sup>a</sup>There is a significant difference using the Mann-Whitney U Test (at the .05 level) between Counselor-Assisted Registration and Self-Advisement Registration.

TABLE VII

MEAN RANK AND DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES ABOUT "COLLEGE PERSONNEL  
INDICATED INTEREST IN HELPING" BY REGISTRATION PROCEDURE

	Mean Rank	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Response
Telephone Registration N=41	199.27	11	16	10	4	0	0
Faculty- Assisted N=40	166.00 <sup>a</sup>	10	23	4	2	0	1
Counselor- Assisted N=80	167.06 <sup>a</sup>	26	37	10	6	0	1
Self-Advised N=254	228.92	32	117	76	26	2	1

Kruskal-Wallis  
Chi Square Value = 25.252\*

Level of Significance = 0.000

\*Significant difference

<sup>a</sup>There is a significant difference using the Mann-Whitney U Test (at the .05 level) between Faculty-Advisor-Assisted Registration and Self-Advisement Registration and between Counselor-Assisted Registration and Self-Advisement Registration.

Advisor-Assisted Registration group ranked this question highest followed by the Counselor-Assisted Registration, the Telephone Registration, and the Self-Advisement Registration groups. The distribution of responses by group shows a large number of respondents in the "agree" column and only two respondents in the "disagree" column. The Mann-Whitney U Test was used to examine differences between respondent groups. Significant differences existed between the Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration group and the Self-Advisement Registration group and between the Counselor-Assisted Registration group and the Self-Advisement Registration group.

The hypothesis developed for this questionnaire item was:

For questionnaire item "college personnel indicated interest in helping," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.

Table VII also includes the results of the Kruskal-Wallis test on the mean rank scores for the questionnaire item "college personnel indicated interest in helping." The Chi Square value of 25.252 resulted in a level of significance of 0.000 which was sufficient to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance.

Data in Table VIII show the mean rank scores for each of the four groups for the questionnaire item "program planning help." The four groups perceived this item in the

TABLE VIII  
MEAN RANK AND DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES ABOUT "PROGRAM  
PLANNING HELP" BY REGISTRATION PROCEDURE

	Mean Rank	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Response
Telephone Registration N=41	225.07 <sup>a</sup>	5	9	24	3	0	0
Faculty- Assisted N=40	139.29 <sup>a</sup>	10	23	4	2	1	0
Counselor- Assisted N=80	149.42 <sup>a</sup>	20	40	11	7	1	1
Self-Advised N=254	234.52	17	78	116	37	5	1

Kruskal-Wallis  
Chi Square Value = 50.670\*  
Level of Significance = 0.000

\*Significant Difference

<sup>a</sup>There is a significant difference using the Mann-Whitney U Test (at the .05 level) between Telephone Registration and Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Telephone Registration and Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Telephone Registration and Self-Advisement Registration; between Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration and Self-Advisement Registration; and between Counselor-Assisted Registration and Self-Advisement Registration.

following order: The Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration group ranked the item highest followed by the Counselor-Assisted Registration, the Telephone Registration, and the Self-Advisement Registration groups. The distribution of responses by group reflects a large number of respondents from all groups in the "agree" and "no opinion" column. The Mann-Whitney U Test was used to examine differences between respondent groups. Significant differences existed between Telephone Registration and Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Telephone Registration and Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Telephone Registration and Self-Advisement Registration. Also, there were significant differences between Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration and Self-Advisement Registration and between Counselor-Assisted Registration and Self-Advisement Registration.

The hypothesis developed for this questionnaire item was:

For questionnaire item "program planning help," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.

Table VIII also includes the results of the Kruskal-Wallis test on the mean rank scores for the questionnaire item "program planning help." The Chi Square value of 50.760 resulted in a level of significance of 0.000 which was sufficient to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Perhaps one explanation for these results

is the number of positive responses made by the Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration and Counselor-Assisted Registration groups.

Data in Table IX show the mean rank scores for each of the four groups for the questionnaire item "transfer to a four-year college." The four groups perceived this item in the following order: The Counselor-Assisted Registration group ranked the item highest, followed by the Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, the Self Advisement Registration, and the Telephone Registration groups. The distribution of responses by group reflects a large number of students in all four groups marking in the "no opinion" column.

The hypothesis developed for this questionnaire item was:

For questionnaire item "transfer to a four-year college," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.

Table IX also includes the results of the Kruskal-Wallis test on the mean rank scores for the questionnaire item "transfer to a four-year college." The Chi Square value of 3.495 resulted in a level of significance of 0.321 which failed to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance.

Data in Table X show the mean rank scores for each of the four groups for the questionnaire item "information

TABLE IX

MEAN RANK AND DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES ABOUT "TRANSFER TO A  
FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE" BY REGISTRATION PROCEDURE

	Mean Rank	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Response
Telephone Registration N=41	216.44	2	5	27	6	1	0
Faculty- Assisted N=40	193.65	7	8	15	6	3	0
Counselor- Assisted N=80	191.41	7	24	28	16	4	1
Self-Advised N=254	214.12	8	49	144	41	11	1

Kruskal-Wallis  
Chi Square Value = 3.495

Level of Significance = 0.321



on course scheduling." The four groups perceived this item in the following order: The Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration group ranked this item highest followed by the Counselor-Assisted Registration, the Self-Advisement Registration, and the Telephone Registration groups. The distribution of responses by group shows a large number of respondents marking the "agree" column. The Mann-Whitney U Test was used to examine differences between respondents groups. Significant differences existed between Telephone Registration and Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration and between Telephone Registration and Counselor-Assisted Registration. Also, there was significant difference between Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration and Self-Advisement Registration and between Counselor-Assisted Registration and Self-Advisement Registration.

The hypothesis developed for this questionnaire item was:

For questionnaire item "information on course scheduling," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.

Table X also includes the results of the Kruskal-Wallis test on the mean rank scores for the questionnaire item "information on course scheduling." The Chi Square value of 20.767 resulted in a level of significance of 0.000 which

TABLE X

MEAN RANK AND DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES ABOUT "INFORMATION  
ON COURSE SCHEDULING" BY REGISTRATION PROCEDURE

	Mean Rank	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Response
Telephone Registration N=41	231.01 <sup>a</sup>	2	17	17	3	1	1
Faculty- Assisted N=40	153.50 <sup>a</sup>	5	31	3	0	1	0
Counselor- Assisted N=80	179.32 <sup>a</sup>	13	45	7	13	0	2
Self-Advised N=254	221.90	23	113	87	27	3	1

Kruskal-Wallis  
Chi Square Value = 20.767<sup>\*</sup>

Level of Significance = 0.000

\*Significant Difference

<sup>a</sup>There is a significant difference using the Mann-Whitney U Test (at the .05 level) between Telephone Registration and Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, between Telephone Registration and Counselor-Assisted Registration, between Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration and Self-Advisement Registration, and between Counselor-Assisted Registration and Self-Advisement Registration

resulted in a level of significance of 0.000 which was sufficient to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance.

Data in Table XI show the mean rank scores for each of the four groups for the questionnaire item "clear directions." The four groups perceived this item in the following order: The Counselor-Assisted Registration group ranked this item highest followed by the Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, the Self-Advised, and the Telephone Registration groups. The distribution of responses by group shows a large number of respondents from all four groups marking in the "agree" and "strongly agree" columns. The Mann-Whitney U Test was used to examine differences between Telephone Registration and Counselor-Assisted Registration and between Counselor-Assisted Registration and Self-Advisement Registration.

The hypothesis developed for this questionnaire item was:

For questionnaire item "clear directions," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.

Table XI also includes the results of the Kruskal-Wallis test on the mean rank scores for the questionnaire item "clear directions." The Chi Square value of 11.791 resulted in a level of significance of 0.008 which was sufficient to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance.

TABLE XI  
MEAN RANK AND DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES ABOUT "CLEAR  
DIRECTIONS" BY REGISTRATION PROCEDURE

	Mean Rank	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Response
Telephone Registration N=41	230.74 <sup>a</sup>	5	20	12	3	1	0
Faculty- Assisted N=40	194.90	5	28	4	2	1	0
Counselor- Assisted N=80	174.79 <sup>a</sup>	19	46	9	5	0	1
Self-Advised N=254	216.85	31	143	55	24	0	1

Kruskal-Wallis  
Chi Square Value = 11.791\*

Level of Significance = 0.008

\*Significant Difference

<sup>a</sup>There is a significant difference using the Mann-Whitney U Test (at the .05 level) between Telephone Registration and Counselor-Assisted Registration and between Counselor-Assisted Registration and Self-Advisement Registration.

Data in Table XII show the mean rank scores for each of the four groups for the questionnaire item "convenient hours." The four groups perceived this item in the following order: The Counselor-Assisted Registration group ranked this item highest followed by the Telephone Registration, the Self-Advisement Registration, and the Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration groups.

The hypothesis developed for this questionnaire item was:

For questionnaire item "convenient hours," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.

Table XII also includes the results of the Kruskal-Wallis test on the mean rank scores for the questionnaire item "convenient hours." The Chi Square value of 0.498 resulted in a level of significance of 0.919 which failed to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance.

Data in Table XIII show the mean rank scores for each of the four groups for the questionnaire item "selection of major courses." The four groups perceived this item in the following order: The Counselor-Assisted Registration group ranked this item highest followed by the Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, the Telephone Registration, and the Self-Advisement Registration groups. The distribution of responses by group shows the largest number of responses in the "strongly agree" and "agree" columns. The Mann Whitney U Test was used to examine differences

TABLE XII  
MEAN RANK AND DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES ABOUT "CONVENIENT  
HOURS" BY REGISTRATION PROCEDURE

	Mean Rank	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Response
Telephone Registration N=41	106.50	9	28	3	1	0	0
Faculty- Assisted N=40	212.52	6	32	0	2	0	0
Counselor- Assisted N=80	201.06	20	50	6	2	1	1
Self-Advised N=254	209.70	68	139	39	7	0	1

Kruskal-Wallis  
Chi Square Value = 0.498

Level of Significance = 0.919

order: The Counselor-Assisted Registration group ranked this item highest followed by the Telephone Registration, the Self-Advisement Registration, and the Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration groups.

The hypothesis developed for this questionnaire item was:

For questionnaire item "convenient hours," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.

Table XII also includes the results of the Kruskal-Wallis Test on the mean rank scores for the questionnaire item "convenient hours." The Chi Square value of 0.498 resulted in a level of significance of 0.919 which failed to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance.

Data in Table XIII show the mean rank scores for each of the four groups for the questionnaire item "selection of major course." The four groups perceived this item in the following order: The Counselor-Assisted Registration group ranked this item highest followed by the Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, the Telephone Registration, and the Self-Advisement Registration groups. The distribution of responses by group shows the largest number of responses in the "strongly agree" and "agree" columns. The Mann-Whitney U Test was used to examine differences between respondent groups. Significant differences existed between Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration and Self-

Advisement Registration and between Counselor-Assisted Registration and Self-Advisement Registration.

The hypothesis developed for this questionnaire item was:

For questionnaire item "selection of major courses," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.

Table XIII also includes the results of the Kruskal-Wallis Test on the mean rank scores for the questionnaire item "selection of major courses." The Chi Square value of 11.381 resulted in a level of significance of 0.010 which was sufficient to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance.

Data in Table XIV show the mean rank scores for each of the four groups for the questionnaire item "selection of elective courses." The four groups perceived this item in the following order: the Self-Advisement Registration group ranked this item highest followed by the Counselor-Assisted Registration, the Telephone Registration, and the Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration groups.

The hypothesis developed for this questionnaire item was:

For questionnaire item "selection of elective courses," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.

Table XIV also includes the results of the Kruskal-Wallis



TABLE XIII  
MEAN RANK AND DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES ABOUT "SELECTION OF  
MAJOR COURSES" BY REGISTRATION PROCEDURE

	Mean Rank	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Response
Telephone Registration N=41	210.87	4	20	9	5	1	2
Faculty- Assisted N=40	182.86 <sup>a</sup>	8	22	3	4	2	1
Counselor- Assisted N=80	177.91 <sup>a</sup>	15	44	6	7	4	4
Self-Advised N=254	220.97	29	125	47	37	13	3

Kruskal-Wallis  
Chi Square Value = 11.381\*

Level of Significance - 0.010

\*Significant Difference

<sup>a</sup>There is a significant difference using the Mann-Whitney U Test (at the .05 level) between Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration and Self-Advisement Registration and between Counselor-Assisted Registration and Self-Advisement Registration.

TABLE XIV

MEAN RANK AND DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES ABOUT "SELECTION OF  
ELECTIVE COURSE" BY REGISTRATION PROCEDURE

	Mean Rank	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Response
Telephone Registration N=41	215.61	3	18	17	1	0	2
Faculty- Assisted N=40	215.89	6	17	8	7	1	1
Counselor- Assisted N=80	208.47	8	38	21	7	2	4
Self-Advised N=254	205.38	25	141	56	20	7	5

Kruskal-Wallis  
Chi Square Value = 0.544

Level of Significance = 0.909

test on the mean rank scores for the questionnaire item "selection of elective courses." The Chi Square value of 0.544 resulted in a level of significance of 0.909 which failed to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance.

Data in Table XV show the mean rank scores for each of the four groups for the questionnaire item "selection of day-time classes." The four groups perceived this item in the following order: the Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration group ranked this item highest followed by the Counselor-Assisted Registration, the Self-Advisement Registration, and the Telephone Registration groups. The distribution of responses by group shows a number of responses in the "no opinion" and "no response" columns. This might have been due to the fact that a majority of students attended classes in the evening and were not concerned with day-time classes.

The hypothesis developed for this questionnaire item was:

For questionnaire item "selection of day-time classes," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.

Table XV also includes the results of the Kruskal-Wallis test on the mean rank scores for the questionnaire item "selection of day-time classes." The Chi Square value of 7.293 resulted in a level of significance of 0.063 which failed to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance.

TABLE XV  
MEAN RANK AND DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES ABOUT "SELECTION OF  
DAY-TIME CLASSES" BY REGISTRATION PROCEDURE

	Mean Rank	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Response
Telephone Registration N=41	226.06	2	15	18	3	1	2
Faculty- Assisted N=40	176.31	7	22	5	5	0	1
Counselor- Assisted N=80	190.17	13	36	14	10	3	4
Self-Advised N=254	215.69	29	113	52	36	18	6

Kruskal-Wallis  
Chi Square Value = 7.293

Level of Significance = 0.063

Data in Table XVI show the mean rank scores for each of the four groups for the questionnaire item "selection of evening classes." The four groups perceived this item in the following order: the Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration group ranked this item highest followed by the Telephone Registration, the Self-Advisement Registration, and the Counselor-Assisted Registration groups.

The hypothesis developed for this questionnaire item was:

For questionnaire item "selection of evening classes," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.

Table XVI also includes the results of the Kruskal-Wallis test on the mean rank scores for the questionnaire item "selection of evening classes." The Chi Square value of 1.971 resulted in a level of significance of 0.587 which failed to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance.

Data in Table XVII show the mean rank scores for each of the four groups for the questionnaire item "chosen method efficient." The four groups perceived this item in the following order: the Telephone Registration group ranked this item highest followed by the Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, the Counselor-Assisted Registration, and the Self-Advisement Registration groups. It may be important to note that the Self-Advisement Registration group ranked this item below the other three

TABLE XVI

MEAN RANK AND DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES ABOUT "SELECTION OF  
EVENING CLASSES" BY REGISTRATION PROCEDURES

	Mean Rank	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Response
Telephone Registration N=41	194.62	2	16	15	3	3	2
Faculty- Assisted N=40	191.11	2	13	21	2	0	2
Counselor- Assisted N=80	212.93	6	12	49	5	2	6
Self-Advised N=254	211.27	18	61	140	16	10	9

Kraskal-Wallis  
Chi Square Value = 1.971

Level of Significance = 0.587

TABLE XVII  
MEAN RANK AND DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES ABOUT "CHOSEN  
METHOD EFFICIENT" BY REGISTRATION PROCEDURE

	Mean Rank	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Response
Telephone Registration N=41	174.20 <sup>a</sup>	12	24	2	1	0	2
Faculty- Assisted N=40	186.55	8	28	1	1	0	2
Counselor- Assisted N=80	203.45	16	48	6	6	0	4
Self-Advised N=254	218.27	39	175	28	7	2	3

Kruskal-Wallis  
Chi Square Value = 9.272 \*

Level of Significance = 0.026

\*Significant Difference

<sup>a</sup>There is a significant difference in using the Mann-Whitney U Test (at the .05 level) between Telephone Registration and Self-Advisement Registration.

groups. The Mann-Whitney U Test was used to examine differences between respondent groups. Significant differences existed between Telephone Registration and Self-Advisement Registration.

The hypothesis developed for this questionnaire item was:

For questionnaire item "chosen method efficient," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.

Table XVII also includes the results of the Kruskal-Wallis test on the mean rank scores for the questionnaire item "chosen method efficient." The Chi Square value of 9.272 resulted in a level of significance of 0.026 which was sufficient to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance.

In addition to responding quantitatively to the fifteen questions of the survey, students were asked four additional questions soliciting suggestions and comments concerning the registration/advisement process they used. Their responses are summarized in Table XVIII through Table XXX.

Data in Table XVIII show responses by student who used Telephone Registration to the questions: "What do you like best about the registration/advisement method you used?" For this question it is important to note that 70.8 percent of the students who used Telephone Registration commented that the process was convenient.



TABLE XVIII  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING BEST LIKED ITEMS  
ABOUT TELEPHONE REGISTRATION

Comment	N	%
Fast	2	4.9
Convenient	29	70.8
Positive relationship with adviser or counselor	1	2.4
No opinion or comment	1	2.4
No response	8	19.5
Total	41	100.0

Data in Table XIX show responses by students who used Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration to the question: "What do you like best about the registration/advisement method you used?" For this question it should be noted that 32.5 percent of the students who used Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration commented that the process was convenient. Also, 30 percent of them commented that they liked the positive relationship with their faculty advisor.

Data in Table XX show responses by students who used Counselor-Assisted Registration to the question: "What do you like best about the registration/advisement method you used?" For this question it is important to note that 40 percent of the students who used Counselor-Assisted Registration commented that they liked the positive relationship with their counselor. Of this group of counselor-assisted students, 28.8 percent did not respond to the question.

TABLE XIX

RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING BEST LIKED ITEMS  
ABOUT FACULTY ADVISOR-ASSISTED REGISTRATION

Comment	N	%
Fast	3	7.5
Convenient	13	32.5
Positive relationship with adviser or counselor	12	30.0
No opinion or comment	4	10.0
No response	8	20.0
Total	40	100.0

TABLE XX

RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING BEST LIKED ITEMS  
ABOUT COUNSELOR-ASSISTED REGISTRATION

Comment	N	%
Fast	8	10.0
Convenient	11	13.7
Positive relationship with adviser or counselor	32	40.0
No opinion or comment	6	7.5
No response	23	28.8
Total	80	100.0

Data in Table XXI show responses by students who used Self-Advisement Registration to the question: "What do you like best about the registration/advisement method you used?" For this question it is important to note that 31.1 percent of

self-advised students commented that they liked the positive relationship with their advisor or counselor. Of this self-advised group, 18.9 percent did not respond to the question and 32.7 percent responded that they liked the self-advisement procedure because it was either fast or convenient.

TABLE XXI  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING BEST LIKED ITEMS  
ABOUT SELF-ADVISEMENT REGISTRATION

Comment	N	%
Fast	41	16.2
Convenient	42	16.5
Positive relationship with advisor or counselor	11	4.3
Can do it by one's self	79	31.1
No opinion or comment	33	13.0
No response	48	18.9
Total	254	100.0

Data in Table XXII show responses by students who used Telephone Registration to the question: "What do you like least about the registration/advisement method you used?" For this question it should be noted that 65.9 percent of those students who registered by telephone gave no response or a response of "no opinion" or "no comment." Also, 14.7 percent of the respondents indicated that they did not have enough advisement.

TABLE XXII  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING LEAST LIKED  
ITEMS ABOUT TELEPHONE REGISTRATION

Comment	N	%
Took too much time	1	2.4
Difficulty in scheduling classes	2	4.9
Not enough advisement	6	14.7
Difficulty with registration procedure	2	4.9
Difficulty with drop/add	1	2.4
Difficulty with fee payment	1	2.4
Telephone lines were busy	1	2.4
No opinion or comment	9	22.0
No response	8	43.9
Total	41	100.0

Data in Table XXIII show responses by students who used Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration to the question: "What do you like least about the registration/advisement method you used?" For this question it is important to note that 12.5 percent of the students who enrolled by Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration indicated that they did not receive enough advisement.

Data in Table XXIV show responses by students who used Counselor-Assisted Registration to the question: "What do you like least about the registration/advisement method you used?" For this question it is important to note that 65 percent of those students who enrolled by Counselor-Assisted Registration gave no response or a response of "no opinion" or "no comment."

TABLE XXIII

RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING LEAST LIKED ITEMS  
ABOUT FACULTY ADVISOR-ASSISTED REGISTRATION

Comment	N	%
Took too much time	2	5.0
Difficulty in scheduling classes	1	2.5
Not enough advisement	5	12.5
Difficulty with registration procedure	3	7.5
Difficulty with fee payment	1	2.5
Difficulty with Bookstore	1	2.5
No opinion or comment	9	22.5
No response	18	45.0
Total	40	100.0

TABLE XXIV

RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING LEAST LIKED ITEMS  
ABOUT COUNSELOR-ASSISTED REGISTRATION

Comment	N	%
Took too much time	2	2.5
Difficulty in scheduling classes	3	3.7
Not enough advisement	16	20.0
Not enough transfer information	3	3.7
Not enough financial aid information	1	1.3
Difficulty with registration procedure	2	2.5
Difficulty with fee payment	1	1.3
No opinion or comment	16	20.0
No response	36	45.0
Total	80	100.0

Data in Table XXV show responses by students who used Self-Advisement Registration to the question: "What do you like least about the registration/advisement method you used?" For this question it should be noted that 18.9 percent of the self-advised students commented that they did not receive enough advisement

TABLE XXV  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING LEAST LIKED ITEMS  
ABOUT SELF-ADVISEMENT REGISTRATION

Comment	N	%
Took too much time	10	3.9
Difficulty in scheduling classes	11	4.3
Not enough advisement	48	18.9
Not enough transfer information	5	2.0
Difficulty with registration procedure	16	6.3
Difficulty with drop/add	2	0.8
Difficulty with Bookstore	2	0.8
No opinion or Comment	68	26.8
No response	92	36.2
Total	254	100.0

Data in Table XXVI show responses by students who used Telephone Registration to the question: "What suggestions would you make for improving the registration/advisement method you used?" For this question it is important to note that 80.5 percent of those students who enrolled by

Telephone Registration gave no response or responded with "no opinion" or "no suggestion." Of the telephone registration students, 17.1 percent commented that they could have used "more advisement assistance."

TABLE XXVI  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING SUGGESTIONS TO  
IMPROVE TELEPHONE REGISTRATION

Suggestion	N	%
More advisement assistance	7	17.1
Improve registration procedure	1	2.4
No opinion or suggestion	11	26.8
No response	22	53.7
Total	41	100.0

Data in Table XXVII show responses by students who used Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration to the question: "What suggestions would you make for improving the registration/advisement method you used?" For this question it should be noted that 80 percent of those students who enrolled by Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration gave no response or responded with "no opinion" or "no suggestion." Of this group, 10 percent could have used "more advisement assistance."

TABLE XXVII

RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING SUGGESTIONS TO  
IMPROVE FACULTY ADVISOR-ASSISTED REGISTRATION

Suggestion	N	%
Expand course offerings	1	2.5
More advisement assistance	4	10.0
More financial aid information	1	2.5
Improve registration procedure	2	5.0
No opinion or suggestion	13	32.5
No response	19	47.5
Total	40	100.0

Data in Table XXVIII show responses by students who used Counselor-Assisted Registration to the question: "What suggestions would you make for improving the registration/advisement method you used?" For this question it is important to note that 61.2 percent of the students who enrolled by Counselor-Assisted Registration gave no response or responded with "no opinion" or "no suggestion." Of this group, 27.5 percent could have used "more advisement assistance."

Data in Table XXIX show responses by students who used Self-Advisement Registration to the question: "What suggestions would you make for improving the registration/advisement method you used?" For this question it should be noted that 68.1 percent of those students who used Self-



Advisement Registration gave no response or responded with "no opinion" or "no suggestion." Of the self-advised, 18.9 percent could have used "more advisement assistance."

TABLE XXVIII  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING SUGGESTIONS TO  
IMPROVE COUNSELOR-ASSISTED REGISTRATION

Suggestion	N	%
Expand course offerings	3	3.8
More advisement assistance	22	27.5
More transfer information	2	2.5
Improve registration procedure	4	5.0
No opinion or suggestion	13	16.2
No response	36	45.0
Total	80	100.0

Data in Table XXX show responses by the four groups to the question: "Do you plan to use the same method of registration/advisement in the future?" For this question 72.3 percent of all four groups said they would use the same registration/advisement method again, 14.9 percent said they would not use the same method again, and 12.5 percent gave no response to the question. A total of 75.6 percent of the Telephone Registration group said they would use the same method again. A total of 75 percent of the Faculty-Assisted Registration group said they would use the same

method again. Of the Counselor-Assisted Registration 71.2 percent said they would use the same method again. Of the Self-Advisement Registration group 72 percent said they would use the same registration/advisement method again.

TABLE XXIX  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING SUGGESTIONS TO  
IMPROVE SELF-ADVISEMENT REGISTRATION

Suggestion	N	%
Expand course offering	9	3.5
More advisement assistance	48	18.9
More transfer information	7	2.8
Improve registration procedure	10	3.9
Improve drop/add procedure	6	2.4
Provide fast refunds for cancelled classes	1	0.4
No opinion or suggestion	75	29.5
No response	98	38.6
Total	254	100.0

### Analysis of Faculty/Counselor

#### Advisement Surveys

The Faculty/Counselor Advisement Survey was delivered in person to all nine full-time counselors employed by the college. Surveys were sent through the college mail system

TABLE XXX  
 RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING USE OF  
 SAME REGISTRATION METHOD AGAIN

Method	Yes		No		No Response		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Telephone	31	75.6	4	9.8	6	14.6	41
Faculty Advisor-Assisted	30	75.0	6	15.0	4	10.0	40
Counselor-Assisted	56	71.2	13	16.2	10	12.5	80
Self-Advisement	183	72.0	39	15.4	32	12.6	254
Total	300	72.3	62	14.9	52	12.5	415

and delivered in person to 41 full-time faculty members. Persons being surveyed were asked to return the form by February 5, 1982. Twenty-eight surveys were returned for a return rate of 68.2 percent.

Table XXXI shows faculty/counselor responses to the statements: (1) "Telephone Registration is an efficient method for students to register"; (2) "Faculty-Assisted Registration is an efficient method for students to register"; (3) "Counselor-Assisted Registration is an efficient method for students to register"; and (4) "Self-Advisement Registration is an efficient method for students to register." A total of 64.3 percent of the faculty and counselors surveyed either strongly agreed or agreed that Telephone Registration was an efficient way to register; 75 percent of the responses either strongly agreed or agreed that Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration was an efficient way for a student to register; 89.3 percent of the respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that Counselor-Assisted Registration was an efficient way to register; and 42.9 percent of them either strongly agreed or agreed that Self-Advisement Registration was an efficient way to register. However, 42.9 percent of the respondents disagreed that Self-Advisement Registration was an efficient way to register.

Table XXXII lists faculty/counselor responses to the question: "In your opinion, which registration process is the most satisfactory?" For this question 42.9 percent

TABLE XXXI  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION RELATED TO METHOD AS  
EFFICIENT WAY TO REGISTER

Method	S. Agree		Agree		No Opinion		Disagree		S. Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Telephone	6	21.4	12	42.9	1	3.6	8	28.6	1	3.6
Faculty Advisor-Assisted	9	32.1	12	42.9	1	3.6	6	21.4	0	0.0
Counselor-Assisted	11	39.3	14	50.0	1	3.6	1	3.6	1	3.6
Self-Advisement	2	7.1	10	35.7	3	10.7	12	42.9	1	3.6

TABLE XXXII  
 RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING  
 MOST SATISFACTORY METHOD  
 OF REGISTRATION

Method	N	%
Telephone	2	7.1
Faculty Advisor-Assisted	12	42.9
Counselor-Assisted	13	46.4
Self-Advisement	0	0.0
No Response	1	3.6
Total	28	100.0

TABLE XXXIII  
 RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING  
 POSITIVE COMMENTS ABOUT  
 TELEPHONE REGISTRATION

Comment	N	%
Convenient	20	71.4
No comment	8	28.6
Total	28	100.0

of the respondents suggested that Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration was the most satisfactory method. A total of 46.4 percent of them indicated that Counselor-Assisted Registration was the most satisfactory.

Table XXXIII shows faculty/counselor responses to the question: "What positive comments have you heard from students regarding Telephone Registration?" For this question 71.4 percent of the respondents said that "convenient" was the most often heard comment.

Table XXXIV indicates faculty/counselor responses to the question: "What negative comments have you heard from students regarding Telephone Registration?" For this question 42.9 percent of them gave "inadequate counseling" as the most heard comment.

Table XXXV reports faculty/counselor responses to the question: "What positive comments have you heard from students regarding Faculty-Assisted Registration?" For this question 50 percent of the respondents listed "knowledgeable of requirements" as the most often heard positive comment.

Table XXXVI shows faculty/counselor responses to the question: "What negative comments have you heard from students regarding Faculty-Assisted Registration?" For this question 35 percent of them gave "unavailable" as the most often heard negative comment.

TABLE XXXIV  
 RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS CONCERNING NEGATIVE  
 COMMENTS ABOUT TELEPHONE  
 REGISTRATION

Comments	N	%
Inadequate counseling	12	42.9
Enrolled in wrong class	5	17.8
Phone lines busy	1	3.6
No comment	10	35.7
Total	28	100.0

TABLE XXXV  
 RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS CONCERNING POSITIVE  
 COMMENTS ABOUT FACULTY ADVISOR-  
 ASSISTED REGISTRATION

Comments	N	%
Knowledgeable of requirements	14	50.0
Willing to help	2	7.1
Respect for faculty	4	14.3
No comment	8	28.6
Total	28	100.0



Table XXXVII reports faculty/counselor responses to the question: "What positive comments have you heard from students regarding Counselor-Assisted Registration?" For this question 38.3 percent gave "knowledgeable of requirements" and 32.1 percent gave "available and helpful" as the most often heard positive comments.

Table XXXVIII indicates faculty/counselor responses to the question: "What negative comments have you heard from students regarding Counselor-Assisted Registration?" For this question 57.1 percent responded with "incorrect advisement" as the most often heard negative comment.

Table XXXIX gives faculty/counselor responses to the question: "What positive comments have you heard from students regarding Self-Advisement Registration?" For this question 53.6 percent responded with "convenient" as the most often heard positive comment.

Table XL states faculty/counselor responses to the question: "What negative comments have you heard from students regarding Self-Advisement Registration?" For this question 57.1 percent of them responded "enrolled in wrong class" and 35.7 percent responded "no comment."

Table XLI shows faculty/counselor responses to the question: "What suggestions for improving Telephone Registration do you have?" For this question 71.4 percent of them suggested "additional advisement" as a means of improving Telephone Registration.

TABLE XXXVI  
 RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING NEGATIVE  
 COMMENTS ABOUT FACULTY ADVISOR-  
 ASSISTED REGISTRATION

Comment	N	%
Incorrect Advisement	7	25.0
Unavailable	10	35.7
No comment	11	39.3
Total	28	100.0

TABLE XXXVII  
 RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING POSITIVE  
 COMMENTS ABOUT COUNSELOR-  
 ASSISTED REGISTRATION

Comment	N	%
Knowledgeable of requirements	11	39.3
Available and helpful	9	32.1
No comment	8	28.6
Total	28	100.0

TABLE XXXVIII

RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING NEGATIVE  
COMMENTS ABOUT COUNSELOR-  
ASSISTED REGISTRATION

Comment	N	%
Incorrect advisement	16	57.1
Unavailable	4	14.3
No comment	8	28.6
Total	28	100.0

TABLE XXXIX

RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING POSITIVE  
COMMENTS ABOUT SELF-ADVISEMENT  
REGISTRATION

Comment	N	%
Convenient	15	53.6
No comment	13	46.4
Total	28	100.0

TABLE XL  
 RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING NEGATIVE  
 COMMENTS ABOUT SELF-ADVISEMENT  
 REGISTRATION

Comment	N	%
Inadequate counseling	2	7.2
Enrolled wrong class	16	57.1
No comment	10	35.7
Total	28	100.0

TABLE XLI  
 RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING SUGGESTIONS  
 TO IMPROVE TELEPHONE  
 REGISTRATION

Suggestion	N	%
Additional advisement	20	71.4
No suggestion	8	28.6
Total	28	100.0

Table XLII gives faculty/counselor responses to the question: "What suggestions for improving Faculty-Assisted Registration do you have?" For this question 46.4 percent of them suggested "training in requirements" as a way to improve Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration.

Table XLIII reports faculty/counselor responses to the question: "What suggestions for improving Counselor-Assisted Registration do you have?" For this question 57.1 percent stated "training in program requirements" as a way to improve Counselor-Assisted Registration.

Table XLIV indicates faculty/counselor responses to the question: "What suggestions for improving Self-Advisement Registration do you have?" For this question 31.2 percent of them had no suggestion and 28.6 percent suggested "require advisement assistance" as a way to improve Self-Advisement Registration.

Some comments surfaced repeatedly in the response of students, faculty, and counselors to the opinion questions. The word "convenient" was applied consistently to the four methods of registration/advisement. "Additional advisement assistance" was requested by all three responding groups as well as "additional registration/advisement information before a student enrolls." Questions asking for a negative comment received a large number of "no opinion, "no comment," or "no suggestion" responses. This was evident from all responding groups even though they were not asked to sign their names to the questionnaire forms.

TABLE XLII  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING SUGGESTIONS  
TO IMPROVE FACULTY ADVISOR-  
ASSISTED REGISTRATION

Suggestion	N	%
Training in requirements	13	46.4
Designated period of advise- ment during the semester	6	21.5
Use only faculty who want to advise	2	7.1
No suggestion	7	25.0
Total	28	100.0

TABLE XLIII  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING SUGGESTIONS  
TO IMPROVE COUNSELOR-ASSISTED  
REGISTRATION

Suggestion	N	%
Training in program requirements	16	57.1
Expand staff of counselors	3	10.7
Counselors and instructors get to know each other	1	3.6
No suggestion	8	28.6
Total	28	100.0

TABLE XLIV  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING SUGGESTIONS  
TO IMPROVE SELF-ADVISEMENT  
REGISTRATION

Suggestion	N	%
More information available to student	7	25.0
Do away with it	4	14.3
Require advisement assistance	8	28.6
No suggestion	9	32.1
Total	28	100.0

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

The discussion in this chapter is divided into three sections. The first section presents a summary of the study. Researcher's conclusions are presented in the second section. Implications for future research and practice are presented in the third section of the chapter.

#### Summary

The purpose of the study was to analyze the perceptions of students who had used one of the registration/advisement methods available at Tulsa Junior College. Results of the study will assist in future decision making to improve registration/advisement procedures. The study sought to answer the following questions:

1. How do students who register by telephone perceive the process?
2. How do students who register via a faculty advisor perceive the process?
3. How do students who register via a counselor perceive the process?
4. How do students who register by self-advisement perceive the process?



5. What significant differences exist between the perceptions of each group?

6. How do faculty members and counselors perceive the different registration/advisement methods?

7. What recommendations can be made to improve the registration processes so that they better meet the needs of the student body?

The researcher conducted a comprehensive review of the literature. This review indicated a trend of continued growth of community/junior colleges and specifically of Tulsa Junior College. The review presented a picture of a changing student population that attends community/junior colleges. Also, it is the researcher's opinion that not much research has been completed concerning methods of registration/advisement.

Student subjects selected were those enrolled in credit classes for the spring semester, 1982. Faculty and counselors that were selected were employed full-time during the spring semester, 1982. Faculty and counselors were selected because of their front-line knowledge of the registration/advisement methods used by the college.

Questionnaires were developed and field-tested for the purpose of surveying students, faculty and counselors. Also used in the study was a computer-generated master list of courses offered.

The student questionnaire was administered to students during regular class meetings on the Northeast and Metro

Campuses of Tulsa Junior College. Instructors collected and returned the surveys to the researcher's office. Faculty and counselor questionnaires were distributed by hand or by in-house mail and were returned to the researcher's office.

## Conclusions

### Student Advisement Survey

A basic research question was formulated for the study which resulted in the development of an overall null hypotheses. Fifteen additional null hypotheses were formulated from the 15 student survey items. Use of a test for non-parametric data of these null hypotheses resulted in the following seven null hypotheses not being rejected.

1. For questionnaire item "additional advisement," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.
2. For questionnaire item "college personnel available," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.
3. For questionnaire item "transfer to a four-year college," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.

4. For questionnaire item "convenient hours," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.
5. For questionnaire item "selection of elective courses," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.
6. For questionnaire item "selection of day-time classes," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.
7. For questionnaire item "selection of evening classes," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.

Use of a test for non-parametric data on the null hypotheses resulted in the following nine null hypotheses being rejected:

1. There are no significant differences among mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration, either on questionnaire total scores or by each questionnaire item.
2. For questionnaire item "sufficient information," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted

Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.

3. For questionnaire item "college personnel courteous," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.
4. For questionnaire item "college personnel indicated interest in helping," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.
5. For questionnaire item "program planning help," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.
6. For questionnaire item "information on course scheduling," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.
7. For questionnaire item "clear directions," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.
8. For questionnaire item "selection of major courses," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.

9. For questionnaire item "chosen method efficient," there is no significant difference in mean rank scores on student evaluations of the registration/advisement process between Telephone Registration, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration, Counselor-Assisted Registration, and Self-Advisement Registration.

The last four questions on the student survey asked for comments from the students concerning the registration/advisement method used by them. The first question asked the students what they liked best about the method they used. All four groups felt that the method of registration/advisement was convenient. Next the students were asked what they liked least about their method of registration/advisement. A high percentage in all four groups did not respond to the question. However, the students who did respond from all the groups indicated that they did not receive enough advisement. The third question asked the students for suggestions to improve the registration/advisement method they used. Students from all four groups suggested that more advisement assistance be made available. The final question asked the students if they would use the same method again in the future. The result of this question was that a large percentage in all four groups plan to use the same registration/advisement method again.

As a result of these responses two conclusions can be drawn. The enrollment system, as it exists at the present time, serves the needs of students with regard to the amount of time needed to enroll and the convenience of

its physical arrangement. Also, there is a need for more advisement information and general directions to be made available. Based on the results of Table XXI in which 4.3 percent of the self-advised students indicated a positive relationship with an advisor or counselor, a student who indicates self-advised may have received assistance from a faculty member or counselor before completing self-advisement registration.

#### Faculty/Counselor Advisement Survey

More conclusions can be drawn based upon the results of the Faculty/Counselor Advisement Survey. The respondents to this survey were generally satisfied with the Telephone, Faculty Advisor-Assisted, and Counselor-Assisted registration methods. Faculty members and counselors would like to see that additional advisement information be made available to students who self-advised at the time they enroll. These respondents agreed that the four different methods were convenient for the students but that both telephone registrants and self-advised registrants would benefit from additional advisement. Also, Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration and Counselor-Assisted Registration would benefit from the additional training of counselors and advisors in program requirements.

## Implications for Practice and Research

### Recommendations for Practice

The results of this study suggest implications for future practice in Tulsa Junior College:

1. Two of the four registration/advisement methods, Telephone Registration and Self-Advisement Registration, should be revised to include additional advisement assistance during the enrollment process.

2. The college should consider a plan to assign a faculty advisor or counselor to work with students using Telephone Registration and Self-Advisement Registration.

3. Professional advisors should be available for referral in a "telephone advisement" area. This service would be invaluable to students who require information and advice not available through the telephone registration operators. In-depth information could be disseminated efficiently and quickly by direct communication with a professional advisor.

4. To assist self-advised student, the registration/advisement procedures should place advisor in locations that are accessible and available to them. Perhaps this procedure would include the establishment of a station if there is a need or a desire for additional advisement assistance. If there is a positive response, the student would be referred to an advisor before proceeding through the registration process.

5. TJC should also consider ways of advertising the existence of the four different registration/advisement methods before enrollment periods begin. This might be accomplished with an information letter or some type of orientation session. Disseminating information on the types of registration/advisement methods available would enable a student to select the method that most closely meets his needs. A student with a technical-occupational major might benefit the most from Faculty Advisor-Assisted Registration. A college parallel major student without a declared major, taking courses for self-improvement only, might be best served by Telephone Registration or Self-Advisement Registration.

6. The college should consider a procedure that continuously evaluates the registration/advisement methods currently being used and be ready to change if needed. Selected faculty, counselors, and students could meet throughout the year to discuss possible additions or deletions to registration/advisement methods.

7. Consideration should be given to providing workshops for faculty advisors and counselors to update and share information on advisement. In addition to providing registration/advisement information to faculty and counselors that are familiar with procedures, new advisement personnel should be given training and information and an opportunity to observe their peers in an advisement situation before they are asked to advise students.



8. The college should consider developing a procedure that incorporates input on registration/advisement methods from high school personnel, business and industry, and the community. Knowledgeable persons from these areas could be asked to serve on an advisory board that would meet with college personnel to review registration/advisement methods. Consideration should be given to continue this process on a yearly basis.

#### Suggestions for Further Research

Additional research in the area of registration/advisement methods may result in more ways to improve the process to better meet the needs of the enrolling students. Listed below are some possible topics:

1. A follow-up study of the grades earned by students that analyzes how they enrolled compared to what grades they earned might provide insight into the effectiveness of each method of registration/advisement.

2. A follow-up study of retention rates of students by each registration/advisement method might suggest improvements to make in the current procedures.

3. A survey of the perceptions of day-time students about the registration/advisement method they used compared with the same perceptions of evening students might lead to recommendations to adjust the registration/advisement processes for one group or the other.

4. An institution-wide survey of the entire college population of students, faculty, and counselors would give the most exact analysis of the perceptions of those groups about the different methods available.

5. A national study concerning students' perceptions of all registration/advisement methods used by two-year colleges might lead to improving TJC's present system by the establishment of additional methods of registration/advisement.

6. A study that compares part-time and full-time students who use the same registration/advisement method would identify which method better meets their needs.

7. A study that analyzes the registration/advisement methods by age of student would help determine if differences exist by age groups.

8. A comparison of registration/advisement methods by multi-campus institutions would identify differences between campuses.

9. A regional study of registration/advisement methods used by urban institutions and rural institutions could provide information as to how students at the two types of institutions could provide information.

10. For Telephone Registration students and Self-Advisement Registration students, a study to determine if they received advisement assistance before enrolling and from what source this assistance was provided would give more insight into what works best for each group.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aitken, Caroline E. and Clifton F. Conrad. "Improving Academic Advising through Computerization." College and University, LIII (Fall, 1977), pp. 115-123.
- Botsman, Peter B. An Analysis of the Continuing Education Interests and Needs of Blue Collar Factory Workers. Ithica, NY: Cornell Institute for Research and Development in Occupational Education, Cornell University, 1975.
- Bonds, Stuart M. TNCC Admission and Registration Survey. Hampton, VA: Thomas Nelson Community College, 1979  
ERIC ED 175 507.
- Cagle, Charles Anthony. "A Comparison of the Results of Student Evaluations of Teachers Between Full-Time Faculty and Part-Time Faculty at an Urban Two-Year College." (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tulsa, 1978.)
- Cohen, Arthur M. and Florence B. Brawer. The Two-Year Instructor Today. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1977.
- Cross, K. Patricia. Beyond the Open Door. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1971.
- Education Beyond the High School. Raleigh, NC: Governor's Commission on Education Beyond the High School, 1962.
- Garner, C. William and Lawrence E. Dalton. "A Transcript and Information Retrieval System for Undergraduate Student Records in an Academic Department." College and University, L (Winter, 1975), pp. 117-123.
- Gilbert, Fontelle, ed. 1980 Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1980.
- Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. Community College: Values, Vision, and Vitality. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1980.

- Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. This is the Community College. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.
- Goodman, Henry H. "Adult Education and Counseling: An Emerging Synthesis." The Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. LIX, (March, 1981), pp. 465-459.
- Huck, Schulyer W., William H. Cormier, and William G. Bounds, Jr. Reading Statistics and Research. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1974.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. Second Edition New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.
- Knowles, Malcolm. The Modern Practice of Adult Education. Chicago: Associated Press/Follett Publishing Company, 1970.
- Knowles, Malcolm. Self-Directed Learning. Chicago: Associated Press/Follett Publishing Company, 1970.
- Levine, A. and J. Weingart. Reform of Undergraduate Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1970.
- London, Howard B. The Culture of a Community College. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1978.
- Philips, Alfred M. The President's Annual Report to the Board. A report submitted to the Tulsa Junior College Regents, Tulsa, 1981.
- Popham, W. James and Kenneth A. Serotnik. Educational Statistics Use and Interpretation. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1973.
- Price, Elizabeth B. "An Analysis of Adult Learning Principles and Practices in an Urban Junior College." (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1981.)
- Quann, C. James et. al. Admissions, Academic Records, and Registrar Services. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1979.
- Rudolph, F. The American College and University. New York: Vintage Books, 1962.

Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.

Steinbrenner, K. and D. H. Bent. SPSS: Statistical Package for Social Sciences. 2nd Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.

Sutterfield, William F. "An Analysis of the Perceptions of Telecourse Students, Faculty, and Administrators at Tulsa Junior College." (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1981.)

Wilkes, Paula and Donna Rosengren. "Phone Registration: Design and Implementation of an Alternative Process." College and University, LIII (Fall, 1977), pp. 124-128.

Woody, Lavera Fay. "Analysis of Perceived Adult Education Practices in Patient Education Programs." (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1981.)

Zwerling, L. Steven. Second Best: The Crisis of the Community College. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1976.

APPENDIX A

STUDENT ADVISEMENT SURVEY

## STUDENT ADVISEMENT SURVEY

Please check the appropriate space for the following items:

1. Sex: ☐ male ☐ female
2. Student status: ☐ full-time, 12 hrs. or more ☐ part-time, less than 12 hrs
3. Age: ☐ under 18 ☐ 18-21 ☐ 22-24 ☐ 25-34  
☐ 35-44 ☐ 45-59 ☐ 60 and over
4. Employment status:  
☐ employed full-time, 40 hours or more per week  
☐ employed part-time ☐ homemaker  
☐ retired ☐ unemployed  
☐ other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_
5. METHOD OF REGISTRATION/ADVISEMENT USED TO ENROLL IN THIS COURSE:  
☐ Telephone Registration. I enrolled by telephone.  
☐ On campus by an assigned faculty advisor. I visited with my faculty advisor then submitted my enrollment card to Registration Office personnel.  
☐ On campus by a counselor. I went to the Counseling & Testing Center and visited with a counselor then submitted my enrollment card to Registration Office personnel.  
☐ On campus, self-advised. I came to the campus and viewed the enrollment information available then submitted my enrollment card to Registration Office personnel.

Please respond to the following statement by checking the appropriate space.

- |  | Strongly<br>Agree        | Agree                    | No<br>Opinion            | Disagree                 | Strongly<br>Disagree     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. The information I received from college personnel was sufficient.                             | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Additional advisement would have been beneficial to me.                                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. The college personnel were available when I attempted to register.                            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. The college personnel were courteous.   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. The college personnel indicated an interest in helping me.                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. The college personnel were able to help me with my program planning.                          | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. The college personnel were able to inform me about planning for transfer to a 4-year college. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. The college personnel were able to give me sufficient information on course scheduling.       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
9. The college personnel provided clear directions for registration/advisement.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
10. The hours of registration/advisement were convenient.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
11. The selection of courses in my major was sufficient.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
12. The selection of elective courses was sufficient.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
13. The selection of needed day-time classes was sufficient.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
14. The selection of needed evening classes was sufficient.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
15. The method of registration/advisement I chose proved to be efficient.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

---

Please comment.

1. What do you like best about the registration/advisement method that you used?

---



---

2. What do you like least about the registration/advisement method that you used?

---



---

3. What suggestions would you make for improving the registration/advisement method you used?

---



---

4. Do you plan to use the same method of registration/advisement in the future?

( ) yes      ( ) no



## APPENDIX B

### FACULTY/COUNSELOR ADVISEMENT SURVEY

## FACULTY/COUNSELOR ADVISEMENT SURVEY

Please respond to the following statements and questions:

- |   | Strongly<br>Agree | Agree | No<br>Opinion | Disagree | Strongly<br>Disagree |
|---|-------------------|-------|---------------|----------|----------------------|
| 1. Telephone Registration is an efficient method for students to register.          | ( )               | ( )   | ( )           | ( )      | ( )                  |
| 2. Faculty-Assisted Registration is an efficient method for students to register.   | ( )               | ( )   | ( )           | ( )      | ( )                  |
| 3. Counselor-Assisted Registration is an efficient method for students to register. | ( )               | ( )   | ( )           | ( )      | ( )                  |
| 4. Self-Advisement Registration is an efficient method for students to register.    | ( )               | ( )   | ( )           | ( )      | ( )                  |

5. In your opinion, which registration process is the most satisfactory? (circle one)

Telephone  
Faculty-Assisted

Counselor-Assisted  
Self-Advisement

6. a. What positive comments have you heard from students regarding Telephone Registration?

---



---

- b. What negative comments have you heard from students regarding Telephone Registration?

---



---

7. a. What positive comments have you heard from students regarding Faculty-Assisted Registration?

---



---

- b. What negative comments have you heard from students regarding Faculty-Assisted Registration?

---



---

8. a. What positive comments have you heard from students regarding Counselor-Assisted Registration?

---



---

- b. What negative comments have you heard from students regarding Counselor-Assisted Registration?

---

---

9. a. What positive comments have you heard from students regarding Self-Advisement Registration?

---

---

- b. What negative comments have you heard from students regarding Self-Advisement Registration?

---

---

10. What suggestions for improving telephone registration do you have?

---

---

11. What suggestions for improving Faculty-Assisted Registration do you have?

---

---

12. What suggestions for improving Counselor-Assisted Registration do you have?

---

---

13. What suggestions for improving Self-Advisement Registration do you have?

---

---

APPENCIX C

KRUSKAL-WALLIS ONE-WAY ANALYSIS  
OF VARIANCE

REGISTRATION + ADVISEMENT STUDY  
 KRUSKAL - WALLIS  
 FILE NCNAME (CREATION DATE = 03/05/82)

- - - - - KRUSKAL-WALLIS 1-WAY ANOVA

BY CUEST6 RR INTL SUFF  
 METHOD REGADV USED

CUEST5 NUMBER	1 41	2 40	3 80	4 254
MEAN RANKS	218.66	167.49	191.24	217.94
CASES	415			
CHI-SQUARE		8.192		
SIGNIFICANCE			0.042	
				CORRECTED FOR TIES
				CHI-SQUARE
				10.139
				SIGNIFICANCE
				0.017

- - - - - KRUSKAL-WALLIS 1-WAY ANOVA

BY CUEST7 RR ADD ADV RENE  
 METHOD REGADV USED

CUEST5 NUMBER	1 41	2 40	3 80	4 254
MEAN RANKS	209.95	207.07	191.21	213.12
CASES	415			
CHI-SQUARE		2.044		
SIGNIFICANCE			0.563	
				CORRECTED FOR TIES
				CHI-SQUARE
				2.235
				SIGNIFICANCE
				0.525

- - - - - KRUSKAL-WALLIS 1-WAY ANOVA

BY CUEST8 RR PERSONNEL AVL  
 METHOD REGADV USED

CUEST5 NUMBER	1 41	2 40	3 80	4 254
MEAN RANKS	210.80	211.94	179.71	215.84
CASES	415			
CHI-SQUARE		5.599		
SIGNIFICANCE			0.133	
				CORRECTED FOR TIES
				CHI-SQUARE
				7.271
				SIGNIFICANCE
				0.064

## APPENDIX D

### MANN-WHITNEY U TEST

REGISTRATION + ADVISEMENT STUDY  
 MANN - WHITNEY U GROUP 1 AND GROUP 2  
 FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 03/05/82)

- - - - - MANN-WHITNEY U - WILCOXON RANK SUM W TEST

QUEST6 RR INTL SUFF  
 BY QUEST5 METHOD REGADV USED

QUEST5 =	1	QUEST5 =	2
MEAN RANK	NUMBER	MEAN RANK	NUMBER
45.68	41	36.20	40

U	W	CORRECTED FOR TIES	
628.0	1448.0	Z	2-TAILED P
		-2.1668	0.0302

- - - - - MANN-WHITNEY U - WILCOXON RANK SUM W TEST

QUEST7 RR ADD ADV RENE  
 BY QUEST5 METHOD REGADV USED

QUEST5 =	1	QUEST5 =	2
MEAN RANK	NUMBER	MEAN RANK	NUMBER
41.29	41	40.70	40

U	W	CORRECTED FOR TIES	
808.0	1628.0	Z	2-TAILED P
		-0.1189	0.9054

- - - - - MANN-WHITNEY U - WILCOXON RANK SUM W TEST

QUEST8 RR PERSONNEL AVL  
 BY QUEST5 METHOD REGADV USED

QUEST5 =	1	QUEST5 =	2
MEAN RANK	NUMBER	MEAN RANK	NUMBER
40.94	41	41.06	40

U	W	CORRECTED FOR TIES	
817.5	1642.5	Z	2-TAILED P
		-0.0269	0.9785

## APPENDIX E

### PROFILE OF STUDENTS



REGISTRATION + ADVISEMENT STUDY  
\*\*\*\*\* QUESTION 3, GROUP 3 \*\*\*\*\*  
FILE NCNAME (CREATION DATE = 02/18/82)

CLES13      AGE

CODE

1. \*\*\*\*\* ( 4)  
I UNDER 18

2. \*\*\*\*\* ( 43 )  
I 18TC21

3. \*\*\*\*\* ( 5 )  
I 221024

4. \*\*\*\*\* ( 22 )  
I 25T034

5. \*\*\*\*\* ( 6)  
I 35TC44

0 ..... 10 ..... 20 ..... 30 ..... 40 ..... 50  
FREQUENCY

MEAN	2.787	STD ERR	0.127	MEDIAN	2.337
NLCE	2.000	STD DEV	1.133	VARIANCE	1.283
KURTOSIS	-1.055	SKEWNESS	0.539	RANGE	4.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	5.000		
VALID CASES	80	MISSING CASES	0		

2  
VITA

Jerry Dale Carroll

Candidate for the Degree of  
Doctor of Education

Thesis: AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENT, FACULTY, AND COUNSELOR  
PERCEPTIONS OF REGISTRATION AND ADVISEMENT  
PROCEDURES AT TULSA JUNIOR COLLEGE

Major Field: Occupational and Adult Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Prairie Grove, Arkansas,  
January 2, 1941, the son of Ray A. Carroll and  
Irene H. Carroll; wife Janice Ann Carroll, two  
children Justen Dale Carroll and Jayme Elizabeth  
Carroll.

Education: Graduated from Muskogee Central High School  
in May, 1958, received Bachelor of Art in Education  
degree from Northeastern Oklahoma State University,  
Tahlequah, Oklahoma, in May 1963; received Master  
of Education degree (Counseling) from Northeastern  
Oklahoma State University in 1970; completed  
requirements for the Doctor of Education degree  
at Oklahoma State Univeristy, in May, 1982.

Professional Experience: Instructor of Social Studies,  
Berryhill High School, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1963 -  
1970; Director of Counseling and Testing, Tulsa  
Junior College, 1970 - 1972; Director of Admissions  
and Records, Tulsa Junior College, 1972 - 1978;  
Dean of Student Personnel Services, Northeast  
Campus, Tulsa Junior College 1978 - 1982.

Professional Organizations: American Association of  
Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers,  
Oklahoma Association of College Coordinators and  
Counselors Past President, Oklahoma College

Personnel Administrators, Oklahoma Association of  
Community and Junior Colleges Past President of  
Student Personnel Division, Southwest Association  
of Student Personnel Administrators, Oklahoma  
Guidance Personnel Association, National Associa-  
tion of Student Personnel Administrators.