

AN INVESTIGATION OF ACADEMIC CLASSIFICATION,
ADVISER CONSISTENCY, AND PERCEPTIONS
OF ACADEMIC ADVISING

By

LISA LENE' GRUBBS
"

Bachelor of Science
Texas A & M University
College Station, Texas
1977

Master of Science
Texas A & M University
College Station, Texas
1981

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
July, 1986

Thesis
1986D
G885i
Cop. 2



AN INVESTIGATION OF ACADEMIC CLASSIFICATION,
ADVISER CONSISTENCY, AND PERCEPTIONS
OF ACADEMIC ADVISING

Thesis Approved:

Jim M. Seals

Thesis Adviser

Dianna L. Newman

William A. Fry

Ronald Beere

Judith E. Dobson

Norman N. Durham

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Whenever one undertakes challenges, the support of others is especially helpful. The completion of this work would have been more difficult without the assistance of several individuals.

I would like to acknowledge the members of my graduate committee for their assistance and guidance: Dr. James Seals, Dr. Judy Dobson, Dr. Dianna Newman, Dr. William Ivy, and Dr. Ronald Beer. I would like to particularly thank Dr. Bill Ivy, Director of Academic Student Services for the College of Arts and Sciences, for his valuable assistance in subject population identification and for allowing me to periodically raid his library.

I sincerely doubt that anyone completes a doctoral program without a circle of special people who are professionally and/or personally supportive. I would like to express my appreciation to the staff of the Personal Counseling Unit, University Counseling Services, at Oklahoma State University, who provided encouragement and patience when it was most needed. I would especially like to acknowledge and thank Dr. Martha Jordan for her valued role as mentor, colleague, and friend; Dr. Patrick Murphy for his good-humored and constant support of my degree work and of my professional growth; and Mr. Kent Sampson for his willingness to direct my doctoral internship, share his experience, and provide opportunities for me to develop new and additional expertise.

I would be more than remiss if I did not express my appreciation to Ms. Victoria McLaurin and Ms. Regina Hawk for their patience with me during

the peaks and valleys of this experience; and to Ms. Brenda Myers for her assistance in preliminary draft preparations, her constant encouragement, and her sense of humor. I also thank Ms. Rhenea Aldridge of the Applied Behavioral Studies in Education and several of my fellow students for all their helpful support and concern. Rhenea was the first person with whom I had contact at OSU; from that time to the present, she has always been helpful and considerate. I very much appreciate her assistance during my tenure as a graduate student.

Colleagues and friends, both in and out of Oklahoma, have been priceless. I would like to especially thank Ms. Mary Teeter. Mary provided perspective and the kind of collegial support that is invaluable. More than once she made a rough road easier to travel. Her friendship and camaraderie has been a treasure. I would also like to acknowledge and thank Dr. John Hurlburt for his support and encouragement. He was colleague, teacher, shoulder to cry on, and source of sane rationality and outrageous lunacy when either was needed. Both of these individuals have my respect and gratitude.

Finally, my family has been a constant throughout it all. My mother's lifelong belief in education has been a positive influence and a driving force for me, and her love and guidance have been a source of strength. I share the completion of this work with my father, who can now have an answer to his weekly question of "how far along is your dissertation?" One of the joys of completing this study is that now my daddy can have the pleasure of saying "my daughter, the doctor" instead of "Ed.D. is better than ABD." I am grateful for the opportunity to make him and my mother proud of me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
Background of the Study.	3
Statement of the Problem	7
Research Questions	7
Operational Definitions.	8
Limitations.	8
Organization of the Study.	8
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.	9
Introduction	9
Historical Development	10
Organizational Models of Academic Advising	12
Academic Advising and Advisers	16
Academic Advising and Advisees	20
Academic Advising and Retention.	22
Summary.	24
III. METHODOLOGY	26
Subjects	26
Instrument	27
Research Design.	29
Procedure.	29
Statistical Analysis	30
IV. RESULTS	32
Discussion of Research Questions	32
Discussion of Results.	35
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	42
Summary.	42
Conclusions.	43
Recommendations for Future Research.	43
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.	46

Chapter	Page
APPENDIXES	50
APPENDIX A – SHANE'S MODEL OF ADVISING PROCESS.	51
APPENDIX B – SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE	53

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Means and Standard Deviations.	33
II. Multivariate Analysis of Variance.	34
III. Crosstabulation of Academic Classification by Adviser Contact Frequency	36
IV. Crosstabulation of Adviser Consistency by Adviser Contact Frequency.	37
V. Model of Advising Process.	52

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

A renewed interest in academic advising exists in higher education today. This interest is due in part to a number of factors. There is concern for individual student growth and development and an interest in increasing student retention. Students indicate a growing concern with the linkage between academic preparation and the world of work. There is greater student choice of curriculum and an increase in the number of nontraditional students. Academic advising is recognized as an integral and necessary part of the higher education process.

*Student
Administrators*

These trends are leading administrators to emphasize the importance of academic advising and student support services. Academic advising is being recognized as an essential service provided by institutions of higher education. On many college and university campuses, however, advising is perfunctory and clerical, and it is not being delivered in the most effective manner (McLaughlin and Starr, 1982; Teague and Grites, 1980). One significant reason is the lack of well-organized and comprehensive training and support materials for those engaged in the advising process. Advising, like teaching, is a personal interaction requiring both knowledge and communication skills. Although most campuses have developed teaching improvement programs in recent years, advising has not received equivalent attention (Trombley and Holmes, 1981). Also, credit for good advising and the time required to provide it is often not included in the institutional reward structure.

Grites (1979) has reviewed the evolution of advising over the past 30 years. As enrollments increased, faculty began to limit their advising efforts. Faculty advisers became dissatisfied with the large number of advisees, and the lack of time, space, and information available for advising. The largely clerical tasks involved in the absence of incentives or rewards for advising were also sources of dissatisfaction. Consequently, faculty chose to involve themselves more with consultation and committee work, institutional governance, publishing, and research. The use of more part-time faculty to meet enrollment demands resulted in high turnover, and, perhaps occasionally, questionable concern for students on the part of advisers.

Students have begun to indicate their concern for a more relevant and personal education. Competition has also fueled a sense of consumerism on the part of students. Their expectations of the role education should play in their lives are such that they expect institutional representatives to respond directly to them as individuals. Student populations are increasingly represented with first generation college students, minorities, and returning adults, and these students bring unique needs (Ender, Winston, and Miller, 1984).

New attitudes toward academic advising have emerged. The retention of students has become a primary focus of administrators (Winston and Sandor, 1984). Students who remain in the institution reduce the need for recruitment from a shrinking pool. In describing an intrusive advising program at Oakland University, Appleton (1983) reported that the rate of withdrawal for Arts and Sciences and undeclared major students dropped considerably below the previous rate in each of the two academic years after the new advising program was established. At the same time, the withdrawal rate for students in other university units increased. Carstensen and

Silberhorn (1979), in a major study of higher education institutions, found retention rates increased 25% or more for some institutions that improved academic advising programs. Student retention is closely linked to the quality of academic advising, and healthy institutions will increase the importance of good advising by placing a high value on meeting the diverse needs of their students. Academic advising plays a major role in students' feelings of identity and perception of "fit" with the institution. Making personally satisfying decisions is also an important aspect of students' development and growth. Students need the opportunity to take personal risks and to hold an element of control over the development of their academic programs. When given the opportunity and guidance through academic advising to shape aspects of their academic lives, they found their personal relationship with the institution enhanced and their desire to persist strengthened (Fuller, 1983).

Academic advising programs have long been considered unique aspects of universities. Regardless of the various patterns found at different institutions, academic advising referred to a formal advising system in which faculty was usually the major component. Inasmuch as advising may influence student retention rates, it is an economic and educational force in higher education.

Background of the Study

Academic advising starts when, or even before, a student applies for admission and continues until graduation. It can involve not only faculty, but also student affairs staff and student peers. In short, academic advising is a complex process that continuously involves the entire campus. Academic advising in American higher education has evolved from a routine, single purpose, faculty activity. It is now a comprehensive process of

academic, career, and personal development performed by personnel from most elements of the campus community.

The attitudinal changes toward advising have been stimulated by student concerns for more personal campus relationships, by the need for better academic planning, and by the concern over increased attrition rates. One definition describes academic advising as a "decision-making process during which students realize their maximum educational potential through communication and information exchange with an advisor" (Grites, 1979, p. 1). The adviser may serve as a facilitator of communication, a coordinator of learning experiences, and a referral agent.

The "successful" advising system often consists of little more than an adviser telling students they must take specific courses in a particular sequence in order to fulfill graduation requirements (Mash, 1978). Hardee (1970) listed four stereotypes of faculty advising. In the "automat" stereotype, the students "slip a coin in and get a schedule out" (p. 10), interacting with advisers solely in the mechanical process of working out a registration program. The "thousand mile checkup" stereotype conceives the adviser as arranging a program of courses and checking how it worked a month or so later. A well-intentioned but ill-planned technique is the "patch-after-crash" stereotype. The adviser acts suddenly when the student is in a crisis. Finally, there is the "malevolent benevolency" stereotype. This stereotype depicts the adviser as a "mother hen," constantly hovering over the student. After a "break period," such an advising system may only delay the student's assumption of personal independence and responsibility.

Three major goals are proposed as a basis for an advising system (Abel, 1980). First, the advising program must provide opportunities for students to select and plan their educational programs. Second, the advising program must provide opportunities for students to evaluate their

progress. Third, the advising program must provide opportunities for students to identify their specific learning needs.

Peabody, Metz, and Sedlacek (1983) surveyed 29 public institutions in Maryland, asking them to rank order the frequency of advisers' job tasks. They reported that the most to least often performed tasks were: helping students to choose courses to fulfill requirements (most often), solving scheduling and registration problems, choosing a major program, exploring vocational-career goals, and exploring life goals (least often).

In assisting each student in gaining the maximum from his or her college experience, Bostaph and Moore (1980) outlined five functions of the advising process. These functions included providing the student with adequate information about courses, areas of interest, educational opportunities, degree programs, special opportunities, educational policies and regulations, administrative procedures, and university resources and services. The advising process also assists the student in making sound decisions concerning the selection of specific programs and courses on a term-by-term basis in keeping with the students' needs and interests. Additionally, advising facilitates student development by getting to know and understand the student and becoming aware of the student's needs, motives, purposes, and expectations. It also acts as an interpreter of the meaning of education and the nature of disciplinary and interdisciplinary studies, as well as the rationale for specific requirements. Finally, advising provides the opportunity and encouragement for each interested student to develop educational programs and professional strategies in keeping with the student's interests and abilities. This long-range program may be the most important advising function because it maps out a direction and rationale for the student's entire academic program.

The specific responsibilities of advisers are relatively noncontroversial, according to Larsen and Brown (1983). Both advisers and advisees in their study agreed that an academic adviser should answer questions regarding requirements, recommend courses outside the major, provide letters of recommendation for graduate school, be knowledgeable about university resources, and keep regular office hours.

Carstensen and Silberhorn (1979) reported that 68% of the 820 two- and four-year institutions in their national survey of academic advising did not have a published statement regarding the advising system, and 75% did not have a formal evaluation process for the academic advising program. When asked what recognition or reward was available for faculty advisers, 56% reported no available recognition. A total of 65% reported that the estimated average number of contacts between faculty advisers and student advisees was two to four times during an academic year. Their study concluded that there are more similarities than differences in the approaches taken to deliver advising services. Academic advising is perceived by administrators as a low status function and is seen as addressing students' informational needs rather than their total development. Few effective evaluation systems exist for, and little recognition or reward is attached to advising, and institutions generally have no comprehensive statement of policy regarding advising. Interest in the advising function is emerging, as evidenced by the new, albeit small, population of "professional advisers."

On the whole, students and faculty tend to agree on the roles and expectations of advisees and advisers (Larsen and Brown, 1983). It should be noted, however, that response rates to questionnaires such as those used by Larsen and Brown tend to be small (40% from faculty and 25% from students). Creamer and Ryan (1984) attempted to measure students' perceptions

of advising quality using eight statements about academic advising. Creamer and Ryan noted that responses to these eight statements could be crosstabulated with such demographic data as academic classification, gender, grade point average, program and/or sequence, and the amount of time spent with one's adviser to determine whether advising quality varies significantly by any of these variables. This could also provide more accurate insight into needed improvements. The present study used the factors of academic classification and adviser consistency in attempting to discover more about student perceptions of academic advising.

Statement of the Problem

The problem in the present investigation was: What are the relationships between academic classification, adviser consistency, and perceptions of academic advising?

Research Questions

The following research questions were considered for this study:

1. Are advisees' academic classification and adviser consistency related to their perceptions of the academic advising process?
2. Are advisees' academic classification and adviser consistency related to their perceptions of advisers' skills?
3. Are advisees' academic classification and adviser consistency related to their perceived satisfaction with the advising they receive?
4. Are advisees' academic classification and adviser consistency related to the frequency of contact advisees have with advisers?

Operational Definitions

Academic Advising refers to assisting students to realize 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.

Academic Adviser refers to a member of the faculty or staff who has been assigned advising duties by the appropriate administrator and who assists students with their educational, vocational, and personal concerns upon their admission to college.

Advisee refers to a student currently enrolled in academic coursework.

Satisfaction refers to the fulfillment of a need or want.

Limitations

The advising system, advisers, and other participants involved in this study are subject to change. For example, advising structures could be altered dramatically from one academic year to another. The advising system could alternately include faculty, professional staff, and peer paraprofessionals. The advisement programs in this investigation, therefore, may not be representative of future programs in the college. In the final analysis, the conclusions can be generalized only to the particular population sampled.

Organization of the Study

Chapter II presents a review of the literature relevant to academic advising. Chapter III describes the methodology used in the current study, including the sample, instrumentation, procedure, research design, and statistical analyses. Chapter IV presents the results of the analyses. Chapter V summarizes the investigation and presents conclusions and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Based on the standards for academic advising approved by the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) in 1982, academic advising should serve several purposes and goals. The primary purpose of academic advising is to assist students in their pursuit of meaningful educational programs which will assist them in fulfilling their life goals. In addition, academic advising assists students in understanding and using available support services, developing decision-making skills, understanding institutional policies and procedures, evaluating, and, in some cases, reevaluating life goals and educational plans and the students' progress toward their attainment.

Few aspects of student services are more directly related to excellence in teaching and learning than academic advising, for at least four reasons (Creamer and Atwell, 1984). Academic advising supports both teaching and counseling, is the basis of all educational planning by students, and is a process inherent in all educational roles. Finally, academic advising summons all educators to intra-institutional cooperation. Grites (1979) drew three primary conclusions from his analysis of the available literature of academic advising. First, advising cannot be done in isolation; rather, this process must be integrated with all constituents of the institution to make the best possible use of all fiscal, physical, and

human resources. Second, there is no single formula for a successful advising program. Each institution and each adviser must decide on the appropriate approach to advise individual students. Third, academic advising will play a more prominent role in the future of higher education. With declining enrollments, increasing costs, and predicted shortages in segments of the labor force, institutions will focus even more on the recruitment and retention of students. Increased emphasis on academic advising is evidenced by the increase in theory development and research on all phases of the advising process. The extensive participation of academic vice presidents and college presidents at the national level is additional evidence, as are the local, regional, and national conferences on academic advising. Many institutions have developed task forces. A new professional organization, the NACADA, has been established and edits a professional journal, The NACADA Journal (Gordon, 1980; Habley, 1981; Trombley and Holmes, 1981).

Historical Development

Expectations and responsibilities of academic advising have evolved from primarily clerical tasks, such as signing registration forms, to a more complex process. Over the years, students have begun to expect, even demand, a more personalized advising relationship. Currently, students generally expect advisers to assist them in integrating academic opportunities with personal interests, capabilities, and goals (Trombley, 1984).

In Academic Advising: Getting Us Through the Eighties, Grites (1979) provided a historical perspective on academic advising. The early days of American higher education presented no real need for a formalized advising structure, since student populations were small, course offerings limited, and programs rigid. Not until 1876 was the first system of

faculty advisers formed at Johns Hopkins University. Harvard followed in 1889, and by 1940, almost every college and university had established some formal system of faculty academic advisement.

After World War II, institutions experienced a tremendous growth in enrollments and in diversity of students. As a result, most campuses developed student service programs in the noninstructional areas of housing, financial aid, job placement, and counseling. Absent from the list of new programs was academic advising, because faculty felt that advising was a curricular academic function that only they could perform. Grites (1979) noted that at the time of publication, those responsible for advising programs were still associated with academic affairs rather than student affairs units by almost four to one.

As enrollments continued to swell in the 1950's, faculty began to limit their energies toward advising. They began to involve themselves more in consultation and committee work, institutional governance, publishing, and research. In the 1960's, demands for freedom, relevance, and participation forced significant changes in the curriculum. Advisers could no longer merely sign class cards; they now had to construct the general curriculum for each student. This responsibility required much more complete knowledge of available courses and of student needs, interests, and abilities. At the same time, however, these same faculty were required to develop new programs and courses to meet curricular demands, conduct more research, and do more publishing.

In the 1970's, student retention became a primary focus of administrators. Enrollments declined. During this time and into the 1980's, recruitment has brought in a diversified student population. Minority students, older students, academically underprepared students, and other less "traditional" students began enrolling in greater numbers. The advising

process had been recognized as an important mechanism for retaining students. Institutions have continued to concentrate on the quality of education they provide to face the competition. Academic advising was seen as a way to provide this quality as a competitive means to attract and retain students, to recognize faculty and staff contributions, and to make the best possible use of resources.

Attitudes toward academic advising changed very little until the 1950's. Until that time, advising was seen as a prescriptive, administrative activity in which faculty approved certain courses for students to take. With more emphasis on interpersonal relationships during the 1960's, advising was perceived as more of a counseling function. The 1970's necessitated cooperative efforts among all constituencies of higher education to address students' psychological development, social responsibility, and occupational future. These efforts resulted in a new developmental emphasis in advising. Academic advising was described as a decision-making process that was ongoing, multifaceted, and was the responsibility of both student and adviser.

Organizational Models of Academic Advising

Habley (1983) presented seven different organizational structure models for academic advising, as well as four essential considerations in the development of an advising program. These four considerations included organizational context, people, policies and procedures, and organizational structure. According to Habley, advising organizational design required an investigation and analysis of the relationship between structure and practical concerns of program implementation. These practical concerns included student needs, staffing, adviser selection, training, evaluation

Advising System

and reward, coordination and supervision, economy, information flow, and communication.

A pragmatic philosophy of academic advising was proposed by Borgard (1981). Pragmatic academic advisers become the arrangers of the interaction of external forces of experience (faculty teaching of curriculum) with internal forces (student's ideas, needs, interests, and capacities). The adviser is concerned with the quality of the total experience the student derives from the college situation. Additionally, the adviser is to bring continuity to the students' experiences with their environments. What students learn in one situation becomes the means by which they deal effectively with the next situation. The pragmatic academic adviser then becomes the bridge between the students and their present environments and their environments to be.

Shane (1981) discussed a model which is a general, functional overview of the advising process. The four basic types of advising and the seven characteristics of each are shown in Appendix A. Shane described how each type of advising may facilitate student growth. Informational advising typically involved unilateral communication and provided fewer opportunities for growth facilitation. Each of the remaining three advising types are more interactive and deal with aspects of student needs.

In any comprehensive advising model, advisers reach beyond information giving and maintenance tasks. They construct interactions designed to enhance their advisees' opportunities for success. A working knowledge of developmental stages in student life would lay a foundation for establishing rapport and providing guidance (Trombley, 1984). The term "developmental" appropriately describes academic advising. Developmental counseling deals with a clientele composed largely of healthy people. It does not have a medical model approach that stresses abnormality-diagnosis-

prescription-cure, but an educational model premised on client dissatisfaction or ambition-goal setting-skill teaching-goal achievement (Walsh, 1979). There is an orientation toward personal growth, and one goal of advising is to assist students in their growth.

To be most effective, academic advising should be founded upon a sound theoretical rationale. If education is designed to foster student growth, one of the most appropriate foundations would be developmental theory. Crookston (1972) described the advisee-adviser relationship in terms of two contrasting behavioral styles: prescriptive and developmental. A prescriptive relationship is one based on authority. It results when the adviser diagnoses the student's problems or concerns and prescribes a remedy or gives advice. The developmental relationship results when "the adviser and the student differentially engage in a series of developmental tasks, the successful completion of which results in varying degrees of learning by both parties" (p. 13).

A developmental model of academic advising has at least four characteristics not typically found in most institutions' programs (Miller and McCaffrey, 1982). First, both intellectual and personal-emotional aspects of development would be of primary concern. Only as students are educated about the process, as well as the content of their own development, can the advising program truly become developmental. Second, systematic training would be incorporated into the model. Highly qualified and competent individuals must take responsibility for the program. Third, an academic community support group would be established, including faculty and academic administrators not directly involved in the advising process. The fourth characteristic is based on the principle that human development occurs through cycles of differentiation and integration. The cyclical aspect of this process is evident as the individual moves to increasing

levels of complexity as a result of having discovered earlier differentiations and responding to their challenge by first assimilating and then integrating the new with the old.

To encourage students' development, academic advisers should help create educational environments that provide enough support to allow students to take risks, but not so much that they become complacent and resist change. Such an environment could satisfy individual needs to the point that students feel comfortable in confronting the challenges of the educational environment. A successful strategy or model for a developmental academic advising program must: (1) be relatively comprehensive in nature, (2) take into account the overall mission of the institution, (3) incorporate principles of human development and learning, (4) seek to utilize the total institutional environment, and (5) be responsive to the developmental and educational needs of individual students within the academic community (Miller and McCaffrey, 1982).

The formal university structure has not always promoted the development of advising. On many campuses, advising is not well defined. Criteria for effective advising are not always identified, and, in turn, advising is not evaluated. Logically, something that is not evaluated cannot be rewarded in any formal way. Good advising, like good teaching, rests on internal energies and intrinsic rewards, but without formal institutional support, the majority of faculty are unlikely to elevate the importance of advising (Holmes, Clarke, and Irvine, 1983). Although a single approach for effective academic advising is not easily identified, Hines (1981) offered basics for institutional consideration when developing an advising system:

Basic Variables: Students, Faculty, Setting. Each of these variables demands careful study before implementing an academic advising system

Students and faculty differ in background and demographic characteristics at every institution.

Academic Advising: A Full-Time Function. The position of coordinator of academic advising should be a full-time responsibility. When the person responsible for advising works only part-time at the job, advising automatically becomes a low priority. The coordinator must also have college-wide legitimacy and consider advising a responsibility.

Rewards. Faculty will take academic advising seriously only if it receives legitimacy in the institution's reward structure.

Training and Evaluation. Once an institution adopts an academic advising system, it must train advisers, evaluate both advisers and the advising system, and conduct research on advising. To learn which advising system(s) works and to identify the most effective academic advisers, both descriptive and analytical research must be conducted. Such studies should delve into student and faculty satisfaction with advising, and a correlation between advising and such data can assist in making more informed decisions about advising.

Academic Advising and Advisers

Certain conditions must exist within the framework of the institution if its program of academic advising is to serve its student population properly (Wilder, 1981). An adequate number of advisers must be available to meet the needs of the total student population, and sufficient clerical help must be available to provide advisers with up-to-date information and data about each advisee. Agencies and personnel must also be available for referrals throughout the university to deal with problems outside the advisers' scope of training or duties, and cooperation and coordination must exist among the faculty advisers, departmental advising coordinators,

college deans, and other support personnel to insure the optimal use of advisers' time.

Faculty advising systems are generally based on several assumptions (Dressel, 1974). These assumptions are that faculty members are interested in one-to-one situations with students, that college instructors are the most appropriate persons to guide students in course selections, that professors are knowledgeable enough to help students through a maze of requirements, that faculty advising is the most financially feasible way of providing academic advising, and that students want advice from the faculty concerning their academic programs. Most advisers view themselves as appropriate sources of academic and vocational information (Biggs, Brodie, and Barnhart, 1975). A predominant activity of advisers in a majority of colleges is approving registration cards. Advisers differ in their opinions regarding the appropriateness of students bringing nonacademic problems (interpersonal relations, cocurricular activities, alternative lifestyles, for example) to them.

Faculty advising may be viewed as two distinct sequences of events. Institutional advising identifies student programs, list requisites and rules, checks course selections, and signs registration cards. In professional advising, student needs and interests are identified, goals are clarified, educational options are prepared, and the adviser guides the student in decision-making and maintains contact (Holmes, Clarke, and Irvine, 1983). Many faculty have observed that institutional advising is mechanical and receives a minimum of professional attention. On the other hand, professional advising may offer greater rewards, but it also demands personal commitment and more time. Through the use of computerized record maintenance and/or carefully selected and trained peer advisers, much of the procedural issues of institutional advising may be resolved elsewhere.

Academic faculty may prove more willing to advise well when they feel that clerical problems have been delegated.

Patton (1977) described a program of intensive advising at Texas Christian University. Intensive advising refers to advising that goes well beyond the mere scheduling of courses for the upcoming semester. Traditionally, advising has appeared to waste the talent and expertise of advisers in performing what is almost a clerical function, but intensive advising assumes the exploration of life and career goals after which a program and relevant courses are selected--only then does the scheduling of courses become appropriate. The adviser's role may also include personal and vocational counseling and referral to appropriate campus and community resources. In short, the adviser seeks to help the student through any stumbling block that might interfere with a successful academic career. Crockett (1977) reiterated these thoughts and presented the academic adviser as a coordinator of the educational experience.

The importance of a faculty member's interest in advising has been debated. In an innovative intrusive counseling program at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, the one most significant trait possessed by all advisers was interest in and a willingness to become involved with students (Glennen, 1976). During the first two years of this particular program, freshman attrition dropped from 45% to 6%, the number of students making the dean's honor list increased by 9%, academic performance improved, fewer students were placed on scholastic probation and suspension, and there were fewer withdrawals from the institution. On the other hand, Sanborn and Taylor (1975) found the degree of interest that a faculty member had in advising did not affect the way in which he or she advised students. Sanborn and Taylor cautioned, however, that interest is not equal to quality of advising performed.

Another factor affecting some advisement systems is that many advisers have limited knowledge of coursework and requirements outside of their specific fields or of available support services on campus (Aitken and Conrad, 1977). Kramer and Gardner (1977) presented a broad list of 10 areas of information for an adviser. Some academic sources included academic assistance, graduation requirements, course selection, and personal counseling. While the majority of academic advisers would not, and perhaps should not, engage in personal counseling, they should be aware of the services available to students.

One of the most common situations which hinders good academic advising is when the advisers discover that their advising duties have a low priority. Faculty are not always systematically rewarded for the roles they assume in the advising program. Holmes, Clarke, and Irvine (1983) reported that two significant factors emerged in those cases where effective advising occurred. One factor was that faculty proved effective when they were clear about what advising is and how it relates to student development. The second factor was that faculty became more active in units where their efforts received recognition within the reward system as an element of their professional activity. Many institutions of higher education list three areas by which faculty are to be evaluated: teaching, research, and service. If academic advising is not included in one of those three areas, faculty advisers are not likely to award a high priority to the task, and academic advising of students is then seen as a hindrance to their main interests, sources of reward, and teaching and research (Schubert, Uhlenberg, and Munski, 1985).

Academic advisers usually provide information about or explanations of academic subjects, procedures, or regulations. In addition to serving as a clearinghouse for academic information, they can also provide referrals to

services in the campus (Gordon, 1980; Polson and Jurich, 1979). The adviser can easily direct students to appropriate offices; the introduction of campus resources has been evaluated as an extremely helpful component of advisement. Advisers are working with the total system and responsible referral is an important aspect of academic advising.

Academic Advising and Advisees

As the primary beneficiary of the advisement process, it is important that the advisee perceive the advising process in a positive manner. A quality advising experience is a developmental encounter in which the adviser and advisee discuss a wide range of topics relating to the student's life goals, educational and career goals, educational program, progress, and problems. Students perceive advising not only as a vehicle for acquiring relevant and accurate information, but also as a resource for receiving help with problems affecting their academic performance. The problems might include inadequate study skills, selecting or confirming a major choice, setting personal goals, learning about occupational relationships to majors, and how current academic decisions may affect their personal and working lives (Gordon and Carberry, 1984). Student satisfaction is highly dependent on the quality of the advisee-adviser relationship.

Dynamic advising programs are characterized by frequent high-quality contacts between the adviser and the advisee. Frequency of contact tends to strengthen the quality of this relationship. In an evaluation of the advising services at a large university, students cited four major factors as important to them in the advising process: accessibility, specific and accurate information, advice and counsel, and a caring and personal relationship with their adviser (Crockett, 1978). Grites (1981) found student attitudes positively related to the degree of knowledge an adviser has

about students and their concerns. Students appear to regard the adviser as their personal link with the university. In turn, students' evaluations of advisers tend to be based on interpersonal dimensions rather than on perceptions of technical skill. Hornbuckle, Mahoney, and Borgard (1979) and Polson and Jurich (1981) suggested that advisers' interpersonal skills influence students' attitudes toward and use of advising. Fuller (1983) saw the personal relationship with an adviser as an important bond needed by students. Students who dropped out of school in the Fuller study perceived their advisers as unavailable, disinterested, and unhelpful twice as much as did graduated students.

In a student survey at the University of California, Santa Barbara, students were asked to rank the sources of information they found helpful in choosing courses (McKinney and Hartwig, 1981). Academic advising was chosen as the most helpful by only 6% of the students. Similarly, John and McCrary (1982) found that the college catalog was the most popular source of course information and advisement, being ranked first by 57% of their sample. The college advisers in their study fared somewhat better, however, than those cited by McKinney and Hartwig. Thirty-five percent of the John and McCrary sample identified the advisers as their sources of information. Advising does not appear to be unimportant to students, but when it is compared with alternative sources (catalog information and class schedules, for example), academic advising is not valued by students as an important informational source. Stickle (1982) compared the faculty's perceived effectiveness of their own advising with students' perceptions of faculty advising and found that faculty consistently rated their effectiveness higher than did students.

Academic Advising and Retention

Students' desires to persist to graduation are tied to the quality of the relationships they establish with faculty outside the classroom. The advising interaction provides a natural context within which to strengthen students' link to the campus. Positive, personalized relationships between students and faculty can make a difference between a student persisting toward a realistic educational goal and one choosing to drop out of the institution.

Kapraun and Coldren (1982) outlined seven components of an academic advising program that emphasizes student retention. One component is institutional commitment. Faculty must believe advising is one of their functions, and the administration must provide the human, fiscal, and physical resources needed to effectively implement the advising program. There should also be a faculty-endorsed statement of adviser responsibilities, and the institution should initiate formal pre- and in-service training programs. Both formative and summative advising evaluations should be conducted. Formative evaluations are designed to gather information helpful to faculty members desiring to improve as advisers. Summative evaluation is designed to identify and reward effective advisers.

Another component listed by Kapraun and Coldren (1982) is the use of peer advisers to assist faculty advisers. These peer advisers can assist in implementing procedural requirements while faculty advisers concentrate on substantive advising responsibilities. The peer advisers can serve as "big brothers/sisters" and can assist in identifying students needing in-depth academic advising. Finally, peer advisers can sponsor activities to enhance the academic socialization of students. Academic socialization refers to the development of a personal relationship between the advisee

and the faculty and staff of the program or department in which the student is enrolled. Two final components are a well-defined referral system and a comprehensive information support system.

Carstensen and Silberhorn (1979), in a major study of higher education institution, found retention rates increased 25% or more for some institutions that improved academic advising programs. In describing an intrusive advising program at Oakland University, Appleton (1983) reported that the rate of withdrawal for arts and sciences and undeclared major students dropped considerably below the previous rate in each of the two academic years after the new advising program was established. At the same time, the withdrawal rate for students in other university units increased.

An intrusive advising system emphasizes individual attention and helps students identify and cope with academic problems that may otherwise interfere with their academic achievement. Glennen and Baxley (1985) described the results of such a system at Western New Mexico University. Retention of students, especially freshmen and sophomores, was historically poor. For the 11 years prior to implementing its retention program, student attrition had increased and reached a peak during the 1980-81 school year. During that year, freshman attrition reached 65% and sophomore attrition reached 35%. Enrollment dropped continually, although the number of incoming freshmen remained fairly stable. An important factor in developing the retention program was the fact that the students showed a disinclination to voluntarily seek assistance. As a key element in its efforts, the university developed an advisement program that students were required to use. This intrusive advising program was based on the philosophy that students should be called in for advising numerous times during the year instead of only once during the semester or waiting until the student's academic career is in serious trouble. Because students have constant

contact with faculty advisers and many opportunities to discuss their progress and changes in goals, they find the university to be a secure, supportive environment where they can comfortably pursue their academic studies. In 1982-83, enrollment at Western New Mexico University increased by 18% and by 13% in 1983-84. Freshman attrition was reduced from 66% to 48% during 1982-82 and from 48% to 25% in 1982-83. Freshmen attempted a greater number of hours, completed more attempted hours, and earned a higher mean grade point average.

Academic advising plays a major role in students' feelings of identity and perception of "fit" with the institution. Making personally satisfying decisions is also an important aspect of students' development and growth. Students need the opportunity to take personal risks and to hold an element of control over the development of their academic programs. When given the opportunity and guidance through academic advising to shape aspects of their academic lives, they find their personal relationship with the institution enhanced and their desire to persist strengthened (Fuller, 1983).

Advising should not be viewed as a "cure-all" for the retention problem. Academic advising programs have long been considered unique aspects of individual universities. Regardless of the various patterns found at different institutions, academic advising referred to a formal advising system in which faculty are usually the major component. Inasmuch as advising may influence student retention rates, it is an economic and educational force in higher education.

Summary

There is no "best" advising system. Each institution must take into consideration the characteristics of its students and faculty, as well as a multitude of other potential influences. While academic advising is a

vital component of every student's career in higher education, it may lack the priority necessary to fully accomplish all that it could. Adequate training and concern on the part of advisers, in addition to comprehensive institutional support, is necessary to bring this critical area into its proper perspective.

Students seem to be taking an active interest in the relationship of education to their post-college life. In addition, the growth of individualized programs and the variety of options within even conventional programs signal a need for greater assistance in intelligent program planning (Walsh, 1979).

The theoretically high priority given to advising undergraduate students appears to be refuted by much of the available literature. These priorities and those actually given in many institutions are often quite discrepant. Faculty advising appears to be narrowed to course selection and other specific aspects of the academic program, a framework often preferred by faculty who have not been trained in advising techniques and who feel inadequately compensated for their efforts. In turn, students perceive inadequacies in the advising systems and in tasks performed by disinterested faculty.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter discusses the methodology utilized in the present investigation. It presents the subject sample, instrumentation, procedure, research design, and statistical analyses used in the investigation of academic advising.

Subjects

The subject sample consisted of 450 students classified as second semester freshman through senior in the College of Arts and Sciences at a large southwestern university. The sample was selected using a random numbers table. A total of 450 questionnaires were distributed. Questionnaires which were returned incomplete were discarded. The 210 questionnaires which were usable for analysis represented a return rate of 47%. This was sufficient for hypothesis testing at the .05 alpha level, assuming a large effect size with power at .80 (Cohen, 1969). The sample consisted of 20% freshmen, 28% sophomores, 20% juniors, and 31% seniors. A total of 60% of the sample was female and 40% was male. Approximately 97% of the subjects were enrolled as full-time students (enrolled in 12 or more hours of coursework).

The College of Arts and Sciences provides academic advising at the college and at the departmental level. Entering freshmen are advised by professional staff advisers in the Office of Academic Student Services. Students are advised in this unit through their first year of undergraduate

enrollment, or until they declare a major course of study. A student who declares an academic major is advised by an academic department adviser who may be a faculty member or, in larger departments, a professional advising staff member. In most cases, faculty advisers are given release time for advising responsibilities. The College of Arts and Sciences recommends an advisee to adviser ratio of 300 advisees to one full-time adviser.

Since subjects were drawn at random from the college, all academic departments housed in the College of Arts and Sciences had an equal opportunity for representation. This sampling may have been biased by the fact that students in only one college were included and by the voluntary nature of their participation.

Instrument

A questionnaire was developed for this study which attempted to obtain data regarding students' perceptions of advisement effectiveness and satisfaction with the advising process. Questionnaires and survey instruments which were used in previous investigations of academic advising were reviewed. The present instrument was composed of items from these earlier questionnaires which were relevant to the current investigation.

Students were asked to respond to statements concerning their attitudes toward the advising system in general, adviser skill, satisfaction with the academic advising they received, and the frequency of contact they had with their advisers. Item responses were presented in the form of a Likert scale, with "1" representing strong disagreement, "2" slight disagreement, "3" slight agreement, and "4" strong agreement. The questionnaire contained 10 items regarding each of three variables ("perception of advising process," "perception of adviser skill," and "perception of

advising satisfaction"), resulting in a total of 30 items. The 10 items for each variable were summed to obtain a single subscale.

Three dependent variables were formed by summing the 10 questionnaire items relevant to each. The dependent variables and the respective items were: perceptions of advising process (item numbers 2, 5, 8, 10, 11, 14, 17, 18, 20, and "How would you rate the overall effectiveness of advising services within your department?"), perception of adviser skill (item numbers 3, 6, 7, 9, 13, 15, 16, 22, 24, and 29), and perception of advising satisfaction (item numbers 1, 3, 12, 19, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27, and 28). The dependent variable of adviser/advisee contact was determined by a fixed-choice item asking for the frequency of contact the respondents had with their advisers. The independent variables of academic classification and consistency of adviser were determined from demographic responses on the questionnaire. Respondents answered "yes" or "no" to the item "Have you had the same adviser throughout your enrollment in your current department?". The dependent and independent variables were then used in statistical analysis of the research questions.

Seven of the original 10 items for the variable "perception of advising process" were employed to calculate the reliability. Three of the original 10 items were discarded because of an item-total correlation of less than .30. The variable "perception of advising process" had a coefficient alpha of .85.

Reliability for the remaining two dependent variables was calculated using 10 items. The variable "perception of adviser skill" had a reliability coefficient of .89, and the variable "perception of advising satisfaction" had a reliability coefficient of .92.

Content validity was determined by a review of the instrument by a panel of four currently active, full-time professional academic advisers.

These advisers critiqued the instrument for the relevance of each item to the adviser role. After this critique, one item was reworded for clarity and additional demographic data were included. A pilot sampling of the instrument with 26 representative undergraduate students was also conducted in order to establish a coefficient of stability for the three dependent variables. The variable "perception of advising process" had a reliability coefficient of .66. The variable "perception of adviser skill" had a reliability coefficient of .75, and the variable "perception of advising satisfaction" had a reliability coefficient of .84. A copy of the questionnaire can be found in Appendix B.

Research Design

A causal-comparative research design was used. This design seeks to establish a relationship by identifying the variables or combinations of variables that are associated with a specific effect. The design deals with ex post facto situations. Comparison on the dependent variable(s) is(are) an attempt to discover possible causes or reasons for differences due to the subject differences in the environmental variable. Causal-comparative research does not isolate a cause; rather, results may suggest possible causal relationships. The causal-comparative research design is justifiable in circumstances in which more stringent designs are not appropriate, not ethical, or not possible.

Procedure

The subject sample consisted of 450 students classified as second semester freshman through senior in the College of Arts and Sciences at a large southwestern university. The sample was selected using a random numbers table.

Survey questionnaires were distributed to this sample. After a period of three weeks, a telephone follow-up was conducted. A second questionnaire was given to those individuals who reported not receiving the first one. A total return rate of 47% was achieved after the distribution of the second questionnaire.

Three dependent variables were formed by summing the 10 questionnaire items relevant to each. The dependent variables were: perception of advising process, perception of adviser skill, and perception of advising satisfaction. A fourth dependent variable was also determined by a fixed-choice item. Respondents reported the frequency of contact they had with their advisers, which represented the fourth dependent variable. The independent variables of academic classification and consistency of adviser were determined from demographic responses. The dependent and independent variables were used in statistical analysis of the research questions.

Statistical Analysis

There were two independent variables and four dependent variables. The independent variables were: classification of the student (four levels), and whether the advisee had the same adviser on a continual basis (two levels). The levels of academic classification were: freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior. Each level was determined based on accumulated academic credit hours as published in the college catalog. "Freshman" was equivalent to 27 or less hours, "sophomore" to 28-59 hours, "junior" to 60-93 hours, and "senior" was equivalent to 94 or more hours. There were two levels of the independent variable "adviser consistency": yes or no. The dependent variables were the student advisees' perceptions of the general academic advising system, perceptions of their advisers' skills as resource persons, perceptions of their satisfaction with the

academic advising received, and the frequency of contact between advisees and advisers.

A 4 X 2 MANOVA was used, with a familywise significance level set at $\alpha = .15$, to investigate research questions 1, 2, and 3. Question 4 was analyzed using a chi-square procedure with a significance level set at $\alpha = .05$.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of a 4 X 2 multivariate analysis of variance of the variables academic classification and consistency of adviser in undergraduate arts and sciences students. A brief restatement of the research questions will be presented for each analysis.

Discussion of Research Questions

Research Questions 1, 2, and 3

Research Questions 1, 2, and 3 were stated as follows: Are advisees' academic classification or the number of advisers they have seen related to advisees' perceptions of: (1) the academic advising process, (2) advisers' skill, and (3) satisfaction with the advising they receive?

The means and standard deviations of the dependent variables are reported in Table I. Examination of the within-cells error correlations indicated a relationship between the dependent variables; therefore, a multivariate analysis of variance procedure using academic classification and consistency of adviser as the independent variables was performed. The results of this analysis are presented in Table II. As these results indicate, no differences for the interaction or either main effect were found. No relationship between academic classification and consistency of adviser was found for students' perceptions of the advising process, or adviser skill, or of advising satisfaction.

TABLE I
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

	N	Same Adviser				Different Adviser			
		Freshman 28	Sophomore 38	Junior 27	Senior 28	Freshman 15	Sophomore 19	Junior 11	Senior 29
Perception of Academic Advising Process	\bar{X}	21.29	21.37	20.89	20.04	21.73	19.68	17.64	19.90
	SD	4.91	4.81	4.93	4.22	3.92	5.09	6.56	4.71
Perception of Adviser Skill	\bar{X}	31.29	32.34	31.82	30.79	31.27	28.47	28.18	30.59
	SD	6.01	5.93	7.48	6.52	6.04	6.88	9.17	6.90
Perception of Satisfac- tion With Advising	\bar{X}	29.75	30.11	30.48	28.29	30.20	26.68	25.55	28.83
	SD	6.97	7.40	7.28	6.80	5.81	7.86	10.23	6.82

TABLE II
MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source	Multivariate		Variable	Univariate	
	F	df		F	df
Adviser Consistency	1.16	3, 185	Advising Process	2.43	1, 187
			Adviser Skill	3.49	1, 187
			Advising Satisfaction	2.70	1, 187
Academic Classification	1.24	9, 450	Advising Process	1.42	3, 187
			Adviser Skill	.23	3, 187
			Advising Satisfaction	.53	3, 187
Adviser Consistency X Academic Classification	.89	9, 450	Advising Process	1.10	3, 187
			Adviser Skill	1.10	3, 187
			Advising Satisfaction	1.48	3, 187

Research Question 4

Research Question 4 was stated as follows: Is advisee academic classification or the number of advisers seen related to the frequency of contact advisees have with advisers?

To further investigate the relationship between advising variables, academic classification and adviser consistency, two tests of proportions were performed. No relationship was found between academic classification and students' frequency of contact with advisers ($\chi^2 = 9.48$, $df = 9$, $p > .05$). The relationship of adviser consistency to frequency of adviser contact was also explored, and, again, no relationship was found ($\chi^2 = 4.72$, $df = 3$, $p > .05$). It therefore appears that one academic class is not more likely to meet with advisers more frequently than another class. It also appears that having or not having the same adviser on a consistent basis has no relationship to the frequency of contact students have with advisers. Tables III and IV present the chi-square data tables for these analyses.

Discussion of Results

The data analyses indicate that no relationship appears to exist between any of the three advising dependent variables and the independent variables of students' academic classification and/or adviser consistency. It also does not appear that the frequency of contact students have with advisers is significantly influenced by whether the student is a freshman, sophomore, junior, or senior. Further, contact frequency is not influenced by whether they have been consistently advised by the same adviser.

The lack of relationship between the independent variables and perceived adviser skill may relate to the findings of Hornbuckle, Mahoney, and

TABLE III
 CROSSTABULATION OF ACADEMIC CLASSIFICATION BY
 ADVISER CONTACT FREQUENCY

Classification	Adviser Semester Contact				Row Totals
	Never	Once	2-3 Times	4 or More Times	
Freshman	0 ^a 0% ^b	7 3.3%	30 14.3%	6 2.9%	43 20.5%
Sophomore	0 0%	18 8.6%	35 16.7%	6 2.9%	59 28.1%
Junior	0 0%	10 4.8%	23 11.0%	10 4.8%	43 20.5%
Senior	1 .5%	16 7.6%	34 16.2%	14 6.7%	65 31.0%
Column Totals	1 .5%	51 24.3%	122 58.1%	36 17.1%	210 100.0%

^aFrequency count

^bPercentage of total

TABLE IV
 CROSSTABULATION OF ADVISER CONSISTENCY BY
 ADVISER CONTACT FREQUENCY

	Adviser Semester Contact				Row Totals
	Never	Once	2-3 Times	4 or More Times	
Same Adviser	1 .5%	35 16.7%	74 35.2%	17 8.1%	127 60.5%
Different Adviser	0 0%	16 7.6%	48 22.9%	19 9.0%	83 39.5%
Column Total	1 .5%	51 24.3%	122 58.1%	36 17.1%	210 100.0%

Borgard (1979), who noted that students' evaluations of advisers tended to be based on interpersonal dimensions rather than on perceptions of technical skill. The present study utilizes the independent variables of academic classification and adviser consistency in a way not cited in the reviewed literature.

There could be several factors affecting the results of this study. There were unequal numbers of students representing each academic classification. Specifically, there were more sophomores and seniors in the sample than freshmen and juniors. Additionally, with the exception of the senior subsample, the sample contained more students who had the same adviser than those who had not. The senior students had approximately the same number of students in both categories (28 with the same adviser and 29 with different advisers). These disproportionate groupings could bias the present results in the direction of the larger groups.

The lack of significant findings associated with the research questions in this study could be attributable to one or more factors. Students from only one academic college were included as subjects. Caution should therefore be used in generalizing these results to other advising units in the same university and certainly to other institutions.

A second influencing factor could be a return rate of 47%. Despite telephone follow-up endeavors, the actual number of usable questionnaires was smaller than desired. This resulted in a limited supply of data available for analysis. It should be noted, however, that the total percentage of questionnaires returned by students in the present study is not dissimilar to that in a similar study by Larsen and Brown (1983), who experienced a 25% overall student return rate. In the Larsen and Brown investigation of student and faculty expectations of academic advising, 11% of the juniors, 36% of the freshmen with declared majors, and 32% of the freshmen

with undeclared majors responded. The current investigation included 20% freshmen, 28% sophomores, 20% juniors, and 31% seniors. The overall return rate of 47% in the present study exceeds the 25% return rate reported by Larsen and Brown. The advisability of nonvoluntary participation by students may likely be a consideration in any future research. Nonvoluntary participation has the risk of intentional biasing by uncooperative participants, which may inaccurately skew data. Voluntary participation can, as is evidenced in the present study and in the cited literature, result in low return rates. Researchers may find it necessary to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of voluntary and nonvoluntary participation as they develop future investigations.

Another factor which may have influenced the present findings is the instrument. Despite a pilot survey with the questionnaire developed for this investigation and subsequent changes as a result, there were occasional remarks from respondents which call into question the clarity of at least two items. Item 1 ("I have a more accurate view of my academic program") and item 23 ("I know more about making career decisions") were occasionally noted as being unclear. Apparently, the word "more" in each of these items was misleading to a small number of respondents. Rewording these items would enhance their clarity and meaning.

The diversity in the academic advising system(s) used in this investigation could be another factor. The current study included departmental and college student services advisers, as well as both faculty and professional advising staff. The differences, if any, which may or may not exist between such types of advisers could be an additional confounding factor.

The survey questionnaire format has some drawbacks (low return rate, disproportionate cells, incomplete responses), yet these drawbacks do not necessarily pose a consistent threat to accuracy or completeness. Polson

and Jurich (1981) utilized a survey questionnaire very similar to the one in the present study to investigate students' ratings of advising program effectiveness, and their study reported high ratings on the overall quality of academic advising. Their study also considered adviser traits and overall adviser outcomes.

In any future investigations similar to the present study, it may be advisable to narrow the focus of study. A separation of faculty and non-faculty advisers may clarify differing sets of expectations and tasks. It is also possible that students may differ in their needs from and expectations of advisers according to students' academic classifications. For example, freshmen may look to advisers for more guidance in choosing a major and a career, while seniors may need assistance in implementing their major and career choices. Future investigations, therefore, may benefit from considering more specific independent and dependent variables.

A large proportion of the research on academic advising consists of surveys of student opinion, whereas studies examining the relationship of student characteristics, student outcomes, and specific advising programs and effectiveness remain scarce (McLaughlin and Starr, 1982). The use of questionnaires in studies of academic advising is a viable technique. Return rates may be enhanced by more personal contact and follow-up. In other words, gathering data directly from students in classes or other groups may result in more complete data.

In any research endeavor concerning academic advising, the observation of Brown and Sanstead (1982) should be considered. Brown and Sanstead noted two major weaknesses in most advising evaluation efforts. First, the usual measures of success, retention and academic achievement, are too global. Both retention and academic achievement are the result of a complex variety of factors, of which advising is only one. Second, the

evaluation focus is almost exclusively on outcome measures rather than on process variables. In Brown and Sanstead's analogy, evaluating an academic advising system by assessing its influence on outcome measures is like evaluating a marriage using longevity and the number of children as criteria. Much more goes into both a marriage and in an effective advising system.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between academic classification, adviser consistency, and undergraduate students' perceptions of academic advising. Additionally, the study investigated the relationship between the frequency of contact advisees have with advisers and both academic classification and adviser consistency.

A total of 210 undergraduate students were used for this study. These students were enrolled during the 1984-85 academic year as second semester freshmen through seniors in the College of Arts and Sciences in a large southwestern university. These students were randomly selected from all students enrolled in the college. The subjects completed an anonymous questionnaire which solicited their responses to 30 items regarding academic advising, as well as relevant demographic data.

A two-way multivariate analysis of variance was used to investigate the relationship between academic classification, adviser consistency, and subjects' perceptions of advising systems, skills, and satisfaction. The alpha level of .05 was established as the level of significance. In addition to the MANOVA, chi-square analysis procedures were performed to investigate the relationship between academic classification, adviser consistency, and frequency of adviser/advisee contact. The results of

this study did not reveal a relationship between any of the independent and dependent variables.

Conclusions

Based on the data analyses, the following conclusions were tentatively drawn:

1. Students' academic classification does not appear to be related to their perceptions of the advising process, the skill of advisers, or the satisfaction they experience regarding the advising they receive.

2. Students' consistency of adviser does not appear to be related to their perceptions of the advising process, the skill of advisers, or the satisfaction they experience regarding the advising they receive.

3. Students' academic classification does not appear to have any relationship to the frequency of contact students have with their advisers.

4. Students' consistency of adviser does not appear to have any relationship to the frequency of contact students have with their advisers

In considering these conclusions, it is useful to note the findings of Grites (1981), which indicated that student attitudes were positively related to the degree of knowledge an adviser had about students and their concerns. Additionally, students' evaluations of advisers tended to be based on interpersonal rather than technical dimensions. In the present study, however, academic classification and adviser consistency appeared to have no relationship to either interpersonal contact or perceptions of technical skill.

Recommendations for Future Research

The present investigation can lead to other research endeavors

designed to define students' needs and preferences with regard to academic advising, as well as to enhance the advising process.

1. This study should be replicated with larger numbers of students in order to more clearly establish the factors relevant to students' perceptions of academic advising.

2. Variables in addition to academic classification and adviser consistency should be incorporated into subsequent studies of academic advising. Research incorporating different study populations, both in terms of academic college and student demographics, may also be valuable.

3. More sophisticated instrumentation could be utilized in subsequent studies of academic advising. A number of survey questionnaires and instruments may currently exist, but refinement is still useful and necessary.

4. Other academic colleges and units could be investigated in order to gain a more expansive and complete picture of the advising process.

5. Administrators responsible for providing academic advising services may need to more clearly scrutinize the effectiveness of their services. While the present study is not definitive, it does not indicate that academic advising becomes any more or less important as students progress in their academic programs. Rather, it may be more essential to question advisement's importance and effectiveness to students at any time. Advising administrators should perhaps explore whether the expectations and needs they attempt to meet are consistent with the expectations and needs felt by their student clientele.

6. In consideration of the effect academic advising may have on enrollment retention, it is strongly recommended that continued and increased study of this student service area be encouraged and implemented.

7. Investigations could focus specifically on the retention of freshmen and sophomores, particularly those students with undeclared majors who may be at high retention risk. This emphasis is supported by the work of Glennen and Baxley (1985), which reported a stable number of incoming freshmen, but a decline in the retention of freshmen and sophomores. Their study supported the positive influence of academic advising on the retention of these students.

8. Future investigations might focus on a variety of student clientele, advising systems, and the factors influencing their effectiveness.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abel, J. (1980) Academic advising: Goals and a delivery system. Journal of College Student Personnel, 21, 151-155.
- Aitken, C. E. and Conrad, C. F. (1977) Improving academic advising through computerization. College and University, 53, 115-123.
- Appleton, C. (1983) The impact of an academic advising program: A case study. NACADA Journal, 3, 57-63.
- Biggs, D. A.; Brodie, J. S.; and Barnhart, W. J. (1975) The dynamics of undergraduate academic advising. Research in Higher Education, 3, 345-357.
- Borgard, J. H. (1981) Toward a pragmatic philosophy of academic advising. NACADA Journal, 1, 1-6.
- Bostaph, C. and Moore, M. (1980) Training academic advisers: A developmental strategy. Journal of College Student Personnel, 21, 45-49.
- Brown, R. D. and Sanstead, M. J. (1982) Using evaluation to make decisions about academic advising programs. In: Developmental Approaches to Academic Advising, R. B. Winston; S. C. Ender; and T. K. Miller (Eds.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Carstensen, D. J. and Silberhorn, C. (1979) A National Survey of Academic Advising. Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Program.
- Cohen, J. (1969) Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: Academic Press.
- Creamer, D. G. and Atwell, C. A. (1984) The great debate: Academic advising. Community and Junior College Journal, 54, 18-20.
- Creamer, D. F. and Ryan, M. (1984) New technique lets students evaluate academic advising. Journalism Educator, 39, 21-22.
- × Crockett, D. S. (1977) Academic advising: A cornerstone of student retention. In: Reducing the Dropout Rate, L. Noel (Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Crockett, D. S., Ed. (1978) Academic Advising: A Resource Document. Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Association.
- Crockett, D. S. (1982) Advising Skills, Techniques, and Resources. Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Association.

- Crookston, B. B. (1972) A developmental view of academic advising as teaching. Journal of College Student Personnel, 13, 12-17.
- × Dressel, F. D. (1974) The faculty adviser. Improving College and University Teaching, 22, 57-58.
- Dunham, B. J. (1981) What's an advisor to do? NACADA Journal, 1, 9-11.
- Ender, S. C.; Winston, R. B, Jr.; and Miller, T. K. (1984) Academic advising reconsidered. In: Developmental Academic Advising, R. B. Winston, Jr.; T. K. Miller; S. C. Ender, and T. J. Grites and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- ✓ Fuller, A. G. (1983) A strategy to improve retention. NACADA Journal, 3, 65-72.
- Glennen, R. E. (1976) Intrusive college counseling. The School Counselor, 24, 48-50.
- Glennen, R. E. and Baxley, D. M. (1985) Reduction of attrition through intrusive advising. NASPA Journal, 22, 10-14.
- Gordon, V. (1980) Training academic advisers: Content and method. Journal of College Student Personnel, 21, 334-340.
- Gordon, V. N. and Carberry, J. D. (1984) The Myers-Briggs type indicator: A resource for developmental advising. NACADA Journal, 4, 75-81.
- Grites, T. J. (1979) Academic Advising: Getting Us Through the Eighties. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.
- Grites, T. J. (1981) Student and self ratings of teacher-advisors. NACADA Journal, 1, 29-33.
- Habley, W. R. (1981) Academic advisement: A critical link in student retention. NASPA Journal, 18, 45-50.
- Habley, W. R. (1983) Organizational structures for academic advising: Models and implications. Journal of College Student Personnel, 24, 535-540.
- Hardee, M. D. (1970) Faculty Advising in Colleges and Universities. Washington, D.C.: American College Personnel Association.
- Hines, E. R. (1981) Academic advising: More than a placebo? NACADA Journal, 1, 24-28.
- Holmes, D. R.; Clarke, J. H.; and Irvine, C. A. (1983) Organizational change and the improvement of faculty advising. NACADA Journal, 3, 21-29.
- Hornbuckle, P. A.; Mahoney, J.; and Borgard, J. H. (1979) A structural analysis of student perceptions of faculty advising. Journal of College Student Personnel, 20, 296-300.

- John, G. and McCrary, R. D. (1982) Evaluating an advisement program. Journal of College Student Personnel, 23, 266-267.
- Kapraun, E. D., Jr. and Coldren, D. W. (1982) Academic advising to facilitate student retention. NACADA Journal, 2, 59-69.
- Kramer, H. C. and Gardner, R. E. (1977) Advising by Faculty. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.
- Larsen, M. D. and Brown, B. (1983) Student and faculty expectations of academic advising. NACADA Journal, 3, 31-37.
- Mash, D. J. (1978) Advising: Too often taken for granted. College Board Review, 107, 33-36.
- McKinney, C. W. and Hartwig, M. (1981) A comparative study of students and academic department personnel perceptions of academic advising at the University of California, Santa Barbara. College and University, 56, 264-282.
- McLaughlin, B. M. and Starr, E. A. (1982) Academic advising literature since 1965: A college student personnel abstracts review. NACADA Journal, 2, 14-23.
- Miller, T. K. and McCaffrey, S. S. (1982) Student development theory: Foundations for academic advising. In: Developmental Approaches to Academic Advising, R. B. Winston, S. D. Ender, and T. K. Miller (Eds.) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Patton, C. R. (1977) Centralized advisement at Texas Christian University. In: Academic Advising: A Resource Document, D. S. Crockett (Ed.) Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Association.
- Peabody, S. A.; Metz, J. F., Jr.; and Sedlacek, W. E. (1983) A survey of academic advising models. Journal of College Student Personnel, 24, 83-84.
- Polson, C. J. and Jurich, A. P. (1979) The departmental academic advising center: An alternative to faculty advising. Journal of College Student Personnel, 20, 249-253.
- Polson, C. J. and Jurich, A. P. (1981) The impact of advising skills upon the effectiveness of the developmental academic advising center. NACADA Journal, 1, 47-55.
- Sanborn, C. H. and Taylor, A. L. (1975) Predicting faculty interest in student advising in the community college. Research in Higher Education, 3, 67-75.
- Schubert, G. W.; Uhlenberg, D.; and Munski, D. C. (1985) Preserving faculty time for analytical advising in a high student-to-faculty ratio. NACADA Journal, 5, 27-38.
- Shane, D. (1981) Academic advising in higher education: A developmental approach for college students of all ages. NACADA Journal, 1, 12-23.

- Stickle, F. (1982) Faculty and student perception of faculty advising effectiveness. Journal of College Student Personnel, 23, 262-265.
- Teague, G. V. and Grites, T. J. (1980) Faculty contracts and academic advising. Journal of College Student Personnel, 21, 40-44.
- Trombley, T. B. (1984) An analysis of the complexity of academic advising tasks. Journal of College Student Personnel, 25, 234-239.
- Trombley, T. B. and Holmes, D. (1981) Defining the role of academic advising in the industrial setting: The next phase. NACADA Journal, 1, 1-8.
- Walsh, E. M. (1979) Revitalizing academic advisement. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 57, 446-449.
- Wilder, J. R. (1981) A successful academic advising program: Essential ingredients. Journal of College Student Personnel, 22, 488-492.
- Winston, R. B. and Sandor, J. A. (1984) Developmental academic advising: What do students want? NACADA Journal, 4, 5-13.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

SHANE'S MODEL OF ADVISING PROCESS

TABLE V
MODEL OF ADVISING PROCESS

	Informational	Explanatory	Analytic	Therapeutic
Content	Data	Procedures	Options	Values
Purpose	Informative	Clarification	Insight	Self-Acceptance
Nature	Presentation	Discussion	Analysis	Awareness
Focus	The Data	The Institution	The Student	The Person
Perspective	Atomistic	Atomistic	Holistic	Introspective
Setting	Public	Semi-Private	Private	Private
Length	2-10 Minutes	5-20 Minutes	20-60 Minutes	Multiple Sessions

Source: D. Shane, "Academic advising in higher education: A developmental approach for college students of all ages," NACADA Journal (1981).

APPENDIX B
SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

How would you rate the overall effectiveness of academic advising services within your current academic department?

_____ excellent _____ good _____ fair _____ poor

Please answer items #1-29 using the scale below. Please write the number corresponding to your response in the blank space before each statement. Use only one of the four alternatives and be sure you respond to each statement.

- 1 = strong disagreement
- 2 = slight disagreement
- 3 = slight agreement
- 4 = strong agreement

- _____ 1. I have a more accurate view of my academic program.
- _____ 2. Advisers decide what courses a student should take, allowing the student little choice in what he/she would like.
- _____ 3. My meetings with my adviser leave me with a good feeling about myself.
- _____ 4. My adviser is available during posted office hours.
- _____ 5. Advisers explore the obstacles the student needs to overcome to reach his/her goal(s).
- _____ 6. My adviser recognizes me and calls me by name when he/she sees me.
- _____ 7. My adviser is aware of campus resources.
- _____ 8. Students should keep the same adviser during their enrollment, assuming they do not change their major or college.
- _____ 9. My adviser usually allows adequate time when I meet with him/her.
- _____ 10. Advisers use knowledge about career opportunities in advising.
- _____ 11. Advisers respect the feelings and opinions of students.
- _____ 12. My adviser is someone on campus I can depend on.
- _____ 13. My adviser seeks and actively explores alternative solutions to student problems.
- _____ 14. When advising on a specific concern, advisers discuss its impact on the student's total academic program.
- _____ 15. My adviser is approachable and easy to talk with.
- _____ 16. My adviser knows the procedure for such things as add/drop, auditing a course, taking proficiency exams, etc.
- _____ 17. It is important for an adviser to know his/her advisees well enough to recognize them and call them by name.
- _____ 18. My adviser seems to enjoy advising students.
- _____ 19. My adviser knows what it is like to be an undergraduate.
- _____ 20. Students should be allowed to select their adviser.
- _____ 21. I feel comfortable sharing problems with my adviser.
- _____ 22. I find my adviser knowledgeable about career and academic guidance.
- _____ 23. I know more about making career decisions.
- _____ 24. My adviser takes a genuine interest in me as a person.
- _____ 25. I am satisfied with the help I receive from my adviser.
- _____ 26. I would recommend my adviser to another student.
- _____ 27. My adviser is willing to find answers to questions whenever he/she is unable to provide them.
- _____ 28. I feel relaxed while talking with my adviser.
- _____ 29. My adviser is willing to discuss my feelings and emotions.

ACADEMIC CLASSIFICATION:

freshman sophomore junior senior

SEX: female male

AGE: _____

ETHNIC ORIGIN:

white black hispanic American Indian
 Asian other (please specify: _____)

PLACE OF RESIDENCE :

residence hall sorority/fraternity married student housing
 off campus commuter student

ARE YOU A . . . :

fulltime student parttime student

HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN ENROLLED AT OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY?

one year or less two years three years
 four years five or more years

HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN ENROLLED IN YOUR CURRENT ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT?

first semester one year two years
 three years four years five or more years

HAVE YOU HAD THE SAME ACADEMIC ADVISER THROUGHOUT YOUR ENROLLMENT IN YOUR CURRENT DEPARTMENT??

yes no

HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN ASSIGNED TO YOUR CURRENT ADVISER?

one semester one year two years
 three years four years five or more years

ON THE AVERAGE, HOW MANY TIMES DO YOU SEE YOUR ADVISER DURING THE SEMESTER?

never once 2 to 3 times 4 or more times

WHAT IS THE AVERAGE AMOUNT OF TIME YOU USUALLY SPEND WITH YOUR ADVISER WHEN YOU SEE HIM/HER?

I have never seen my adviser.
 less than 5 minutes a visit.
 about 15 minutes
 about 30 minutes
 more than 30 minutes

VITA

Lisa Lene' Grubbs

Candidate for the Degree of
Doctor of Education

Thesis: AN INVESTIGATION OF ACADEMIC CLASSIFICATION, ADVISER CONSISTENCY AND PERCEPTIONS OF ACADEMIC ADVISING

Major Field: Counseling and Student Personnel

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Bryan, Texas, February 16, 1955.

Education: Graduated from Bryan High School, Bryan, Texas, in May, 1973; received Bachelor of Science degree in Psychology from Texas A & M University in May, 1977; received Master of Science degree in Psychology (Industrial) from Texas A & M University in August, 1981; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in July, 1986.

Professional Experience: Graduate Assistant, Office of Student Activities, Texas A & M University, February, 1980-August, 1980; Lecturer, Department of Management, Texas A & M University, August, 1981-May, 1982; Graduate Teaching Associate, Oklahoma State University, August, 1982-August, 1983; Career and Study Skills Counselor, University Counseling Services, Oklahoma State University, August, 1983 to present.