AN ANALYSIS OF FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF ACADEMIC ADVISING AT SELECTED SOUTH CENTRAL, PRIVATE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES

By

DANIEL LEE SEIM

Bachelor of Arts
South Dakota State University
Brookings, South Dakota
1973

Master of Education
South Dakota State University
Brookings, South Dakota
1975

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, 1994

AN ANALYSIS OF FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF ACADEMIC ADVISING AT SELECTED SOUTH CENTRAL, PRIVATE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES

Thesis Approved:

Thesis-Adviser

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The completion of this graduate program was by no means done alone, and it requires that I acknowledge many debts owed to my faculty advisers and my family. Many thanks to Dr. Webster, my major adviser, for his understanding and patience for my efforts. A special thanks must certainly go to Dr. Dickman, who has worked endlessly with me on the statistical issues relative to this dissertation. To Dr. Katsinas and Dr. Karman, who served on my committee, I express my deepest appreciation and pray that I have not imposed too much.

I also express my gratitude to the faculties of small, liberal arts colleges that were, in spite of their busy schedules, willing to complete the survey. Their support was traditional.

Finally, I thank my wife, Ann, for her continual support, as well as my two children, Ryan and Jennie, for their willingness to understand as I battled to complete this project.

In the end, we are all equal in our efforts, as we all believe that education makes a difference.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The importance and value of the student-faculty relationship in advising has undergone a dramatic transformation during the past half century. As Rudolph (1962) has noted, the idea of a university education as a stepping stone for a privileged few studying a narrow predetermined curriculum is archaic. The advising system that worked well from the 1600's until the early part of the twentieth century has disintegrated. As a result of the twin burdens of a rapidly evolving curriculum impacted by technological and social change and the spread of the belief in higher education for the masses, the advising process had to change. No longer could universities offer the same classes year after year; no longer could faculty treat young men and women as adoptive children left in their intellectual care. The old system of one-on-one advising with the faculty serving as "*In Loco Parentis*," could no longer serve as a model for the advising process.

The challenge facing universities today is multifaceted. Advising has to change because the very concept of a college education is in a state of flux. Beginning with the huge influx of returning military veterans after World War II and continuing with the enrollment of an increasingly diverse student population, the university is no longer the territory of the middle-upper class white male pursuing a professional degree. Hispanics, African-Americans, Native Americans, Asian-Americans, older students, and working mothers constitute this growing diversity. Coupled with the rapid technological changes and the changing job market, advising has to change. This challenge has been particularly strong during the past 20 years. Although universities began to

systematically plan and organize as early as the 1930's (Rudolph, 1962), the costs of failing to provide a quality advising program did not impact university administrators until the baby boomer college-age population began to decline in the 1980's. As long as universities could afford the attrition of students, advising stayed on the back burner of university policies. In a study of college attrition, it was concluded that universities would have to revolutionize their approach to advising or face a serious loss in students and in funding (Pantages & Creedon, 1978).

This realization was especially eye-opening for traditional private universities, which had come to depend upon the old model of one-on-one advising. Faced with competition from public universities and other private schools, private universities had to re-evaluate the advising process. Burke (1981), Hardee (1970), and Stickle (1982) have pointed out that advising has to go far beyond mere class recommendations and must achieve two major goals: (1) the student must gain personal insight and responsibility for his or her own well being; and (2) the student has to comprehend how his or her career goals are to be fulfilled by selecting the best possible academic program. In essence, the student needs to be taught how to survive and thrive in the university system. This is the goal of the modern adviser. Ironically, the student becomes even more dependent upon the adviser during the first year or so in college. Until the student has clarified career goals, the complexities of class scheduling, the changes in university programs, and the difficulties of adjusting to different professors with varying instructional styles, he/she tends to be overwhelmed as a first-year student (Parris, 1982).

Obviously, advising can no longer be left to fall between the cracks. For too long universities have depended on the old fashioned approach, to their own detriment. Unfortunately, much confusion still exists about taking the right approach to advising. In innumerable studies, universities have surveyed their drop-outs, hoping to focus on the key factors affecting attrition (Brown & Robinson, 1988). Academics,

socioeconomic, school size, sex, age, personality profiles, finances, and even cultural backgrounds have been examined for clues. In response to these studies, universities have offered several solutions: (1) centralizing advising in one office; (2) mentor programs; (3) team advising; and even (4) extending orientation programs for college freshmen. Germaine to all of these is the role of the faculty in the advising process and the perception of the faculty themselves in this process.

Purpose of the Study

Articles are published constantly regarding the number of students who enter four year colleges, but never graduate. The literature is also abundant with the multitude of causes as well as the many ideas offered as solutions to the problem. Some believe that the students themselves can provide much of the information needed to attack the problem. Carstensen and Silberhorn (1979), reporting the results of a national academic advising survey, found that the lack of good advising was the major negative characteristic related to student attrition. Students indicated that, in their opinion, faculty were too busy with research and grading papers to help advising in any way other than signing class enrollment cards (Polson & Jurich, 1979).

This perceived lack of adequate or misguided advising has had a negative impact on the number of students who actually graduated within the four-year period normally reserved for completion of the bachelor's degree. Pantages and Creedon (1978, p. 49), stated that: "For every ten students who enter college in the United States, only four will graduate from that college four years later. One more will eventually graduate from the college at some point after those four years."

Unfortunately, in spite of on going studies, most colleges and universities that maintained records concerning student withdrawal found that the reasons for withdrawal were most often summarized as financial, academic, advising, and personal/unknown. Seldom did the institutions conduct exit interviews to provide more

detailed information (Pantages & Creedon, 1978). In fact, Noel, Levitz, and Kaufmann (1981) reported that faculty felt they did not have enough input into the decision making on retention related issues.

Students at one private liberal arts university in the midwest often complained that advisers were unaware of the total course offerings, major requirements, and graduation requirements within the university according to Seim (personal communication, 1989). These complaints suggested that not all academic advisers were informed adequately in some critical areas of the academic programs.

Smaller institutions are highly sensitive, financially, to the loss of a student. As a result, these smaller institutions must provide for a well-informed and coordinated system of academic advising. Faculty advisers must be aware of their total responsibilities and have adequate data concerning the student at their fingertips. Hofman (1974) suggested that the following are necessary ingredients for an effective college level advising programs:

> 1. An understanding of the organization of the advisement program, with delineation of lines of authority and channels of communication, must be clear to all concerned.
>
> 2. Advisement responsibilities must be clearly defined.
>
> 3. Faculty advisers should be encouraged to improve their advisement performance through access to and participation in in-service training programs.
>
> 4. Academic advising must allow for changing campuses, students, and curricula (p. 46).

In a report by the president of a small college to the college's board of trustees in the spring of 1989, it was indicated that for the institution to maintain any sort of viable future the institution must not only be able to recruit quality students, but more importantly, retain them for four or more years (Peck, 1989). New programs to expand course offerings, increase extracurricular activities and upgrade the advising program were being planned for the future.

It was abundantly clear from the literature that, because of the diverse nature of the college student in the 1980's, the way a faculty adviser perceives the responsibilities of an academic adviser can have a major impact on the success of the student in the college environment. If the advisement system maintains a consistent minimum expectation of performance, then each student will be assured of receiving sufficient advice to succeed in college. Koerin (1991, p. 326) reported that "A key barrier to developing effective advising programs is the lack of consensus on the part of faculty on what advising is and ought to be." Additionally, there was evidence in the literature that academic advising has a direct relationship to student retention. Therefore, investigating academic advising would be useful in studying retention.

The literature review for this study indicated that an analysis of faculty academic advisers should reveal something about their perception of their role in academic advising, institutional and student responsibilities, student attrition, and advising techniques. Also, the significant lack of information about faculty perceptions at small, liberal arts colleges in the literature serves as a basis for this study. The purpose of the study was to explore the relationship of faculty perceptions of academic advising functions relative to various demographic factors; faculty perceptions of functions that should be fulfilled and those that are being fulfilled; and finally, factors that may limit academic advisers' effectiveness.

Significance of the Study

The literature does not address adequately the role of faculty academic advisers nor their perceptions of this assigned responsibility. Also, the literature was significantly lacking in faculty perceptions that may limit their effectiveness as academic advisers. This researcher believes that there has been limited input from faculty regarding faculty academic advising at small, liberal arts colleges and that the complete participation in this activity is essential to the success of small, liberal arts colleges, and

also that faculty lack consensus on their advising roles as well as the institution's role in the advising process. The study will address questions regarding faculty perceptions of their role in faculty academic advising and issues that may limit their effectiveness. This information can be used to improve the success rate of undergraduates via improved effectiveness, as well as for the faculty and as assistance for administrators in revitalizing the academic advising program.

Statement of the Problem

The problem investigated in this study was: To analyze and compare the perceptions of faculty academic advisers at randomly selected small, liberal arts colleges in the south central region of the National Academic Advising Association. Specifically, academic advising responsibilities and issues related to factors that may limit their effectiveness as academic advisers was explored. The objectives of this study were as follows:

1. To review perceptions of the responsibilities of faculty academic advisers as they may relate to gender, tenure status, total number years of undergratuate advising experience, highest degree earned, and age.

2. To determine the relationship between the real and ideal perceptions of faculty academic advisers regarding their advising functions.

3. To determine the most important factors that faculty perceive as limiting their effectiveness in the advising process.

Definition of Terms

The terms used in this study that have some special meaning will be operationally defined in the following manner:

Academic Advising: Duties performed by full-time or part-time university staff members to assist students in realizing the maximum educational benefits available to

them by helping them to better understand themselves and to learn to use the resources of the institution to meet their special educational needs and aspirations.

Faculty Academic Advisers: Full-time or part-time faculty members who are advising on less than a 100% time basis, who were selected from Class II institutions as defined by the Carnegie Foundation (1987) Class II classification..

Perception: To have taken hold of, felt, comprehended, or become aware of, primarily through the senses of sight and hearing as determined by the scores on the survey instrument, Part III.

Small, Liberal Arts Colleges: Institutions that are less selective and award more of their degrees in liberal arts fields and/or institutions that award less than half of their degrees in liberal arts fields, but with fewer than 1,500 students.

Tenure: [Tenure is] an arrangement under which faculty appointments in an institution of higher education are continued until retirement for age or physical disability, subject to dismissal for adequate cause or unavoidable termination on account of financial exigency or change of institutional program (AAUP/AAC Commission on Academic Tenure, 1973).

Nontenured Faculty: Full-time faculty that have not yet met the institution's requirements for tenure.

Effectiveness: The act of producing the desired effect as demonstrated by scores on the survey instrument, Part IV.

Assumptions and Limitations

It was assumed that accurate information was obtained from respondents and that questionnaires were answered with candor. It was assumed that questionnaires were accurately answered from the perspective of faculty academic advisers. Also, it was assumed that the group of faculty that responded to the survey were representative of the population.

The study had the following limitations:

1. The study was limited to faculty at randomly selected institutions located in the states of Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico.

2. Data were not generalized outside the selected regions nor to institutions outside the Carnegie Foundation (1987) Class II classification.

3. The study measured only perceptions of faculty academic advisers at Class II institutions as identified in Chapter III.

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to answer the following questions:

1. What is the relationship of various demographics of faculty academic advisers to perceptions of academic advising functions?

2. What is the relationship between the real and ideal perceptions of faculty academic advisers?

3. What are the most important factors that faculty perceive as limiting their effectiveness in the advising process?

Organization of the Study

Chapter I has discussed the evolution and decline of student advising at liberal arts colleges. Because of the growing demands on faculty and administrators, the traditional faculty-student advising relationship has been placed under severe stress. Advising has been particularly hard hit at small, liberal arts colleges, the focus of this study. The combination of a number of factors, including an increasingly diverse curriculum and student population, along with rapid technological changes, competition from public colleges, and heavier faculty teaching loads, has pushed advising low on the list of priorities at small, liberal arts colleges. In response to the challenge, small, liberal arts colleges have implemented a number of changes, including mentoring, team

advising, centralized advising, and extended orientation programs. Chapter I concludes with a proposed study of the status of student advising at small, liberal arts colleges as perceived by faculty in selected south central, liberal arts colleges.

Chapter II will provide the reader with an overview of the literature related to student academic advising. Emphasis will be placed on the evolution and decline of the student-adviser relationship and the factors cited in various studies for the present crisis in student advising. Chapter III will present a methodology for examining faculty perceptions of the present state of student advising at such colleges, including a description of the population sample, the instrumentation, and the research design for the study.

Chapter IV reports the analyses of the data. In this chapter, the perceptions of advisers about the state of student advising is analyzed through the use of various statistical methods relating adviser characteristics to their perceptions. Special emphasis is placed upon key indicators which seem to correlate with adviser attitudes. The summary, including conclusions and recommendations, is presented in Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The literature relating to college advising has been reported in the following sections: (1) Historical Background of Academic Advising; (2) The Importance of Academic Advising; (3) Responsibilities of Academic Advisers; (4) Academic Advising Delivery Systems; and (5) Evaluating Academic Advising Programs.

Historical Development

Expectations and responsibilities of academic advising have evolved from an *in loco parentis* relationship to primarily clerical tasks, such as signing registration forms and assisting students in personal, educational, and career decisions. Currently, students expect a more personalized advising relationship in which they assume that advisers will assist them in integrating academic opportunities with personal interests, capabilities, and goals (Guinn & Mitchell, 1986).

In 1638, when students first began to arrive at colleges, they came ready to study. The student's career was usually already determined, as the selection process occurred during his secondary school years, and there were seldom any variations. Choices were limited, and sons often followed in their father's footsteps. Those students attending college were well prepared in mathematics, science, English, history, and religion as well as being competent in the areas of reading and writing (Rudolph, 1962).

Students attended colleges that their parents or other family members had attended. Presidents and professors readily accepted the students into their homes as

residents. As a result, early academic advising was performed by the president of the college. Since most of the earliest American colleges were predominantly private and controlled by clergy, the faculty were committed to helping their fellow man and sharing knowledge, thereby aiding young people in becoming adults. The president was accountable to the parents for education of their children and was also the primary disciplinarian. Later, this responsibility was delegated to a personnel administrator or dean who saw to the enrollment and teaching of students (Rudolph, 1962).

Faculty with a reputation for being empathic, caring advisers were excellent candidates for appointments as dean of men. President Charles W. Eliot of Harvard characterized these unofficial advisers who served students as "advising . . . rather than controlling." One example is his description of Dean LaBaron Briggs: "He possesses a high honesty, a readiness to give himself to others and a certain kindliness of character which made students at ease in his presence. . . . They were going to him for counsel for every kind of problem" (Brown, 1926, p.11).

The first system of faculty advisers was initiated at Johns Hopkins in 1876. In 1889, the first chief of faculty advisers was appointed by President Daniel Gilman. This appointment provided official recognition of the important institutional need for academic counseling and advising (Cowley, 1949). Freshman advisers were appointed at Harvard in 1888 because of the increased size and elective additions to the curriculum, which necessitated closer attention to undergraduate guidance (Rudolph, 1962).

There is little doubt that the rapid growth of institutions of higher education in America is unique in the history of higher education (Mueller, 1961). Academic advising reflects this growth in a variety of settings, including small, liberal arts colleges, state universities, church-supported schools, municipal institutions, and technical and community colleges. Academic advising also reflects the diversity of students which has come to include students from all socioeconomic and cultural background. The complexity of institutions and diversity of students have influenced the type of advising

delivery systems that were created to meet the unique needs of each institution (Gordon, 1990).

Academic advising continued to evolve out of the need to interpret a more complex and varied curriculum. Curricula are considered to make a statement about one's continual growing knowledge and experience that is considered useful, appropriate, and/or relevant to the lives of educated men and women (Rudolph, 1977).

As the breadth and complexity of the curricula increased, the need for extended educational counseling became more critical. Following World War I, counselors were trained to complement faculty advising. Feelings and attitudes of students were taken into account in addition to aptitude for study (Rudolph, 1977).

After World War II, higher education experienced a tremendous growth in both student enrollment and the diversity of students. As a result, most campuses developed student oriented programs in housing, financial aid, job placement, and counseling. Because faculty felt that academic advising was primarily an academic function that only a faculty member should perform, even though there was growing support for professional advisers, it did not experience the same growth as other non-curricular activities (Grites, 1979). Grites also noted that during the post World War II period, faculty were primarily responsible for academic advising by almost a four to one margin as compared to nonfaculty or professional advisers.

During the 1950's, as student enrollment continued to grow, faculty began to limit their energies toward advising. As a result, they began to involve themselves more in institutionally rewarded activities; i.e., consultation, committee work, institutional governance, publishing, and research. In the 1960's and early 1970's, student unrest impacted all aspects of higher education, most notably the university curriculum. Faculty advisers could no longer simply sign class cards. They now virtually had to construct the general curriculum for each student. The responsibilities of the faculty required much more knowledge of the university curriculum; i.e. availability of courses,

student needs, and abilities. At the same time, faculty were expected to fulfill their roles as teachers, developers of the institutional curriculum, researchers, and publishers (Gordon, 1990).

In the second half of the 1970's, as enrollments declined, student retention became a primary focus of administrators. Recruitment efforts then, and even now, brought an increasingly diversified student population. Minority students, older students, academically under prepared students, and other untraditional students began enrolling in far greater numbers.

During this period, the advising process had been shown to be an important element in the retention of these students (Carstensen & Silberhorn, 1979). Institutions began to concentrate on the quality of education that they were providing because they faced a more competitive market for students. Academic advising was seen as one way to provide this quality via making use of the best possible resources with the assistance of faculty for students.

Attitudes towards academic advising changed very little until the 1950's (Grites, 1979). Until that time, advising was seen as a prescriptive, administrative activity where faculty approved certain courses for students. Afterwards, there was an increased emphasis on interpersonal relationships, a counseling function in the 1960's. The students of the 1970's prompted a need to address students' psychological development, social responsibilities, and vocational interests. The result was a new developmental emphasis in advising.

One of the most important aspects to be recognized in the field of advising in the 1970's and 1890's was developmental advising. The theoretical frameworks set forth by William Perry, Arthur Chickering, Lawrence Kohlberg, Carol Gilligan, and others, as well as the vocational theories of Donald Super, John Holland, and David Tiedeman, were adopted to personalize advising in an approach that went far beyond the traditional advising agenda. Students were perceived as individuals with unique

needs and concerns, and advising practices were expanded to include educational and vocational goal setting as well as the traditional scheduling of classes (Gordon, 1990). Academic advising evolved into a decision-making process that was ongoing, multifaceted, and the responsibility of both student and adviser (Winston et al., 1984).

The growth and significance of academic advising has grown to such proportions that in the spring of 1979, the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) was chartered, with a membership of 429 individuals. In 1981, the first edition of the NACADA Journal was published, and in 1989 the National Clearing House for Academic Advising was established at The Ohio State University. The latter was to serve as a repository of research on academic advising (Beatty, 1991).

National Standards for Developmental Academic Advising were established in 1983 by NACADA and the Council for the Development of Standards for Student Services/Development Programs (CAS, 1990). These professional standards, once implemented and practiced, were intended to bring a sense of accountability and integrity to the entire field of academic advising in higher education.

As enrollments began to decline in the 1970's and throughout the 1980's, student satisfaction and retention became major focal points for many universities, with proper academic advising regarded as an integral key to keeping students in school. This was first highlighted in the First National Survey on Academic Advising by Carstensen and Silberhorn (1979). It found that retention rates increased 25% or more for some universities that had improved their academic advising programs.

Academic advising has made significant progress since its beginning in the colonial colleges. No matter what their official or unofficial title, advisers have cared for the students' intellectual, physical, social, and moral well being from the beginning of higher education in America to today's complex and comprehensive advising structures. In the future, as long as there are changes in universities across America, academic advisers will face challenges brought about by accompanying changes in

university standards, curriculum, and changes in the personal views held by faculty members, administrators, and students.

The Importance of Academic Advising

The literature is replete with commentaries on academic advising. In a national study of colleges with enrollments of 5,000 or more, Richardson, Seim, Eddy, and Brindley (1985) found that personal adjustment to college, career and life planning, academic difficulties, and basic skills remediation were among the seven leading counseling problems encountered by student affairs personnel. These items have traditionally been associated with academic advising. Noel et al. (1985) suggested that three of the six primary obstacles to persistence in college were: completing institutional procedures, selecting appropriate courses, and providing time for academic work; tasks usually covered in academic advising. Brown and Robinson (1988) found that persisters in college frequently reported using advising services, while over half of those who withdrew before graduation had never used advising services or did not know they existed. Parris (1982) found that students who received advisement had significantly higher GPA's than student who did not receive advisement.

Winston et al. (1984) found that there was a significant relationship between student satisfaction and the student's relationship with faculty members, and that student satisfaction and retention were related directly to the quality of academic advising they received. Noel et al. (1985) found that retention was the by-product of improvements in services and programs, and that dissatisfied students at an institution influenced other students. This dissatisfaction resulted in increased attrition.

Hornbuckle et al. (1979) found that students' persistence to a degree was also related to the quality of the relationship established with a faculty advisor. Schubert and Munski (1985) found that better academic advising was often the result of efforts to

increase student retention, to reduce problems in registration procedures, and to develop more realistic study goals.

Several other researchers have noted the correlation between academic advising and retention. Stodt (1987) indicated that poor academic advising was the primary reason given by students for dropping out of college. Metzner and Bean (1987) found that academic advising ranked seventh out of 26 variables related to persistence. Buhr, Pelletier and Wark (1987) found that the first day on campus was the most critical from a retention perspective and that the most influential person on that day was the academic adviser.

Tinto (1987) claimed that quality advising services were important for all students, not just those in academic trouble, and that good advising is an essential component in any effective retention program. Glennen (1983) commented, "An effective academic advisement program will be the prime factor in increasing student retention during the 1980s and 1990s" (p. 59). He also claimed that academic advising with emphasis on student satisfaction and retention would become the foremost weapon against declining enrollments. In an important study, Noel (1983) noted that institutions with highly successful programs emphasizing academic persistence and achievement of learner outcomes (as measured by scores on the College Outcomes Measures Program scores) placed significantly more emphasis on academic advising and orientation than did institutions with less successful persistence rates. His research also noted that the number of faculty with doctoral degrees, student/faculty ratio, library holdings, and accreditation had little impact on retention.

Responsibilities of Academic Advisers

Through the years, the responsibility of the college academic adviser has changed to meet the needs of an ever changing student population. In the 1980's,

academic advising was beginning to address the need to advise the "whole" student and thus become responsible for how the student developed beyond the classroom.

Stickle (1982) advocated that the adviser fulfill five functions:

> 1. The advisor assists the student in effecting a program of study consistent with the students interest and needs;
>
> 2. The advisor provides the student with adequate information on courses being offered, regulations, and administrative procedures to assist the student with class scheduling;
>
> 3. The advisor assists the student with academic concerns such as how to take a test, study skills, motivation, and reading comprehension;
>
> 4. The advisor becomes aware of the student's needs, motives, purposes, and expectations and assists the student with such personal problems as college adjustment and self understanding;
>
> 5. The advisor provides the opportunity and encouragement for each student to develop long term professional strategies by exploring occupational and graduate school alternatives (pp. 356-357)

According to Henggeler (1980), one ideal of the responsibility of the academic adviser was to look at alternative ways of providing students with skills, attitudes, and resources necessary to help them function successfully in the educational environment. Comments like Henggeler's and also Stickle's (1982) reflect the division that exists in the literature between the responsibility of the academic faculty advisers and the personnel or professional counseling specialists toward the roles each play in advising students.

The responsibilities of academic or faculty advisers and personnel or professional counseling specialists were being debated even during the 1960s. DeLisle (1965) felt that a distinction between faculty advising and psychological counseling needed to be made.

> In academic advising, the student is seeking information and explanations in contacts that are more limited and immediate. The area of discussion relates to subject matter, academic requirements or intellectual problems as these apply to the individual student in his unique capacities. Related concerns or ramifications are included, though the faculty academic advisor may make use of other resources, to which he

> refers the student. By contrast, psychological and vocational counseling represents a longer process at a deeper level of involvement focusing around feelings and attitudes rather than on facts and information. Thus, it is not a question of whether to use faculty advisors, or professional counselors, but rather at what levels (pp. 1-2).

Teague and Grites (1980) pointed out that:

> Although student personnel professionals have generated improvements in the academic areas that affect the academic advising process through admission counseling, orientation programs, freshman seminars, career development centers, and learning laboratories; the faculty cannot be overlooked or discarded. Rather, cooperative efforts between the faculty and student personnel staffs need to be expanded mutual expertise must be recognized and used for the betterment of the total institution (p. 41).

Teague and Grites' comments reflected the more recent discussions occurring in the literature; i.e., rather than discussing the differences in responsibilities of college and university professional staff the real issue is; "How academic advising should be designed to facilitate the educational mission of the institutions and to assist students in achieving personally relevant academic objectives" (Kramer & Gardner, 1984; p. 412). This concept is commonly known as "developmental advising"; i.e., the education of the whole student.

Academic Advising Delivery Systems

Just as is true for various teaching techniques in the classroom, academic advising has various modes of delivery. The most frequently used advising delivery system is that involving faculty advisers. Crockett and Levitz (1984) found that 80% of the 754 institutions surveyed involved faculty in academic advising. Four year private institutions (72%) were more likely to utilize faculty in academic advising than the other three types of institutions surveyed (two-year private: 68%, two-year public: 57%, and four year public: 64%). Habley and McCauley (1987), in a study that focused on delivery systems and institutional characteristics, found that faculties' only delivery systems were directly related to the size of the institution; i.e., faculty only was over-represented in schools of 1,000 students or fewer and under-represented in institutions with more

than 10,000 students. Crockett (1986a) stated, "Faculty advising systems have emerged primarily because many institutions have assumed, correctly or incorrectly, that faculty are interested in advising and perceive advising as an important faculty role" (p. 10).

Another common advising delivery system is the use of persons with full-time responsibility for advising. Habley and McCauley (1987) found that this delivery system was under-represented in the small, institutions (fewer than 4,999 students) and over-represented in the larger institutions (10,000 and above). Crockett and Levitz (1984) found that 57% of the institutions used full-time professional advisers to some degree. Professional advisers are usually used in conjunction with faculty advisers, and, according to Crockett (1986a), have the advantage of devoting their full attention and expertise to the advising process, but they may sometimes be overloaded and unfamiliar with specific majors and departments.

Advisement centers or centralized advising has been a more recent development in the delivery of academic advising. Crockett and Levitz reported in 1984 that 30% of all institutions responding to their survey indicated that they had an advisement center. Four year public institutions were more likely to maintain an advisement center than were private four year and two year colleges, and public two year colleges. Academic advising delivery systems using both centralized and faculty advising are more common than institutions using one or the other. However, Habley and McCauley (1987) have reported that when the responsibility for academic advising is divided between the advising office and faculty (which showed the largest participation), smaller institutions (under 2,499 students) were slightly under-represented compared to institutions with a larger populations. This meant, of course, that institutions with a larger student enrollment are more likely to utilize centralized advising than institutions with smaller enrollments. Grites (1979) pointed out that centralized advising centers are a ". . . readily available repository of information, a monitor of developing students

concerns, an internal referral and support system, and a place that students can call 'home'" (p. 27).

Peer/paraprofessional advisers have also been used effectively in academic advising. Twenty-seven percent of the institutions responding in Crockett's and Levitz's (1984) study indicated that they utilized peer/paraprofessionals in academic advising. Public four year colleges were more likely to utilize peer/paraprofessional advisers than were any of the other three types of institutions. Peer/paraprofessional advisers provide release time for full-time professional advisers and faculty advisers to concentrate on more in-depth advising issues (King, 1988). A disadvantage of this advising delivery system concerned the peer/paraprofessionals advisers' lack of proper background or skills to deal effectively with some of the more complex aspects of the advising process (Crockett, 1986b).

The increasing emphasis on technology has led to the use of computer programs to assist in advising. Additionally, computer-assisted, self, and group academic advising have increased in popularity at many institutions. Their benefits have involved sharing costs and time effectiveness (King, 1988). However, the methods should supplement, not replace, one-to-one advising, as one-to-one academic advising provides advisees the opportunity to interact with advisers on the important developmental matters of life, academic and career goals, and planning (Crockett, 1982).

Institutions must determine which advising delivery system or combination of systems is best suited to meet their institutions' unique needs. Student needs and personnel options are essential in the implementation of a successful academic advising program (Grites, 1979).

Although delivery systems may vary in their approach, a common theme incorporated into many academic advising models is developmental academic advising. Historically, higher education has promoted the education of the whole person. Leading academic administrators like Gilman at Johns Hopkins, Lowell at Harvard, and

Woodrow Wilson at Princeton decried the narrow focus of intellectualism (French, 1964). The legendary dialogue, while sitting on a log, between Mark Hopkins and one of his students depicts a classic example of advising and teaching in a developmental sense, taking place in an earlier era (Rudolph, 1962).

The concept of student development goes beyond the offices of student affairs into every facet of the educational process. Ender, Winston, and Miller (1982) indicated that theories of student development fit well into developmental academic advising. Developmental academic advising should be viewed as a patient intervention for influencing positively the educational and personal development of students and is defined by Ender, Winston, and Miller:

> . . . a systematic process based on a close student-advisor relationship intended to aid students in achieving educational, career, and personal goals through the utilization of the full range of institutional and community resources. It both stimulates and supports students in their quest for an enriched quality of life...Developmental advising relationships focus on identifying and accomplishing life goals, acquiring skills, and attitudes that promote intellectual and personal growth, and sharing concerns for each other and for the academic community (pp. 18-19).

Ender, Winston, and Miller (1982) indicated that "A major characteristic of the developmental advising process is the relationship between the students and advisors." (p. 58) Ender, Winston, and Miller listed seven principles that are essential if the goal of developmental advising is to be achieved:

> 1. Advising is a continuous process with an accumulation of personal contacts between advisor and advisee--these contacts have both direction and purpose;
>
> 2. Advising must concern itself with quality of life issues and the advisor has a responsibility to facilitate the quality of the student's experience while on the college campus;
>
> 3. Advising is goal related and goals should be established and owned by the advisee--these goals should include academic, career, and personal planning areas;
>
> 4. Advising requires the establishment of a caring human relationship--one of which the advisor must take primary responsibility for its initial development;

5. Advisors should be models for students to emulate--specifically demonstrating behaviors which lead to self-responsibility and self directiveness;

6. Advising should seek to integrate the services and expertise of both academic and student affairs professionals; and

7. Advisors should seek to utilize as many campus and community resources as possible (p. 256).

Evaluating Academic Advising Programs

Recently, accountability has been heavily stressed in education, and, more specifically, in higher education. The interest in evaluating and improving higher education appears to be part of an evaluative surge in American culture, where accountability is the main issue. Academic advising must be held accountable for its operations, resources, and program effectiveness (Kramer, 1984).

Crockett (1988) stated that there are four basic assumptions to be considered for the evaluation of academic advising:

1. Evaluation and measurement can improve program effectiveness and individual advisor performance;

2. Academic advising programs, as well as individual advisors, should be systematically and periodically appraised;

3. Advisee evaluation is one of the most direct and useful methods of assessing advising effectiveness;

4. Every evaluation system can be improved; there is no perfect method of evaluating the totality of advisor or program performance (p. 169).

However, despite the documented interest in and the apparent need for evaluation, various reports, and studies indicate that there has been very little adviser program evaluation or development actually taking place (Srebnik, 1988).

The 1979, 1984, and 1987 ACT National Surveys each examined the role of evaluation in a college or university advising program. Though some of the results have already been reported (see Academic Delivery Systems, Chapter II), the review of additional findings from these studies revealed the following:

1. There are few effective systems in place for the evaluation of academic advising and little reward or recognition attached to its successful delivery (Carstensen & Silberhorn, 1979).

2. The vast majority of institutions have not implemented a systematic and periodic appraisal of either their advising program or individual advisers (Crockett & Levitz, 1983).

3. Less than one-half of institutions report regular evaluation of advising program effectiveness. Evaluation of faculty advisers is not widespread (Habley, 1988).

Habley's 1988 study also reported that 42.5% of the universities and colleges surveyed indicated that they regularly evaluated the effectiveness of their advising program, but 57.5% responded that they did not.

Universities should periodically evaluate their advising programs to determine their overall effectiveness. Crockett (1988) stated:

> A well designed evaluation program can and should achieve multiple objectives. Such purposes need to be agreed upon and then clearly articulated to all those affected by the program. The following are typical evaluation program goals:
>
> 1. To determine how well the advising system is working.
>
> 2. To obtain information on individual advisor performance for the purpose of self-improvement.
>
> 3. To gain information on areas of weakness to better develop in-service training strategies.
>
> 4. To provide data for use in administering a recognition/reward system for individual advisors.
>
> 5. To gather data to support requests for funding or gain improved administrative support of the advising program (p. 173).

Crockett (1988) stated that all universities and colleges should conduct an overall program evaluation every two or three years. The 1987 ACT National Survey, compared to the 1981 National Survey, indicated that although there was a substantial increase in the number of institutions providing regular program evaluations, of the four

year private institutions, only 45% regularly provided regular evaluation of their advising program.

Also, the 1987 ACT National Survey revealed that the majority of universities and colleges have no formal method of individual advisor evaluation. Furthermore, this researcher found no study that reviewed faculty perceptions of academic advising on a national or regional level. Yet, as the literature suggests, assessments of the entire advising program and of individual advisers should be an on going activity. All participants in the advising process are fully cognizant of their roles and responsibilities.

Summary

In retrospect, the process of advising students in the twentieth century has become divorced from its roots in the traditional university setting. As the number and diversity of the student population increased and as the demands of new technologies and social change impacted the old traditions, the ideal of the faculty member as a mentor and adviser disappeared. Unfortunately, advising became a burden few faculty were willing to undertake. As universities shifted emphasis and rewards from good instruction to research, advising became even less popular. In one of the great ironies, the 1970's and 1980's saw the growth of developmental advising, which, in fact, represented an attempt to recapture the counseling aspect of traditional advising. Of course, this modern approach to advising is far less prescriptive and far more sensitive to the idiosyncrasies of today's students; nevertheless, it does seek to reestablish the faculty member as both a mentor and key counselor in the student's professional and personal development. As Ender, Winston, and Miller (1984) noted, the process balances responsibility on the parts of both student and the faculty-adviser. The establishment of NACADA and the Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) signifies the reawakening of both administrators and faculty to the value of a quality

advisement program. Unfortunately, advising remained an orphan until the economic impact of poor retention rates hit home in the late seventies and eighties.

Significant research regarding the importance of advising did not begin until the 1980's with the work of Richardson et al. (1985), Noel et al. (1985), Brown and Robinson (1988), Metzner and Bean (1987), and numerous others. Their studies revealed what many university administrators had suspected: academic advising correlates with retention and overall student satisfaction with the college experience. Especially important was the work of Hornbuckle et al. (1979), Schubert and Munski (1985), and Stodt (1987), which revealed how critically important the relationship of the adviser to student really was. By the beginning of the nineties, it became obvious that schools which ignored the value of providing competent and caring faculty advising, did so at their own peril. The research significantly linked the retention and persistence of the student to the success of any university.

Thus, the responsibilities of the adviser have become paramount. Stickle (1982), Henggeler (1980), and Teague and Grites (1980) enunciated the professional obligations of the academic adviser. These went far beyond merely providing information for students to recasting the adviser in the form of a personal counselor whose job was to anticipate student needs and develop expertise in directing the student to the resources needed to enhance the student's academic and personal satisfaction with the university experience. As a result of this movement, the education of the whole student became a focused concern of the adviser. This is the basis of the term "Developmental Advising."

The delivery of the advising function to the student had to be carefully examined and analyzed. As a result, several approaches were developed. Crockett and Levitz (1984) found that many institutions still relied on the faculty to do the advising. On the other hand, professional full-time academic advisers were being used as either a solo approach to the problem or were, at least, used to interact in combination with the

faculty adviser at some institutions. Some four year institutions had even begun to utilize the peer/paraprofessional approach in order to free up time for faculty members to assist more advanced students. As Crockett (1986b) pointed out, this approach runs the risk of permitting younger, less experienced individuals to do some advising. Ender, Winston, and Miller's (1982) seven principles governing the Developmental Advising Approach are rudimentary to the holistic advising movement and, in many ways, seek to recapture the traditional aspects of the student-adviser relationship lost many years ago. In fact, advising must now confront all aspects of student development, not just the academic. The narrow intellectualism attacked by Gilman, Lowell, and Woodrow Wilson at the start of the twentieth century is the obstacle to be overcome (French, 1964).

Finally, the evaluation of academic programs remains an issue. As Srebnik (1988) noted, little has been done to show accountability in advising. Crockett (1988), Carstensen and Silberhorn (1979), and Habley (1988) have confirmed this serious inadequacy. The lack of a formal method for delivering and assessing the effectiveness of advising is the great challenge. Unquestionably, the attitudes of the university faculty and staff will affect any attempt to reform the approach to advising. In essence, selling the faculty and staff on the need to change advising presents the greatest challenge. Until a consensus exists on a university campus, no serious progress can be made regarding the advising process.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter presents a description of the subjects in the study, an explanation of how faculty subjects were selected to participate, a description of the data collection procedures, and a description of the analysis of the data.

The problems investigated in this study were the perceptions of faculty academic advisers at small, liberal arts colleges regarding their advising responsibilities and their perceptions of factors that limit their effectiveness in the advising process as measured by their responses on the survey instrument.

Specifically, the three components of the study that were investigated are:

1. What is the relationship of various demographics of faculty academic advisers to their perceptions of academic advising?

2. What is the difference between the real and the ideal perceptions of faculty academic advisers?

3. What are the most important factors that faculty perceive as limiting their effectiveness in the advising process?

Selection of the Subjects

The sample for this study included 138 faculty academic advisers from five selected small, private liberal arts colleges located in the south central region of the National Association of Academic Advising. Cluster sampling was used because

permission from senior administrators was required, and this technique was the most efficient and effective method. The researcher used the Carnegie Foundation's (1987) A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education to define and identify small, liberal arts colleges.

The Carnegie Foundation's (1987) classification system groups institutions into categories on the basis of the level of degree offered and the comprehensiveness of their missions. They categorize institutions into 10 different classifications. The category of institutions selected for this study was labeled "Liberal Arts Colleges II" and defined as institutions that are less selective and award more than half of their degrees in liberal arts fields and/or institutions that award less than half of their degrees in liberal arts fields, but with fewer than 1,500 students.

The 1987 edition of the Carnegie Foundation's A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education indicated that Liberal Arts Colleges II represents 5.7% of all institutions classified and reflect a total enrollment of over 330,000 students. The number of Liberal Arts Colleges II identified in the 1987 edition was 400 institutions.

The Liberal Arts Colleges II institutions that were selected are most similar in that they not only meet the Carnegie Foundation guidelines but tend to overlap in the recruitment of students. The south central states include: Louisiana (4 institutions), Arkansas (6 institutions), Oklahoma (5 institutions), Texas (21 institutions) and New Mexico (2 institutions). The south central region represents over 9% of the total number of Liberal Arts Colleges II. The average number of full-time faculty per institution in this population is 71, as determined by Peterson's Guide To Four Year Colleges and Universities (1991). Although Arkansas was part of the geographical area, no institution was represented in this study. Five institutions were randomly selected for this study, and are described as follows:

1. Institution A was from Oklahoma, with a student population of 2,321 full-time students. Eighty full-time faculty members were identified as academic advisers.

2. Institution B was also from Oklahoma, with a student population of 1,002 full-time students. Sixty-eight full-time faculty were identified as academic advisers.

3. Institution C was from New Mexico, with 61 full-time faculty identified as academic advisers. Their full-time student enrollment was 950.

4. Institution D was from Louisiana, with a full-time enrollment of 1,223. Seventy-three full-time faculty were identified as academic advisers.

5. Institution E was from Texas, with a student population of 1,895 full-time students. Seventy-nine full-time faculty were identified as advisers.

Additionally, of the 138 surveys that were returned, 66% were male and 34% were female. Sixty-four percent were nontenured faculty, while 36% were tenured faculty. The average total number of years of undergraduate advising was 16, and the highest degree earned reflected 61% with doctoral degrees and 38% with master's degrees. Finally, the average age that was reported was 52.5 years.

Instrumentation

The survey instrument (see Appendix A) was developed by the researcher following an extensive review of the related literature and was reviewed by several experts from Class II Institutions that included: one Senior Vice President and Dean of Students, who had written two major grants emphasizing academic advising; one Associate Vice President responsible for academic advising, two nontenured faculty, and two tenured faculty members. Additionally, two members that were not from Class II institutions were also used to determine the content of the instrument. They were members of the researcher's dissertation committee.

The survey questions were based on established issues related to student attrition and advising responsibilities. Other questions were developed by the researcher specifically for the purposes of this study.

The survey instrument (see Appendix A) was divided into a cover page and four sections. The cover page stated:

1. the name of the survey;

2. purpose of the survey and a time line and procedure for returning the instrument; and

3. a statement of confidentiality.

The survey instrument is outlined below:

Part I: Academic Undergraduate Academic Advisers' Personal Data (questions 1-10).

Part II: Academic Advisers' Perceptions (factors that impact students' decisions to remain in college) (questions 11-26).

Part III: Academic Advisers' Perceptions (advising functions that should and/or are being performed at your college/university) (questions 27-61).

Part IV: Academic Advisers' Perceptions (conditions and student behavior that limit effectiveness (questions 62-85).

Part V: Academic Advisers' Perceptions (provides respondents an opportunity for general comments).

To minimize the possibility of measurement errors, the instrument was tested for its validity and utility. To determine the validity of the instrument, the six member panel, (previously described) reviewed the initial draft of the survey instrument and the stated objectives of the study. They were then requested to assess the content validity of the instrument. From their suggestions, the final draft of the survey was written.

For the purposes of utility and clarity, a final version of the instrument was again provided to the six member panel. They were asked to assess the utility and clarity of the instrument. The information received from the panel's review of utility and clarity was used in the development of this survey. The panel also assisted with the final lay-out and proofreading.

Research Design

The data for this study were collected during the 1992-93 academic year from 138 faculty members who served as academic advisers at small, private liberal arts colleges in the five-state south central region of the National Academic Advising Association. Specifically, the states that were included in this study were: Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas. The study was conducted to analyze the perceptions of faculty academic advisers regarding their responsibilities and to determine faculty academic advisers' perceptions of high school and personal/environmental influences on a student's tendency to remain in school. The independent variables in this study were the number of years of academic advising, gender, age, teaching experience, and tenure status. The dependent variable was the perceptions held by faculty academic advisers.

Procedures

Institutions in the previously described region were randomly selected. Letters were sent to the respective presidents (see Appendix B) requesting their permission for the researcher to contact their faculty. The presidents' letter stated the reason for the letter and how the information was to be collected and distributed. Included in the mailing were the following: a sample of the letter which was distributed to the faculty and a sample of the survey. If approval was not received from a president, another random selection was made, until such time as five presidents agreed to participate. Once approval was received from five presidents, a contact person at the institution was identified who supplied the researcher with names of the faculty members serving as academic advisers.

After receiving approval from the respective presidents, each faculty member was mailed a letter of introduction (see Appendix C) and a survey instrument. A self-addressed, stamped, return envelope was included for the return of the survey.

A follow-up mailing was conducted three weeks following the initial mailing, in order to maximize the response rate. The specific time line concerning the dates of the contact period was established by the researcher's dissertation committee.

Statistical Analyses

The quantifiable data were coded and entered into a computerized statistical software system (Wilkinson, 1990). The classification of research data fell into four categories: nominal, ordinal, interval, and ratio. The category and subject variables dictated the general group of analytical tools to be used to analyze data. Accordingly, the researcher used descriptive statistics (Keppel, 1991).

For the purposes of this study, the demographic data included: gender, tenure status, number of years of undergraduate advising, highest degree earned, and age. Also included were perceptions of academic advisers' advising functions that should and/or are being performed and perceptions of conditions/student behavior that limit faculty advisers' effectiveness.

To determine the faculty academic advisers' perceptions of their responsibilities performed at the respective institutions; the participants were asked to respond with either a "should be fulfilled" or "is now being fulfilled" choice. These responses were evaluated using a weighted scale, with a range from: 1--not being important, 2--not very important, 3--being important, 4--some what important, and 5--very important. To determine the factors that limit academic advisers' effectiveness the interviewees were asked to respond with: 1--strongly disagree, 2--disagree, 3--no opinion, 4--agree, 5--strongly agree.

The researcher used t-tests, correlation, a paired t-test, and a rank order of means to describe the perceptions of academic advisers relative to their advising functions and the factors that they perceive as limiting their effectiveness. Independent variables employed in this analyses included those variables that were used to

compare groups along one dimension, such as gender, tenure status, number of years of undergraduate advising, highest degree earned, and age.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The primary purpose of this study was to determine what relationships, if any, existed between faculties' perceptions of themselves as academic advisers and the advising process at small, private liberal arts colleges. Five institutions were randomly selected within the south central region of the United States. Each institution from the sample was identified by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1987) as a class II liberal arts college.

Of particular interest in this study were the various demographic factors (gender, tenure status, total years of undergraduate advising experience, educational level, and age) associated with the adviser and the adviser's perception of his or her responsibilities regarding the advising process. In addition, the faculty responded to questions which highlighted the discrepancy between the actual practice of their advising versus what they perceived they should be doing. Also examined were the faculty advisers' perceptions of the limitations of their effectiveness as advisers. Ultimately, the goal was to explore the perceptions academic advisers have of their responsibilities in relation to the advising process and whether there is a discrepancy between faculty perceptions of what they do and what they should be doing. The issue revolves around whether or not the faculty's role in the advising process is consistent with how faculty believe they should perform their role.

Following the procedures outlined in Chapter III, surveys were sent to faculty advisers at each of the five colleges. Three hundred fifty-five surveys were sent to the five institutions. The number of surveys sent to each institution varied from 61 to 80.

Of these, 152 (43%) were returned, and of this number, 138 (39%) were usable. This was considered to be an adequate response since the national average on such surveys ranges from 5-25% (Jaccard, 1983).

Results Related to Research Questions

Research Question One

Research question one asked what relationship, if any, exists between various demographic factors and the advising function. This question dealt with a number of independent variables (demographic factors: gender, tenure status, total years of undergraduate advising, educational level, and age) as determined from the responses of the participants which were analyzed according to the respondents' answers to questions about their perceptions of the advising functions. For the purpose of this study, these demographic factors were selected because they were the most significant factors affecting advising as identified in the review of literature.

Specific questions from the survey were selected as representative of a consensus of opinions held by experts in the field as being important advising functions. These functions were selected because of their presence in the review of the literature. The specific questions addressed were whether or not faculty should: (1) care about advisees as people (question 27), (2) keep office hours and appointments (question 32), (3) monitor advisees' progress toward educational goals (question 40), (4) encourage advisees to consider and develop career alternatives (question 45), (5) keep anecdotal records (question 46), (6) assist students in selecting a major (question 53), (7) explain university academic regulations and requirements to students (question 54) (8) assist students with personal problems (question 55), and (9) assist students with course registration (question 56).

The first demographic factor examined was gender. It is the researcher's opinion that gender influences the respondent's perceptions of the advising process. In order to analyze the relationship between gender and the questions listed above, a two-tailed t-test was utilized. The .05 level of significance was chosen for this non-directional t-test. The results are displayed in Table I. Of the nine questions, only two (questions 27 and 53) were found to be significant at the .05 level of significance. All other seven questions were not significant at the .05 level; however, question 45, which deals with career alternatives, approaches the .05 level of significance with a .087 level of probability.

The second demographic factor examined was faculty classification (tenure versus nontenure status). Table II displays the results. Several significant differences were found between tenured and nontenured advisers in terms of any of the nine questions focused upon. The answers to questions 32, 40, 53, 54, and 56 were all found to be significant at the .05 level of the nondirectional t-test. Question 45 displayed no difference between tenured and nontenured faculty.

The third demographic factor examined involved the total number of years of undergraduate advising. Using a correlation analysis of the number of years of undergraduate advising in relation to the responses to the nine questions, weak but positive relationships were found (Table III). Only one of the nine responses (question 55), which dealt with assisting students with personal problems, showed even a weak but significant relationship.

The fourth demographic factor examined was the highest educational level achieved by faculty. Again, a nondirectional t-test was employed with a .05 level of significance. Table IV reveals the results. Only one question (question 27) was determined to be significant at the .05 level of significance between the 85 respondents with doctoral degrees and the 53 who had earned master's degrees.

TABLE I

FACULTY GENDER RESPONSES TO ADVISING FUNCTIONS

Questions	Female (N=47)	Male (N=91)	t-test
27. Do faculty care about advisees as people?	x = 4.532 (s) = 1.177	x = 4.846 (s) = 0.392	2.317*
32. Do faculty members keep office hours and appointments?	x = 4.425 (s) = 1.078	x = 4.593 (s) = 0.666	1.127
40. Do faculty monitor advisees' progress toward educational goals?	x = 4.179 (s) = 1.185	x = 4.385 (s) = 0.879	1.202
45. Do faculty encourage advisees to consider and develop career alternatives?	x = 3.787 (s) = 1.587	x = 4.143 (s) = 0.838	1.726
46. Do faculty keep anecdotal records?	x = 3.383 (s) = 1.540	x = 3.338 (s)= 1.165	0.228
53. Do faculty assist students in selecting a major?	x = 3.617 (s) = 1.662	x = 4.121 (s) = 0.964	2.253*
54. Do faculty explain university academic regulations and requirements to students?	x = 4.298 (s) = 1.178	x = 4.088 (s) = 1.092	1.042
55. Do faculty assist students with personal problems?	x = 3.596 (s) = 1.469	x = 3.396 (s) = 1.144	0.882
56. Do faculty assist students with course registration?	x = 4.447 (s) = 1.493	x = 4.286 (s) = 0.847	0.924

*$P \leq .05$

TABLE II

FACULTY CLASSIFICATION (TENURE STATUS)
AND ADVISING FUNCTIONS

Questions	Tenure (N=50)	Nontenure (N=88)	t-test
27. Do faculty care about advisees as people?	x = 4.900 (s) = 0.303	x = 4.648 (s) = 0.923	1.874
32. Do faculty members keep office hours and appointments?	x = 4.740 (s) = 0.443	x = 4.420 (s) = 0.968	2.205*
40. Do faculty monitor advisees' progress toward educational goals?	x = 4.560 (s) = 0.705	x = .4170 (s) = 1.106	2.243*
45. Do faculty encourage advisees to consider and develop career alternatives?	x = 4.480 (s) = 0.677	x = 3.761 (s) = 1.286	3.668
46. Do faculty keep anecdotal records?	x = 3.480 (s) = 1.266	x = 3.717 (s) = 1.420	0.900
53. Do faculty assist students in selecting a major?	x = 4.340 (s) = 0.798	x = 4.000 (s) = 1.420	2.807*
54. Do faculty explain university academic regulations and requirements to students?	x = 4.440 (s) = 1.013	x = 4.000 (s) = 1.155	2.247*
55. Do faculty assist students with personal problems?	x = 3.420 (s) = 1.247	x = 3.498 (s) = 1.278	0.306
56. Do faculty assist students with course registration?	x = 4.640 (s) = 0.722	x = 4.170 (s) = 1.053	2.800

*P≤.05

TABLE III

TOTAL NUMBER OF YEARS OF UNDERGRADUATE ADVISING EXPERIENCE AND ADVISING FUNCTIONS

Questions	Correlation Coefficient R
27. Do faculty care about advisees as people?	0.019
32. Do faculty members keep office hours and appointments?	0.145
40. Do faculty monitor advisees' progress toward educational goals?	0.100
45. Do faculty encourage advisees to consider and develop career alternatives?	0.160
46. Do faculty keep anecdotal records?	0.150
53. Do faculty assist students in selecting a major?	0.103
54. Do faculty explain university academic regulations and requirements to students?	0.071
55. Do faculty assist students with personal problems?	0.067
56. Do faculty assist students with course registration?	0.169*

*$P \leq .05$

TABLE IV

HIGHEST EDUCATIONAL LEVEL EARNED AND ADVISING FUNCTIONS

Questions	Doctorate (N=85)	Master's (N=53)	t-test
27. Do faculty care about advisees as people?	x = 4.741 (s) = 0.758	x = 4.736 (s) = 0.788	0.040*
32. Do faculty members keep office hours and appointments?	x = 4.506 (s) = 0.826	x = 4.585 (s) = 0.842	0.543
40. Do faculty monitor advisees' progress toward educational goals?	x = 4.294 (s) = 1.010	x = 4.340 (s) = 0.979	0.260
45. Do faculty encourage advisees to consider and develop career alternatives?	x = 4.035 (s) = 1.139	x = 4.000 (s) = 1.193	0.174
46. Do faculty keep anecdotal records?	x = 3.235 (s) = 1.221	x = 3.528 (s) = 1.409	1.292
53. Do faculty assist students in selecting a major?	x = 3.906 (s) = 1.288	x = 4.109 (s) = 1.232	0.510
54. Do faculty explain university academic regulations and requirements to students?	x = 4.141 (s) = 1.135	x = 4.189 (s) = 1.110	0.241
55. Do faculty assist students with personal problems?	x = 3.471 (s) = 1.171	x = 3.453 (s) = 1.408	0.081
56. Do faculty assist students with course registration?	x = 4.424 (s) = 0.864	x = 4.208 (s) = 1.116	1.275

*$P \leq .05$

The fifth demographic factor examined age of the faculty member related to their responses on the nine questions. According to Table V, a positive but weak correlation existed between age and the nine responses. However, one response dealing with assisting students with personal problems was found to be significant. There seemed to be a direct relationship between the increasing age of faculty members and their concern with the students' personal problems.

Research Question Two

Research question two dealt with the difference between the advisers' perceptions of what is being done in terms of advising versus what should be done. A paired t-test was performed to compare how the adviser believed that the advising function should be done with the adviser's perception of how advising is now practiced (Table VI). Of the nine questions examined, no significant relationship was observed on eight of them. The only significant result involved question 53, which dealt with faculty assistance in choosing a major.

Research Question Three

The third research question dealt with the factors that limit faculty advisers' effectiveness in the advising process. Faculty were asked their perceptions of factors that limit the effectiveness of the advising function. Among these were student attitudes, administrative commitment, and institutional support for advising. Faculty were asked a series of 24 questions relating to these issues. Table VII lists the results in terms of means, ranked from the level of strongest disagreement to the level of strongest agreement. The means ranged from 1.370 to 3.906. No response with a mean of four or more was obtained. Since a 1.00 corresponded to strong disagreement and a 3.00 indicated no opinion, it can be said that faculty were in strong

TABLE V

FACULTY AGE AND ADVISING FUNCTIONS: A CORRELATION

Questions	Correlation Coefficient R
27. Do faculty care about advisees as people?	0.032
32. Do faculty members keep office hours and appointments?	0.010
40. Do faculty monitor advisees' progress toward educational goals?	0.024
45. Do faculty encourage advisees to consider and develop career alternatives?	0.067
46. Do faculty keep anecdotal records?	0.113
53. Do faculty assist students in selecting a major?	0.051
54. Do faculty explain university academic regulations and requirements to students?	0.079
55. Do faculty assist students with personal problems?	0.172*
56. Do faculty assist students with course registration?	0.101

*$P \leq .05$

TABLE VI

A COMPARISON OF WHAT ADVISERS PERCEIVE AS ADVISING FUNCTIONS THAT SHOULD BE FULFILLED AND THOSE THAT ARE BEING FULFILLED

Questions	A Paired Samples t-test Is Presently Being Fulfilled and Are Being Fulfilled	t-test
27. Do faculty care about advisees as people?	x Difference 0.507 (s) Difference 0.922	6.462
32. Do faculty members keep office hours and appointments?	x Difference 0.493 (s) Difference 0.953	6.072
40. Do faculty monitor advisees' progress toward educational goals?	x Difference 0.536 (s) Difference 1.012	6.224
45. Do faculty encourage advisees to consider and develop career alternatives?	x Difference 0.520 (s) Difference 1.012	5.629
46. Do faculty keep anecdotal records?	x Difference 0.862 (s) Difference 1.394	7.265
53. Do faculty assist students in selecting a major?	x Difference 0.283 (s) Difference 1.011	3.284*
54. Do faculty explain university academic regulations and requirements to students?	x Difference 0.014 (s) Difference 0.996	5.128
55. Do faculty assist students with personal problems?	x Difference 0.014 (s) Difference 1.120	0.152
56. Do faculty assist students with course registration?	x Difference 0.496 (s) Difference 0.970	6.002

*$P \leq .05$

TABLE VII

BARRIERS TO EFFECTIVE ADVISING

(A rank order of factors that limit faculties' effectiveness, according to means.)

Question Nos.		Mean
79	have to share advising room	1.370
63	should not be part of work	1.580
65	should advise only upper division	1.703
64	advising is low status	1.754
78	lacks information from institution	1.978
77	students go to other faculty	2.007
74	students lack confidence in advising	2.080
72	students go elsewhere for advising	2.087
71	administration's absence of support	2.138
80	takes too much time	2.152
70	students lack information	2.275
73	lack of advising orientation program	2.399
81	absence of central advisory office	2.442
83	advising procedures not explained to faculty	2.449
67	students prefer to solve own problems	2.478
82	lack of coordinated advising system	2.732
75	faculty should receive extra compensation	2.797
76	students only sign up for courses, not advising	2.833
62	workload too heavy	2.899
84	advising accountability system needed	3.116
85	advising training programs needed	3.174
69	lack of college-wide advising program	3.304
68	too many changes in advisers	3.616
66	requires personal involvement	3.906

disagreement with many questions and rarely agreed with any of the questions asked. Additionally, those items that mentioned university administration as an obstacle to advising had a higher mean.

Summary

This chapter reported the results of a survey of faculty advisers at five small, liberal arts colleges in the south central United States. The focal point was faculty perceptions of the effectiveness of the advising function, their role in the process, and their opinions about the obstacles to effective advising. Various demographic factors (gender, tenure status, years of undergraduate advising experience, educational level, and age) were analyzed to determine if they had some impact on the advising process. The response rate of 39% was most satisfactory, since the survey required considerable thought and time on the part of faculty advisers.

The first research question examined the various demographic factors and the advising function. To simplify the process of analysis, nine questions from the survey were selected to be cross-checked against each demographic factor. Of the five demographic factors, several were found to be significant at the .05 level of significance using both a t-test and a correlation as a measure of statistical analysis. Gender appeared to be related to two of the nine questions (questions 27 and 53). Male faculty advisers tended to perceive themselves as caring more about advisees as people than did female advisers (question 27). Male faculty advisers also seemed to see themselves as more interested in helping students choose a major than did female advisers (question 53).

Tenure status was also significantly related to questions 32, 40, 53, 54, and 56. The tendency observed was for tenured advisers to take a much more active role in advising by keeping regular office hours and appointments (question 32), monitoring advisees' progress (question 40), assisting students in selecting a major (question 53),

explaining academic regulations to students (question 54), and assisting students with course registration (question 56).

Of the three remaining factors, only two (total years of undergraduate advising and age) were found to have correlation with some of the responses. As the total number of years of undergraduate advising increased, faculty became more fixated with the registration of students. As faculty age increased, their concern for students' personal problems also increased. Other responses to the questions had a positive but weak correlation to both factors of total years of undergraduate advising and age. This indicated that some linkage existed between factors of total years of undergraduate advising and age and responses to questions dealing with monitoring of advisee progress (question 40), encouraging advisees to explore career opportunities (question 45), assisting advisees in selecting a major (question 53), explaining academic regulations (question 54), and assisting students in the registration process (question 56).

The second research question used a paired t-test to examine the difference between the adviser's perception of what is being done in the advising process versus what should be done. Only question 53 was significant. Advisers tended to see no discrepancies between what was being done in the advising process and what they felt should be done.

The third research question involved a series of 24 questions and the faculty advisers' perceptions about obstacles in the advising process. Observations from a prioritized ranking of means (Table VII) led the researcher to note that advisers, on the whole, did not find fault with themselves or the students in the advising process. In fact, they tended to accept advising as a part of their obligation as faculty, and they expressed their confidence in students as advisees. For example, faculty generally were not critical of the advising process as it now exists on the college campus. Faculty felt that students generally accepted their faculty advisers as a source of knowledge

relevant to their educational goals, that students desired personal involvement of faculty advisers, and that students had confidence in the advising process. Noting the prioritized ranking, it can be said that faculty were rather mixed in their views of some aspects of advising as it dealt with the relationship of the faculty to the administration of the college. Faculty advisers seemed to support a college-wide training program for advisers, a system of accountability and evaluation for the advising process, and minimizing the changes that occur in the course of that process.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study was designed to determine what kind of relationships, if any, existed between advising functions and faculty advisers' perceptions of their role as advisers. Since the historical development of advising, especially since the early part of the twentieth century, has been a movement away from the traditional intimacy of the adviser-advisee relationship and toward a less personal one, advising has lost much of its luster. Academically, advising has not been a source for recognition or career advancement. The growing diversity of the student population and the impact of evolving technology on the curriculum has exacerbated the situation. Advising in the modern small, liberal arts college offers a severe challenge. By focusing upon the perceptions of advisers facing this challenge, this study offers insight into an academic function which has been generally taken for granted and considered burdensome by faculty at larger universities. By analyzing any relationships between demographic factors, adviser responses, and by contrasting advisers' perceptions of what they are doing versus what they should be doing, insight into the nature of the adviser-advisee relationship can be achieved.

The advantages of an enhanced advising function and the perceived need for change has been widely heralded. Bass (1982), in a survey of public institutions, found that faculty had a strong interest in attending to the special problems of students, undergraduate career counseling, and personal advising. Lewis (1990) noted that private

colleges offered a better opportunity for improving academic advising than what is offered by public institutions. Furthermore, the work of Winston et. al. (1984), Noel et. al. (1985), and Hornbuckle et al. (1979) buttressed the view that the need for a quality advising program is paramount for student retention.

This study enjoyed several distinct advantages. First, the private institutions involved in the study were a good cross section of small, private liberal arts colleges, (Class II level), as noted in the Carnegie Foundation's (1987) Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. Secondly, the unusually high response rate greatly added to the credibility of the survey itself. Also, the survey, despite its length, exhaustively dealt with primary and more peripheral issues linked to the advising process. Besides the obvious demographic features (gender, tenure status, years of advising experience, educational level, and age), the survey was crafted to ascertain the fine differences between faculty perceptions of the advising process and how they felt the process should be conducted. Questions permitted the respondents to give their perceptions of the obstacles to quality advising, including student apathy, administrative neglect, class overloads, or procedural errors.

Conclusions

In the first research question, a few demographic factors seemed to be significantly related to the advising function. Gender, tenure, years of undergraduate advising experience, age, and educational level all demonstrated a relationship of some degree to the advising process. By focusing upon a few of the key questions in the survey, some observations about demographics can be made. Of course, any conclusions remain quite tentative, since no causal relationship can be drawn from mere demographic data.

Gender provided some interesting observations. Male faculty appeared to differ significantly from female faculty in terms of their responses to question 27, which dealt

with caring about students, and their responses to question 53, which involved helping students choose their major. Males appeared to place greater importance on these issues than did the female faculty. This seemed to fly in the face of conventional wisdom, which suggests that female faculty are more nurturing than their male counterparts. The finding suggested that conventional wisdom is probably an outgrowth of the stereotyped image of the matronly school teacher. Attributing mothering instincts to female faculty members is an absurd notion and is just as patronizing as assuming that all male faculty should somehow fulfill the role of a father to their female students. Certainly, suggesting such role playing as a natural part of the advising process demeans the professionalism of the faculty member as an adviser. Regardless of gender, great importance was placed upon keeping regulars office hours (question 32), monitoring advisee progress (question 40), explaining college academic regulations (question 54), and assisting students with course registration (question 56). Neither male nor female advisers placed much importance on record keeping (question 46) and assisting students with personal problems (question 55). However, the overall results suggested that no major distinctions can be drawn on the basis of gender; rather, both displayed a high degree of professionalism and concern for the advising process.

Tenured faculty differed on some factors from nontenured faculty in terms of commitment to quality advising. Tenured advisers were significantly more concerned with keeping regular office hours (question 32), monitoring advisee progress (question 40), assisting students in selecting majors (question 53), explaining academic requirements (question 54), and assisting students with course registration (question 56) than were nontenured faculty advisers. Since age was not found to be a significant factor in the advising function, it would appear that a real difference existed between younger faculty who often are not tenured and the older, tenured faculty. This is a critical issue in the estimate of this researcher, since it suggests that saddling

nontenured faculty with a flock of freshmen advisees may seriously backfire. The impact could even be more dramatic in the case of part-time faculty, who would have little to gain from building up student retention and programs by providing quality advising.

When correlated with the total number of years of advising experience, the nine questions all demonstrated a positive but weak relationship. Statistically, eight of the responses were not significant, but one was significant. As faculty members gain years of advising experience, they seem to become more preoccupied with the registration of students for classes. This would seem to reflect that as faculty members gain experience, they begin to become more focused upon the mechanics of advising. This runs counter to the finding that as faculty members age, they become more concerned with students' personal problems. Perhaps this response reflects the grind associated with the stress of modern advising. As faculty become more adept at advising, their advising load may increase and they find themselves increasingly concerned with mastering the process rather than personalizing advising.

In terms of the educational level and the advising function, the only significant result involved faculty with doctoral degrees who appeared to be more concerned about the student as a person (question 27) than were faculty who held the master's degree only. Again, this may reflect upon the differences between tenured versus non-tenured faculty. Faculty holding only master's degrees might have far more on their minds than just teaching and advising. For faculty with master's degrees, research would be critical to their achievement of a doctorate and to recognition within their field. Faculty already holding a doctorate would not be under this kind of dual pressure, since they had already achieved many of their personal goals. It would seem that doctoral faculty might be more interested in the whole student because they might be seeking to serve as mentors. In this sense, they would be nurturing students in order to create a legacy. While both groups were very similar in their dislike for keeping anecdotal

records (question 46) and helping students with personal problems (question 55), the faculty with terminal degrees may have been in a position to be more concerned with the advisee on a more holistic level as a result of their tenured position.

The final demographic factor, age, was only found to correlate significantly with one of the responses (the question dealing with faculty concern for students' personal problems). This implied that as faculty mature in their professional and personal lives, they seem to move more toward the *in loco parentis* point of view in their relationships with their student advisees. This is a finding that might have been expected, but it is well to remember that tenured faculty were more concerned with a number of advising functions than nontenured faculty. It is not possible to clearly separate age from tenure status, but it seems reasonable to assert that as faculty continue with the college, they develop positive professional and personal relationships with their advisees which younger, nontenured faculty are unwilling or unable to establish.

Research question number two contrasted the faculty ideals of advising with their perceptions of the advising function as practiced in their institutions. Ironically, only question 53, which dealt with assisting students in selecting a major, was significant. The fact that none of the other questions was significant highlighted the lack of a gap between what faculty saw as the ideal advising function and how advising is actually practiced. This led to a host of questions about the need to revise the advising process. The greatest of these would be whether or not the faculty has any serious interest in making changes in the advising function as it is now practiced on their campuses. The general complaints about uncompensated advising tasks, class overloads, lack of administrative support, student apathy, and other demands did not seem to be enough to create a gap between the idealized practice of advising and the reality of the advising function.

The third research question dealt with the perceived obstacles which limit the effectiveness of faculty as advisers. The rank ordering of means revealed that faculty

perceived the administration of their colleges as the greatest obstacle to their work as advisers. A sampling of the questions was most enlightening. Frequent adviser-advisee changes and the lack of a program of college-wide training for advisers, coupled with an ongoing evaluation of the advising function, were cited in four of the five top complaints about advising as a whole. Faculty advisers quite pointedly addressed the issue of their colleges' failure to deal with the advising issue. This was in contrast to the conclusion from research question two, since it indicated that faculty desire major changes in the way advising is supported across the campus.

Recommendations

The following are recommendations for small, liberal arts colleges which resulted from this study:

1. Because of the clear indications that tenured faculty tend to place greater importance on advising than do nontenured faculty, college administrators and departmental heads must consider the impact upon advising made by the replacement of retiring tenured faculty with younger nontenured faculty and/or part-time instructors.

2. Small, liberal arts colleges need to encourage and train their faculty to be more flexible and willing to embrace the developmental role of the adviser as both an academic and, to some extent, counselor for students' personal problems, even though faculty tend to object to this role and see it as peripheral to their given responsibilities.

3. Since faculty find that the greatest obstacle to effective advising results from administrative issues, the administration needs to develop programs which encourage faculty participation and leadership in creating and enhancing the advising function on campus.

4. Because younger faculty place less emphasis upon advising, it is incumbent upon older faculty members to serve as mentors in a program to train younger faculty to serve as advisers.

Research Recommendations

Research recommendations which follow are based upon the results of this study:

1. Future research should focus upon the role of tenured versus nontenured faculty in terms of the advising function. Four out of the nine questions addressed regarding this demographic variable reflected a significant difference. Obviously, differences of this magnitude, and given the future trends in faculty employment, warrant further research.

2. Future research should investigate the specific factors which limit the effectiveness of advising involving the perceptions of faculty, administrators, and students, and how those limitations could be alleviated. As was pointed out in the review of the literature, faculty have continually expressed their displeasure with their lack of involvement in areas that directly affect them. Advising appears to be no different. What factors specifically are perceived as limiting faculty's effectiveness in the advising process?

3. Future research should study how older faculty can serve as adviser-mentors for newer faculty members and how such a program can be created campus wide. It seems clear from this study that older faculty members appear to accept the developmental mode of advising. How can they help younger faculty do the same? Given the further employment trends, additional research is needed.

4. Future research should focus on how the developmental model of academic advising can be more effectively implemented in the small, liberal arts college. Developmental advising clearly has established its place in the advising process. How involved are the small colleges and to what extent are institutions as described in this study willing to enhance its development on their campuses? Given developmental advising success, researchers need to conduct further research.

5. Finally, this study focused heavily on what differences existed regarding various demographic factors, ideal versus real perceptors, and factors that were perceived to limit a faculty's effectiveness. What needs to be emphasized is that faculty tended to agree on more issues than they disagreed on. The only demographic factor that showed a relatively high number of differences to the questions asked was faculty classification.

REFERENCES

AUP/AAC Commission on Academic Tenure. (1973). Faculty tenure: A report and recommendations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bass, J. (1982). University organization: A matrix analysis of the academic professors. New York: Human Sciences Press.

Beatty, J. D. (1991). NACADA monograph number 1: The National Academic Advising Association--A brief narrative history. NACADA Journal, 11(1), 5-24.

Boyer, E., & The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1987). College: The undergraduate experience in America. New York: Harper & Row.

Brown, R. W. (1926). Dean Briggs. New York: Harper & Bros.

Brown, J., & Robinson, R. D. (1988). The adult male undergraduate: Who stays and who leaves." College Student Journal, 22, 95-100.

Buhr, T., Pelletier, G., & Wark, D. (1987). An orientation program that Increases the quality of student-adviser contact. Journal of College Student Personnel, 22, 462-463.

Burke, T. H. (1981). Student and faculty perceptions of student's academic advising needs at Florida State University. Unpublished dissertation, Florida State University, Tallahassee.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1987). A classification of institutions of higher education. Princeton, New Jersey: Carnegie Foundation.

Carstensen, D. J., & Silberhorn, C. (1979). A national survey of academic advising: Final report. Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Program.

Cope, R. G., & Hannah, W. (1975). Revolving college doors: The causes and consequences of dropping out, stopping out, and transferring. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) for Student Services/Development Programs. (1990). Standards and guidelines. NACADA Journal, 10(1), 52-62.

Cowley, W. H. (1949). Some history and venture in prophecy. In. E. G. Williamson (Ed.), Trends in student personnel work (pp. 12-27). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Crockett, D. S. (1982). Academic advising delivery systems. In U. Delworth & G. Hanson (Eds.), New directions for student services services: Developmental approaches to academic advising (pp. 39-53). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Crockett, D. S. (1986a). Academic advising audit. Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Program.

Crockett, D. S. (1986b). Advising skills, techniques, and resources. Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Program.

Crockett, D. S. (1988). Evaluating and rewarding advisors. In W. R. Habley (Ed.), The status and future of academic advising: Problems and promise (pp. 69-197). Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Program.

Crockett, D. S., & Levitz, R. S. (1983). A national survey of academic advising standards for academic advising. NACADA Journal, 61, 13-15.

Crockett, D. S., & Levitz, R. S. (1984). Current advising practices in colleges and universities. In W. R. Habley (Ed.), Developmental academic advising: Addressing students' educational, career, and personal needs (pp. 97-120). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Crookston, B. B. (1972). A developmental view of academic advising as teaching. Journal of College Student Personnel, 13, 12-17.

DeLisle, H. F. (1965). A study of academic advising of undergraduate students. Unpublished manuscript, Michigan State University, East Lansing.

Ender, S. C., Winston, R. B., Jr., & Miller, T. K. (1982). Academic advising and student development. In U. Delworth & G. Hanson (Eds.), New directions for student services: Developmental approaches to academic advising (pp. 3-18). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ender, S. C., Winston, R. B., Jr., & Miller, T. K. (1984). Academic advising as student development. In W. R. Habley (Ed.), Developmental academic advising: Addressing students' educational, career, and personal needs (pp. 68-87). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fenske, R. H. (1990). Historical foundations of student services. In Delworth, Hanson, & Associates (Eds.), Student services: A handbook for the profession (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

French, J. (1964). A history of the university founded by Johns Hopkins. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Glennen, R. E. (1983). Effective outcome measurers of intrusive advising programs. In J. E. Roueche (Ed.), A new look at successful programs. (New Directions for College Learning Assistance Series) (no. 11) (pp. 127-140). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gordon, V. (1990). Handbook of academic advising. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

Grites, T. J. (1979). Academic advising: Getting us through the eighties. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research (report no. 7). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Guinn, D., & Mitchell, R. (1986). Academic advising and different expectations. NASPA Journal, 6, 99-105.

Habley, W. (1983). Organizational structures for academic advising: Models and implications. Journal of College Student Personnel, 24(6), 535-536, 539-540.

Habley, W. R. (1988). The status and future of academic advising: Problems and promise. Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Program.

Habley, W. R., & McCauley, M. E. (1987). The relationship between institutional characteristics and the organization of advising services. NACADA Journal, 7(1), 25-29.

Hallberg, E. C. (1964). Realism in academic advising. Journal of College Student Personnel, 5, 11.

Hardee, M. D. (1970). Faculty advising in colleges and universities. Student Personnel Services (no. 9). Washington, D.C.: American College Personnel Association.

Harper, H., Herring, Kelly, J., & Schinoff, R. (1980). Advisement and graduation information system. Unpublished internal report. Miami: Miami-Dade Community College.

Henderson, A., & Henderson, J. (1981). Higher education in America. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Henggeler, S. W. (1980, December). The perception of students and professionals. Journal of College Student Personnel, 15, 38-41.

Hofman, M. (1974, December). Academic advising in higher education. Journal of College Student Personnel, 15, 45-50.

Hornbuckle, P. A. et al. (1979). A structural analysis of student perception of faculty advising. Journal of College Student Personnel, 20, 296-300.

Jaccard, J. (1983). Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. Belmont, California: Wadsworth.

Kapraun, E. D., Jr. (1982). Academic advising to facilitate student retention. NACADA Journal, 2(2), 59-69.

Keppel, G. (1991). Design and analysis: A researcher's handbook. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

King, M. C. (1988). Advising delivery systems. In W. R. Habley (Ed.), The status and future of academic advising: Problems and promise (pp. 141-149). Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Program.

Koerin, B. B. (1991). Improving academic advising: Strategies for change. NASPA Journal, 28, 323-327.

Kramer, G. L. (1984). Planning and managing academic advising. NACADA Journal, 4, 29-37.

Kramer, H. C., & Gardner, R. E. (1984). Advising by faculty. In W. R. Habley (Ed.), Developmental academic advising: Addressing students' educational, career, and personal needs (pp. 27-39). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lewis, L. (1990). The philosophy, organization, delivery, and evaluation of developmental academic advising at American research universities. Unpublished dissertation, University of Miami, Coral Gables.

Metzner, B. S., & Bean, J. P. (1987). The estimation of a conceptual model of nontraditional undergraduate student attrition. Research in Higher Education, 27(1), 15-38.

Mueller, K. H. (1961). Student personnel work in higher education. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Noel, L. (1983). Increasing student learning and retention: The best case for academic advising. In C. M. Chando (Ed.), Beyond change: Managing the multifaceted role of the academic advisor (pp. 94-102). Proceedings of the Seventh National Conference on Academic Advising. (ERIC ED 249 878.)

Noel, L., Levitz, R., & Kaufmann, J. (1981). Organizing the campus for retention: A summary report of a national study. Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Program, National Center for Advancement of Educational Practices.

Noel, L. et al. (1985). Increasing student retention. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pantages, T. J., & Creedon, C. (1978). Studies of college attrition: 1950-1975. Review of Educational Research, 48(1), 49-101.

Parris, R. L. (1982). Academic advisement for rural and urban freshmen. Washington D.C: University Press of America.

Peck, R. (1989, January). President's report. Unpublished report, presented at the quarterly meeting of the Board of Trustees, Phillips University, Enid, Oklahoma.

Peterson's guide to four year colleges and universities. (1991). Princeton, New Jersey: Peterson's.

Polson, C. J., & Jurich, A. P. (1979). The departmental academic advising center: An alternative to faculty advising. Journal of College Student Personnel, 20, 249-252.

Richardson, B. K., Seim, D. .L., Eddy, J. P., & Brindley, M. (1985). Delivery of counseling and psychological services in small colleges: A national survey. Journal of College Student Personnel, 26, 508-512.

Riesman, D. (1981). On higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Rudolph, F. (1962). The American college and university: A history. New York: Vintage Books.

Rudolph, F. (1977). Curriculum. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schubert, G. W., & Munski, D. C. (1985). An academic advising handbook as a tool to help faculty advisers. Journal of College Student Personnel, 26, 360-361.

Seim, D. L. (1989, March). Personal communication. Phillips University, Enid, Oklahoma.

Srebnik, D. S. (1988). Academic advising evaluation: A review of assessment instruments. National Academic Advising Association Journal, 8(1), 52-62.

Stickle, F. (1982). Faculty and students' perceptions of faculty advising effectiveness. Journal of College Student Personnel, 18, 262-265.

Stodt, M. M. (1987). Intentional student development and retention. In increasing retention. Monograph: New directions for higher education series (no. 60), (pp. 187-201). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Teague, G. V., & Grites, T. J. (1980). Faculty contracts and academic advising. Journal of College Student Personnel, 21, 40-44.

Tinto, V. (1987). Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wilkinson, L. (1990). Systat: The system for statistics. Evanston, Illinois: Systat, Inc.

Winston, R. B., Jr. et al. (1984). Developmental academic advising. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

PART I: ACADEMIC UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC ADVISORS PERSONAL DATA:

Questions 1-10

Please indicate your answer for each item by checking (__) the line or filling in the blank that is most appropriate.

1. Gender: ___ 1. Female ___ 2. Male

2. Ethnicity: ___ 1. White American ___ 2. Black American ___ 3. Hispanic American
___ 4. American Indian ___ 5. Asian American
___ 6. Other _____ (please identify)

3. Faculty classification:

___ 1. Tenured ___ 2. Non-Tenured ___ 3. Non Tenure Track

4. Number of tenured years at present institution: ___ years

5. Total years of undergraduate advising experience at present institution:

___ 1. Less than 1 year ___ 2. 1-2 yrs ___ 3. 3-4 yrs ___ 4. 5-6 yrs
___ 5. 7-8 yrs ___ 6. 9-10 yrs ___ 7. 11-12 yrs ___ 8. 13+ yrs

6. Number of advisees assigned to you:

___ 1. 1-10 ___ 2. 11-20 ___ 3. 21-30 ___ 4. 31-40 ___ 5. 41-50
___ 6. Over 50

7. Highest degree earned: _____

8. I am an undergraduate advisor in the Department/Division of _____

9. Present Age: ___ 1. Under 25 ___ 2. 26-30 ___ 3. 31-35 ___ 4. 36-40
___ 5. 41-45 ___ 6. 46-50 ___ 7. 51-55 ___ 8. 56-60
___ 9. 61-65 ___ 10. 66-70 ___ 11. Over 70

10. Average hours per week spent advising: _____ hours

PART II: ACADEMIC ADVISORS PERCEPTIONS: FACTORS THAT IMPACT STUDENTS DECISIONS TO REMAIN IN COLLEGE

Questions 11-26

The following questions concern your perception of how the high school, parents and the student's personal decision influence the student's decision to remain in college. You have a choice of a numerical score of 1 (meaning no impact) to 5 (meaning high impact). You have a choice of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 (Please circle your choice).

PART II: continued.....

NO IMPACT 1 2 LOW IMPACT 3 4 HIGH IMPACT 5

HIGH SCHOOL INFLUENCE

1 2 3 4 5 11. To what extent do you feel a low high school GPA causes college students to drop out of college?

1 2 3 4 5 12. To what extent does high school performance predict persistence in college?

1 2 3 4 5 13. To what degree does size of the high school affect the student's decision to remain in college?

1 2 3 4 5 14. To what extent does personal motivation brought from high school affect the student's decision to remain in college?

PARENTAL INFLUENCE

1 2 3 4 5 15. To what extent does parental encouragement to remain in college impact the student's decision to remain in college?

1 2 3 4 5 16. To what extent does the fact that parents or other family members attended college affect the student's desire to remain in college?

1 2 3 4 5 17. To what extent does the parent's interest in the student's success in their chosen area affect the student's desire to remain in college?

1 2 3 4 5 18. To what degree does increased emotional dependence on their parents affect their decision to remain in college?

1 2 3 4 5 19. To what extent does parent's ability to provide financial support affect the student's decision to remain in college?

STUDENT PERSONAL/ENVIRONMENTAL INFLUENCE

1 2 3 4 5 20. To what extent does student's fear of college failure affect the student's decision to leave college?

1 2 3 4 5 21. To what degree does being employed more than twenty hours per week affect a full-time student's decision to leave college?

1 2 3 4 5 22. To what extent does use of drugs or alcohol affect the student's decision to leave college?

PART II: continued.....

NO IMPACT		LOW IMPACT		HIGH IMPACT
1	2	3	4	5

1 2 3 4 5	23. To what degree does lack of "fit" with the college affect the student's decision to leave college?
1 2 3 4 5	24. To what extent does choosing the wrong major impact the student's decision to leave college?
1 2 3 4 5	25. To what extent do unrealistic aspirations and expectations impact the student's decision to leave college?
1 2 3 4 5	26. To what extent does a student belonging to a fraternity/ sorority impact a student's decision to stay in college?

PART III: ACADEMIC ADVISOR'S PERCEPTIONS: ADVISING FUNCTIONS THAT SHOULD AND/OR ARE BEING PERFORMED AT YOUR COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY.

Questions 27-61

On the column to the left, please circle the number you feel is the extent these functions should be fulfilled. On the column to the right, please circle the number you feel the functions are being fulfilled.

Please read the following and circle the appropriate number in each column. You have a choice of "1" (NOT IMPORTANT) and 5 (VERY IMPORTANT). You have a choice of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. PLEASE CIRCLE ONE.

NOT IMPORTANT		SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT		VERY IMPORTANT
1	2	3	4	5

SHOULD BE FULFILLED	ADVISING FUNCTIONS	IS NOW BEING FULFILLED
1 2 3 4 5	27. Care about advisees as people by showing empathy, understanding, and respect.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	28. Establish a warm, genuine, and open relationship.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	29. Display interest, helpful intent, and involvement.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	30. Be a good listener.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	31. Establish rapport by remembering personal information about advisees.	1 2 3 4 5

PART III: continued.....

NOT IMPORTANT SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT VERY IMPORTANT

1 2 3 4 5

SHOULD BE FULFILLED		ADVISING FUNCTIONS	IS NOW BEING FULFILLED
1 2 3 4 5	32.	Be available: Keep office hours and appointments.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	33.	Provide accurate information.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	34.	Know how and when to make referrals and be familiar with referral sources.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	35.	Recognize situations you are not qualified for and take the time to refer.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	36.	Have students contact referral sources in your presence.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	37.	Keep in frequent contact with advisees; take the initiative.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	38.	Focus on advisees strengths and potentials rather than limitations.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	39.	Seek out advisees in informal settings.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	40.	Monitor advisees progress towards educational goals.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	41.	Explore with the student reasons for poor academic performance and direct advisees to appropriate support services.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	42.	Be realistic with advisees.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	43.	Clearly outline advisees responsibilities.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	44.	Follow up on commitments made to advisees.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	45.	Encourage advisees to consider and develop career alternatives.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	46.	Keep an anecdotal record of significant conversations for future references.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	47.	Evaluate the effectiveness of your advising.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	48.	Be knowledgeable about career opportunities and job outlook for various majors.	1 2 3 4 5

PART III: continued.....

NOT IMPORTANT SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT VERY IMPORTANT

1 2 3 4 5

SHOULD BE FULFILLED		ADVISING FUNCTIONS	IS NOW BEING FULFILLED
1 2 3 4 5	49.	Encourage advisees to talk by asking open-ended questions.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	50.	Does not betray confidential information.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	51.	Categorize advisees questions: Are they seeking action, information, or involvement and understanding.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	52.	Be yourself and allow advisees to be themselves.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	53.	Assist students in selecting a major.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	54.	Explain university academic regulations and requirements to students.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	55.	Assist students with personal problems.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	56.	Assist students with course registration procedures.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	57.	Assist students in planning their academic program of study.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	58.	Assist students in resolving extracurricular problems.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	59.	Assist students in obtaining appropriate internship experiences.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	60.	Assist students with problems they encounter with faculty members.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	61.	Assist students with problems they encounter with university administrators and financial aid.	1 2 3 4 5

PART IV: ACADEMIC ADVISORS PERCEPTIONS: CONDITIONS AND STUDENT BEHAVIOR THAT LIMIT EFFECTIVENESS

Questions 62-85

The following questions concern your agreement or disagreement with statements concerning academic advising. Please read each statement and circle the number that best describes your level of agreement about that particular statement.

PART IV: continued.....

STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NO OPINION	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
1	2	3	4	5

1 2 3 4 5	62. My present work load is too heavy to conduct adequate advising.
1 2 3 4 5	63. Academic advising should not be a part of my work.
1 2 3 4 5	64. Advising functions occupy a low status in my department.
1 2 3 4 5	65. I should only advise upper divisional students.
1 2 3 4 5	66. Academic advising requires personal involvement with students.
1 2 3 4 5	67. Students generally prefer to solve their problems by themselves.
1 2 3 4 5	68. Frequent changes in advisees prohibit continuity in consistent relationships.
1 2 3 4 5	69. Absence of a college-wide or well-defined academic advising program makes advising difficult.
1 2 3 4 5	70. My lack of information about our academic advising program (available to students) interferes with my advising.
1 2 3 4 5	71. Absence of commitment on the part of the university's administration towards academic advising has a negative impact on my advising.
1 2 3 4 5	72. Students often seek help from other university members rather than me.
1 2 3 4 5	73. The lack of a well-organized orientation program by the university to help students understand academic advising interferes with my advising.
1 2 3 4 5	74. Students seem to have little confidence in present academic advising.
1 2 3 4 5	75. I believe faculty members should receive additional compensation for advising.
1 2 3 4 5	76. Generally, students come only to sign up for courses, not for ongoing advising.
1 2 3 4 5	77. Students go to offices other than mine to solve their academic problems.
1 2 3 4 5	78. My lack of information regarding institutional academic policy and standards inhibits my advising.

PART IV: continued.....

STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NO OPINION	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
1	2	3	4	5

1 2 3 4 5 79. Too many individuals share an advising room with me.

1 2 3 4 5 80. Academic advising takes up too much time of a full-time faculty member.

1 2 3 4 5 81. The absence of a centralized Advisory Office on campus causes confusion during the registration period.

1 2 3 4 5 82. Lack of a well-planned coordinated academic advising system throughout the college/university causes major academic advising problems.

1 2 3 4 5 83. The purpose and procedures of academic advising are not clearly understood by faculty members in our college/university.

1 2 3 4 5 84. An ongoing, systematic accountability/appraisal for the academic advising program is greatly needed in our college/university.

1 2 3 4 5 85. Attend training programs for advising.

PART V: ACADEMIC ADVISORS PERCEPTIONS: COMMENTS

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO PRESIDENTS

Date

President

Dear _____:

I am a graduate student in Higher Education and Educational Administration at Oklahoma State University in Stillwater, Oklahoma. Presently, I am embarking on my dissertation. The topic that I have chosen is faculty academic advising and the title is "An Analysis of Faculty Perceptions of Academic Advising at Selected South Central, Private Liberal Arts Colleges."

Retention continues to be a major concern for many colleges and universities throughout the United States. This is particularly true for small colleges. Reserarch has shown that academic advising can/does play a significant role in the retention effort, but little research has focused on the perceptions of faculty and how they perceive their responsibilities. This study is intended to develop a clearer understanding of those perceptions.

In order for me to conduct my research, I need your help. I would like to have permission to contact your faculty and request that they complete a survey on academic advising (copy enclosed). I have also enclosed a copy of the letter that I intend to send to each faculty member. As you can see, I have indicated in the letter that individual results will be anonymous. This is also true for the participating institutions. The purpose of this study is not to compare institutions nor their respective faculties. The results will only be reported in aggregate form, with each participating institution receiving a copy of the results.

Within the next two weeks, I will telephone your office to determine if you are willing to allow your institution to participate. This study is scheduled to begin January, 1993.

If you are willing to allow your institution to participate in this study, I would appreciate being referred to an individual that could provide me with a list of all faculty members, preferably on mailing labels, but not necessary. Also, this individual would be asked to assist me in the distribution of the surveys; i.e., placing the surveys in the faculty mail boxes, as I plan to mail the surveys to each institution in bulk so as to minimize my costs. Naturally, if there are any costs incurred on the part of your institution, I will gladly provide reimbursement.

Respectfully,

Dan L. Seim

(Encl.: 2)

APPENDIX C

LETTERS TO FACULTY

Date

Dear Faculty Member:

My name is Dan Seim and I am a graduate student at Oklahoma State University, completing my doctoral degree in Higher Education and Educational Administration. I am requesting that you participate in my dissertation project. My topic is an analysis of "Faculty Perceptions of Academic Advising at Selected Small Liberal Arts Colleges."

_____ has graciously given permission for your institution to participate in this dissertation project. However, he/she did indicate that each individual faculty member has the right to make their own decision as to their level of participation.

The enclosed questionnaire contains 85 questions related to your work as an academic adviser. The questions concern only your opinions and perceptions regarding academic advising tasks and advising problems. The questionnaire should take no longer than 25 minutes to complete. Because you, as a faculty member, play such a critical role in the advising process, you can understand how much I need your participation to make this study a success. The questions encourage you to remain anonymous; however, the surveys will be coded by the researcher in the event a second mailing is needed.

The results of this study will be reported to the participating institutions. However, information from this project will only be compiled in aggregate form and institutions will not be identified other than the institutions who participated in the study.

After you have completed the questionnaire, please place it in the self-addressed, stamped envelope and return it to me by _____.

By returning the questionnaire, please be aware that you are implying your consent to participate in the project.

Thank you very much for your cooperation and consideration in this project.

Respectfully,

Dan L. Seim

Date

Dear Faculty Member:

In January you were requested to participate in my dissertation project regarding your perceptions of your role and responsibilities as they relate to academic advising.

Specifically, you were asked to complete a survey I developed for this project and return it completed in the self-addressed, stamped envelope. As yet I have not received your survey. On the chance that the survey has been misplaced, and in accordance with the research procedures outlined in my dissertation proposal, I am sending you a second survey.

Hopefully, you will find the time (approximately 25 minutes) to complete this survey. Your willingness to assist me in this project would be greatly appreciated. Also, I truly believe that by responding to this survey you will facilitate the continuing development of quality academic advising programs in small colleges.

Thank you for your anticipated cooperation in the above matter.

Respectfully,

Dan L. Seim

(Encl. 2)

VITA 2

Daniel Lee Seim

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: AN ANALYSIS OF FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF ACADEMIC ADVISING AT SELECTED SOUTH CENTRAL, PRIVATE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES

Major Field: Higher Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Huron, South Dakota, October 1, 1949, the son of Gordon and Helen Seim.

Education: Graduated from Watertown High School, Watertown, South Dakota, in June, 1968; received Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology from South Dakota State University in May, 1973; received Master of Education degree in Counseling from South Dakota State University in May, 1975; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1994.

Professional Experience: Career Development Internship, Mountain-Plains Education and Development Program, Glasgow, Montana, 1974-75; Vocational Guidance Career Counselor, Lake Region Junior College, Devils Lake, North Dakota, 1975-78; Dean of Counseling and Career Services, Olivet College, Olivet, Michigan, 1978-82; Vice President for University Community Life, Phillips University, Enid, Oklahoma, 1982-90; Psychologist, Robert M. Greer Center, Enid, Oklahoma, 1990 to present; Student Development Consultant, Phillips University, Enid, Oklahoma, 1993 to present.