This dissertation has been
microfilmed exactly as received

69-1990

RECER, James Daniel, 1936-
ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVE ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT SYSTEMS IN UNIVERSITY COLLEGE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA.

The University of Oklahoma, Ph.D., 1968
Education, administration

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/2461

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVE ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT SYSTEMS IN UNIVERSITY COLLEGE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

JAMES DANIEL RECER

Norman, Oklahoma

1968

ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVE ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT SYSTEMS IN UNIVERSITY COLLEGE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

APPROVED BY

Herbert R. Hengst

John L. Harris Jr.

William C. Price

Floyd P. Williams

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

DEDICATION

TO

MARY JANE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The writer is and shall continue to be sincerely grateful to the chairman of his doctoral committee and director of this study, Dr. Herbert R. Hengst, whose patience and tenacity were so vitally essential in the development of this dissertation. He also expresses gratitude to Dr. Lloyd P. Williams, Dr. John R. Morris, and Dr. William C. Price who served as members of his doctoral committee. He greatly appreciates the inspiration and encouragement given by Dr. James Harlow who, before accepting the presidency of the University of West Virginia, served as the writer's adviser.

Appreciation is expressed to the students and faculty members who, by returning the instruments, contributed to the study. The writer is deeply indebted to a host of friends, relatives and professional associates who, in innumerable ways, made an incalculable contribution to the writer's achieving the goal which this study completes.

Appreciation is expressed to Chancellor E. T. Dunlap and Vice-Chancellor John Coffelt of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education who encouraged the completion of this project.

Deepest thanks are offered to Dr. Fred Haroleroad, President, and Dr. Vernon Odom, Regional Director, of the American College Testing Program whose foresight and wisdom stimulated the writer in numerous ways.

The writer stands in debt to Dr. Rabun L. Brantley who has been a great source of encouragement.

Sincere thanks are offered to Mrs. Clayton Spriggs whose able assistance made this publication a reality.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT		iv
LIST OF TABLES		viii
Chapter		
I.	THE PROBLEM	1
	Need for the Study	4
	Statement of the Problem	7
	Design of the Study	7
	The Population of the Study	9
	Types of Questions with which this Study Is Concerned	9
	Definition of Terms	10
	Scope of the Study	13
II.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	14
	A Survey of Faculty-Advisement Systems	16
	Faculty Interest	17
	What Faculty Advisers Do	19
	Kinds of Published Research	23
	Summary of Review of Literature	36
III.	DESCRIPTION AND COMPARISON OF POPULATION GROUPS	38
	Selection of Subjects	38
	Gathering the Data	39
	Procedure	41
	Hypotheses	41
	Treatment of Data	42
	Results	43
	Summary	48

Chapter		Page
IV.	PRODUCTS OF THE ALTERNATIVE ADVISEMENT SYSTEMS	50
	Introduction	50
	Course Load Quantity	50
	Enrollment Errors	62
	Retention	73
	Grade-Point-Average	75
	Summary of Chapter IV	78
V.	ATTITUDES AND OPINIONS TOWARD THE ALTERNATIVE ADVISEMENT SYSTEMS IN UNIVERSITY COLLEGE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA	79
	The Population	79
	The Instrument	79
	Scoring the Instrument	80
	Gathering the Data	81
	Hypotheses	81
	Treatment of Data	83
	Results	83
	Summary	86
VI.	PREFERENCE FOR CHANGE IN UNIVERSITY COLLEGE ADVISEMENT	87
	The Population	87
	The Instrument	87
	Gathering the Data	88
	Scoring the Instrument	88
	Summary	93
VII.	SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS	95
	Summary	95
	Findings	95
	Conclusions	100
	Recommendations	101
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY		103
APPENDIX		110

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Aids Received from Faculty Counselors Expressed in Percentages	20
2.	Students' Rating on a Six-point Scale of Their Interviews With Their Counselors	21
3.	Group Difference as Measured by ACT English Score	43
4.	Group Difference as Measured by ACT Mathematics Score	44
5.	Group Difference as Measured by ACT Social Science Score	44
6.	Group Difference as Measured by ACT Natural Science Score	45
7.	Group Difference as Measured by ACT Composite Score	46
8.	Group Difference as Measured by Hours Completed Fall 1966	46
9.	Group Difference as Measured by GPA Fall 1966	47
10.	Group Difference as Measured by Credit Hours Dropped Fall Semester 1966	48
11.	Summary of Group Differences	49
12.	Credit Hours Dropped Spring Semester 1967	56
13.	Credit Hours Dropped Fall and Spring by Faculty-Advised Freshmen	56

Table		Page
14.	Credit Hours Dropped Fall and Spring by Self-Advised Freshmen	57
15.	Credit Hours Attempted Spring 1967 ...	58
16.	Credit Hours Completed and Attempted by Faculty-Advised Freshmen	59
17.	Credit Hours Completed and Attempted by Self-Advised Freshmen	60
18.	Credit Hours Completed and Attempted by Men and Women	60
19.	Differences Between Hours Attempted Spring and Completed Fall	61
20.	Distribution of Enrollment Errors	65
21.	Enrollment Errors	66
22.	Fall and Spring Semester Grades of Sixteen Faculty-Advised Freshmen Who Enrolled in "Sophomore-Standing" Courses in the Spring of 1967	68
23.	Grades Earned by Sixteen Faculty-Advised Freshmen in "Sophomore-Standing" Courses in the Spring Semester of 1967	69
24.	Fall and Spring Semester Grade-Point-Averages of Eight Self-Advised Freshmen Who Enrolled in "Sophomore-Standing" Courses in the Spring of 1967	69
25.	Grades Earned by Eight Self-Advised Freshmen in "Sophomore-Standing" Courses in the Spring Semester of 1967	70
26.	Grades Earned in Economics 41 by Twelve Second-Semester Freshmen in the Spring Semester of 1967	71
27.	Grade-Point-Averages of Twelve Second-Semester Freshmen Who Enrolled in Economics 41 in the Spring Semester of 1967	72

Table		Page
28.	Difference in Retention Rates	75
29.	Fall and Spring GPA Differences for Men	77
30.	Fall and Spring GPA Differences for Women	77
31.	Number and Percent of Likert Scales Returned	82
32.	Faculty Members' Data on the Likert Scale	84
33.	Faculty-Advised Students' Data on the Likert Scale	84
34.	Self-Advised Students' Data on the Likert Scale	85
35.	Differences Among Group Means	86
36.	Return Results for the Preference-for-Change Rating Scale	88
37.	Faculty Members' Scores on the Preference-for-Change Scale	89
38.	Faculty-Advised Students' Scores on the Preference-for-Change Scale	90
39.	Self-Advised Students' Scores on the Preference-for-Change Scale	90
40.	Ranking of Items by the Three Groups ..	92
41.	Preference-for-Change Scale Items Listed as Respondents' First Choice ...	93

ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVE ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT SYSTEMS IN UNIVERSITY COLLEGE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

American society, in its present state of flux, change and introspection finds itself facing a multitude of extremely difficult problems. Many of these, if researched, might find part of their genesis in the general area of the means utilized in educational and vocational counseling of the nation's youth. Although this facet of national life is spread over a substantial area of the population and institutions, it is nowhere more apparent than in our institutions of higher education. More precisely, the need for carefully planned methodology is most apparent in the early years of the higher education experience.

"It has been calculated that with the coming together of two human beings there are genetical possibilities in the order of two to the 20,000 power."[1] Although institutions of

---

[1]Melvene Draheim Hardee, The Faculty in College Counseling (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959), p. 293.

higher education are not human beings, one can hardly fathom the tremendous number of possible chances for choice when, as in the fall of 1967, more than one and one-half million new freshmen arrived on the twenty-five hundred campuses in America. In recent years, the explosion of knowledge leading to the proliferation of college and university course and program offerings, the increasing awareness of individual differences and the increase in students have made the choice more acute than it was in the past.

People in various sectors of the higher education community have shown increasing concern for these problems. Traditionally they have addressed academic advisement by instituting a system of faculty advisement whereby a faculty member had a planning session with each advisee. Of course, the extent and depth of such sessions has varied in many ways from campus to campus and person to person.

Educators generally agree that this problem has not been adequately solved; consequently, there are a number of experimental and innovative programs in existence or development at this time. Hardee describes twenty different approaches which have been taken by institutions in dealing with the problem of academic advisement and emphasizes that these are by no means inclusive of all types which have been and are being tried.[1] Chapter two of this study describes

---

[1]Hardee, The Faculty in College Counseling, p. 55.

several other approaches and experiments which have been conceived in regard to advisement problems.

One innovation took place at the University of Oklahoma in 1966. Faced with the problems of increasing freshmen enrollments and limited resources, the University College permitted some of its students a choice of two advisement systems. Second-semester freshmen and upperclassmen were permitted either to see an adviser or to enroll without the assistance of an adviser. This alternative advisement system, its evaluation and its degree of acceptance among campus publics is the subject of this paper.

Over twenty-three hundred freshmen constitute the primary population group of the study. All of these people entered the University of Oklahoma as first-time-entering freshmen in the fall of 1966 with no previous college work. In November and December, when pre-enrolling for the spring term, they had their choice of advisement systems.

Many were advised in the traditional way; they met with faculty advisers who, in some manner, aided them in course selection. The kind and degree of assistance received from the various advisers is unknown. In most cases, however, the adviser at least signed the enrollment card indicating his approval of the enrollment program.

Some freshmen chose to enroll in spring semester courses without the aid of a faculty adviser. They filled out their own enrollment card and took it to the office of

the Dean of University College. There each card was checked by well-trained clerical personnel without the aid of faculty or professional staff people. Students who enrolled without faculty advisement are commonly referred to as self-advised students.

Previously no thorough study has been conducted in order to appraise and evaluate the products of the two advisement systems. This study appraised parallel groups of freshmen in terms of their ACT scores and first-semester college grade-point-average. It then evaluated the products of the two advisement systems as measured by number of credit hours attempted and completed, retention into the spring term of 1968, differences between first-semester and second-semester grade-point-averages, and enrollment errors committed. Campus attitudes toward the advisement problem were ascertained by means of a Likert scale and preference for change was determined by using a rating scale.

Need for the Study

In his Final Report . . ., Rossmann noted the paucity of research and the lack of consistent findings in regard to academic advisement.[1] When the fact that this phenomenon touches the lives of some four million students in American

---

[1]Jack E. Rossmann, Final Report to the Louis W. and Maud Hill Family Foundation on An Experimental Program for the Advising of Freshmen (Macalester College, 1966), p. 6.

higher education from one to twelve times during their collegiate careers is recognized, it is amazing that so little high quality research has been pursued.

Recently Dr. John Coffelt, Vice-Chancellor for Planning and Research of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, stated that twenty-two percent of the 1962 first-time-entering freshmen in Oklahoma graduated from an Oklahoma institution within the "normal" four-year period.[1] It appears that approximately twice that number will graduate within six years, i.e. spring, 1968. If the latter twenty-two percent had graduated within four years, they would have paid nearly a quarter of a million dollars in tuition and fees. This financial statistic is probably the least of many which would have demonstrated a greater potential contribution to society. Their earning power, tax contribution, and general ability to contribute to society during their additional years in college are incalculable. A better academic advisement program could conceivably contribute toward the achievement of such goals. Morehead said, "Whether faculty advising can prevent a larger proportion of able students from dropping out during the freshman year in college is an interesting question that might be investigated further by experimenters."[2]

---

[1]John Coffelt, speech at Oklahoma Association of Junior Colleges at the University of Oklahoma, April 14, 1967.

[2]J. Clyde Johnson and Charles G. Morehead, "Some Effects of a Faculty Advising Program," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLIII (1964), p. 143.

Campbell challenged students of higher education in 1965 as follows:

> If the counseling profession . . . aspires to scientific status, it should establish systematically, for all to see, that it knows something of what it is doing. It had better know:
>
> 1. What kinds of people use its services.
> 2. What kinds join its ranks.
> 3. How to judge between a "good" and "bad" practitioner.
> 4. What is "good" and "bad" . . .
> 5. How to develop (or recognize) and use differential treatments.
> 6. The effects of such treatments.
> 7. How to recognize and measure, at least crudely, relevant differential qualities among those treated.
> 8. The relation between differential treatments and differential individual qualities.[1]

While his remarks were directed specifically to the counseling profession, they could be applied to the entrepreneuers of any profession and are especially relevant to people who have responsibilities in the area of academic advisement.

When the present alternative plan of academic advisement was instituted at the University of Oklahoma in 1966, it was admittedly an experimental project. University College personnel were desireous of obtaining some empirical data which could be scientifically treated and evaluated. Sufficient time has elapsed for the students to have compiled an academic record which is to some degree quantifiable and is,

---

[1]D. P. Campbell, The Results of Counseling; Twenty-Five Years Later (Philadelphia: Saunders, 1965), p. 2.

therefore, capable of being measured. Consequently, it behooves the professional people involved to undertake a careful study of the systems.

Statement of the Problem

Two distinctly different methods of advisement are operative in University College; there exist certain quantified variables by which these two advisement systems may be examined. If, as measured by the variables, one of the systimes is superior to the other, that fact needs to be known by those responsible for University College academic advisement so that they may make future decisions in light of that knowledge.

In addition to the quantified variables, decision-makers must know something of the attitudes, opinions and preferences of the publics with which they deal. Regardless of how ideally a particular treatment may fit a situation as regards the administrator and/or practitioner, it cannot be implemented successfully if the clientelle is unwilling to accept it. Therefore, this study was designed to seek to understand the attitudes, opinions and preferences of various campus personnel.

Design of the Study

This study consists of four parts. Part one describes and compares the students who opted for self-advisement or faculty-advisement in terms of their ACT scores, first-semester

college grade-point-average, number of hours completed first semester, and number of hours dropped during the first semester.

Part two of the study examines selected measures of the products of the two advisement systems. The two groups of students are compared in terms of the following criteria:

1. Difference between number of credit hours completed first semester and attempted spring semester.
2. Difference between number of credit hours completed first semester and second semester.
3. Difference between the number of credit hours dropped second semester.
4. Percentages of students which persisted into the fourth semester (spring, 1968).
5. Number and kind of enrollment errors committed by the faculty-advised and self-advised groups.
6. Grade-point-average difference between first and second semester.

An examination of the two advisement patterns would be less than complete without a consideration of the attitudes of both faculty and students who were involved. Consequently, part three of the study samples, by means of an attitude scale, the attitudes of faculty and students toward the academic advisement process.

The last part of the study deals with identified preferences for possible change in the academic advisement system.

The Population of the Study

This study encompasses selected data concerning 2,363 first-time freshmen who entered the University of Oklahoma in the fall semester of 1966 without previous college work and who acquired a grade-point-average for both semesters of the 1966-67 academic year. In addition, 124 faculty members who were assigned to University College faculty-advisement in the spring of 1968 were invited to evaluate the two advisement systems and offer their suggestions for changing the systems.

Types of Questions With Which This Study is Concerned

The nature of the present study is such that descriptive techniques are appropriate. Consequently, a series of "guiding questions" has been developed. They might well be considered as hypotheses, for they serve that purpose. The type of data available, however, precludes the rigorous empirical design.

1. What kind of student, as measured by ACT scores, chose to register without faculty advisement?

2. Do students who chose to be self-advised remain in college longer than those who chose to be faculty-advised?

3. Do students who chose to be self-advised make higher grades?

4. Do self-advised freshmen commit more advisement errors than do faculty-advised freshmen?

5. What are the attitudes of faculty and students toward academic advisement?

6. What changes would faculty advisers like to see made in University College academic advisement?

7. Are students satisfied with the present system?

8. What kind of further studies are needed?

9. Do self-advised students take more college hours than their faculty-advised counterparts?

10. Should faculty advisement be abolished in part or in toto?

Definition of Terms

Group A.--Students who meet the following criteria:

1. Entered the University of Oklahoma fall semester, 1966.
2. Had no previous college work.
3. Attained a grade-point-average for the fall semester, 1966, and the spring semester, 1967, at the University of Oklahoma.
4. When enrolling for the spring semester, 1967, chose to be faculty-advised.

Group B.--Students who meet the following criteria:

1. Entered the University of Oklahoma fall semester, 1966.
2. Had no previous college work.

3. Attained a grade-point-average for the fall semester, 1966, and the spring semester, 1967, at the University of Oklahoma.
4. When enrolling for the spring semester, 1967, chose to be self-advised.

Group AA.--A random sample of 100 students taken from Group A.

Group BB.--A random sample of 100 students taken from Group B.

Group C.--All University of Oklahoma faculty members who were assigned to University College academic advisement during the spring of 1968 and who participated in the study.

Self-Advised.--This term refers to students who chose to enroll for the spring semester of 1967 without being advised by a faculty adviser. These students did visit with a clerk in the University College who checked their enrollment.

Faculty-Advised.--This term refers to students who chose to see a faculty adviser when enrolling for the spring semester of 1967.

First-Semester College GPA.--The mean of all honor points earned during the fall semester of 1966. A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1, F=0, WF=0, W=course not attempted.

Second-Semester College GPA.--The mean of all honor points earned during the spring semester of 1967.

ACT English Score.--The standard score derived from the 40-minute test in English usage in the battery published by The American College Testing Program. Range: 0-36.

ACT Mathematics Score.--The standard score derived from the 50-minute test in mathematics usage in the battery published by The American College Testing Program. Range: 0-36.

ACT Social Science Score.--The standard score derived from the 35-minute social science reading test in the battery published by The American College Testing Program. Range: 0-36.

ACT Natural Science Score.--The standard score derived from the 35-minute natural science reading test in the battery published by The American College Testing Program. Range: 0-36.

ACT Composite Score.--The arithmetic mean of a person's four ACT test scores.

Retention into the Fourth Term.--A student's enrolling in the spring semester of 1968 at the University of Oklahoma.

University College.--A non-degree-granting college in the University of Oklahoma composed of undergraduates who have not been admitted to one of the degree-granting colleges.

First-time-entering Freshman.--A University of Oklahoma student who entered the University in the fall of 1966 without previous college work.

Undecided.--A student's indication that he has not yet decided on the degree-granting college of his intended entrance.

Advisement.--This term relates to assistance given the student regarding his educational aspirations and the appropriate steps toward them. The term in no way implies psychotherapy or in-depth counseling concerning personal problems.

Scope of the Study

This study is limited to selected aspects of the University College academic advisement system at the University of Oklahoma. It is limited to a study of 2,363 freshmen who entered the University of Oklahoma as first-time freshmen in the fall of 1966 and acquired a GPA for the fall and spring semesters, 1966, and 1967, and to the opinions expressed by these students and by the 102 faculty advisers who were assigned to University College advisement during the spring semester of 1968 and who participated in this study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A survey of the literature related to academic advisement of lower division students failed to produce anything resembling the concept of self-advisement currently in use at the University of Oklahoma. Brown conducted an experiment in which he matched students who were advised by upperclassmen with students who received no advisement.[1] The non-advised students were merely a control group and did not continue in that manner; therefore, they could hardly be considered self-advised students.

Although the term "self-advised" is not used in the literature, there is a significant body of writing on the general subject. However, students of the subject must be careful to understand each writer's use of such terms as "advising" and "counseling." The keystone of the related literature is Hardee's The Faculty in College Counseling. Four of her chapters relate to faculty advisement; particularly helpful is Chapter IV entitled "Promising Programs in

---

[1] William F. Brown, "Student to Student Counseling for Academic Adjustment," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLIII (April, 1965), pp. 811-817.

Faculty Advisement." Here she samples "something old, something new, something borrowed . . ."[1] from a survey of 218 colleges. Specifically, she reports details of faculty advisement programs at twenty institutions ranging from Carnegie Institute of Technology to Stephens College. She concludes and illustrates this chapter by pointing out the vast differences in the reported and real advisement programs at one of the institutions.

In spite of this and other limitations, Hardee has become the chief contemporary advocate of the faculty-advising system. In "Faculty Advising in Contemporary Higher Education," Hardee advocates a systematic program of faculty advisement as the best means toward integrating the various campus personnel into a whole.[2] She points out the lack of identity among college teachers and college personnel workers; she says both are searching for identity. Part of the middle ground between the teacher-researcher on one hand and the student personnel worker-administrator on the other hand lies in the area of academic advisement. She advocates achieving a higher degree of integration between student personnel services and instructional programs and states that, in the judgment of many, the best "integrator" is that of systematic

---

[1]Hardee, The Faculty in College Counseling, p. 56.

[2]Hardee, "Faculty Advising in Contemporary Higher Education," Educational Record, XLII (April, 1961), p. 116.

faculty advisement. Thus, Hardee seems to be utterly committed to the faculty-advisement system.

A Survey of Faculty-Advisement Systems

In view of the fact that the faculty advisement system is the classical approach to academic advisement, Tinsley performed a needed service thirteen years ago in documenting some facts about such systems.[1] She sent questionnaires to twenty-two major universities; among her findings were the following:

1. Duties assigned to faculty advisers are mainly academic in nature.
2. Slightly over one-half of the nineteen schools have specific training programs for faculty advisers.
3. The mean numbers of advisees assigned to advisers range from approximately twenty to fifty.
4. For the most part, student-personnel data are available to advisers before advising every student.
5. In slightly over half of the schools, there seems to be a frequent exchange of information about students between faculty advisers and student-personnel officers.

---

[1] Mary Ann Tinsley, "The Faculty Adviser in the Liberal Arts College," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXIV (December, 1955), pp. 219-220.

6. Approximately one-third of the nineteen schools make no stipulation as to the number of interviews advisers are expected to have with advisees.
7. Increases in salary, reduction in teaching load, or reduction in committee assignments in recompense for faculty advising seem to be uncommon.
8. Less than half the schools have manuals for advisers.

Faculty Interest

Faculty members who participate in faculty advisement systems come from a wide variety of academic disciplines. With the possible exception of some people in counseling and psychology, none could be said to have studied the problems and processes of academic advisement. Thus, it could be argued that few are qualified by training to engage in academic advisement. Consequently, the matter of faculty interest in the problem becomes germane to the study.

Dr. Earl A. Koile identified the characteristics of college teachers who are interested in faculty counseling activities.[1] He administered the Professional Activity

---

[1]Earl A. Koile, "Characteristics of College Teachers Interested in Faculty Counseling Activities," Journal of Counseling Psychology, II, No. 1 (Spring, 1955), p. 32-34.

Inventory for College Teachers to 105 pairs of counseling and non-counseling teachers matched case by case on the basis of sex, teaching field, type of college, academic rank and the highest degree held. The two groups were matched according to means and standard deviations on age, years of college teaching and years of other teaching experience and on a group basis according to geographic area. The raw data were treated with t tests and analysis of variance.

For the subjects in this study, he concluded that:

1. Women tend to be more interested than men in faculty advising activities.
2. Instructors and assistant professors, combined as a group, obtained higher mean scores than did associate and full professors combined as another group.
3. Teachers who do not hold the earned doctorate appear to be somewhat more interested in faculty counseling activities than those who hold it.
4. College teachers in the two age groups in the middle are more interested in faculty advising activities than teachers in the youngest and the oldest groups.
5. Interest in faculty advising activities tends to increase with increases in the number of years of non-college teaching experience.

6. Teachers in state teachers' colleges and state regional colleges apparently have greater interest in faculty counseling activities than do teachers in liberal arts colleges.

What Faculty Advisers Do

In this review of the literature, no recent study which documented the substantive nature of the faculty adviser's work was found. The recent writers assume that their readers know what faculty advisers do. However, it seems unfair to the reader to make this assumption. Therefore, it is necessary to report from a study conducted nearly 20 years ago. Paterson and Clark queried students at the University of Minnesota to ascertain the kinds and quality of assistance they received from their faculty counselors.[1] Over a three-year period, 1,138 questionnaires were returned. Students were asked to report the kinds of aid received. Table 1 is a reproduction of Table I from the article which reported the study in The Personnel and Guidance Journal. It shows that the highest percentage of students report having received help from their advisers in course selection.

---

[1]Kenneth E. Clark and Donald G. Paterson, "Students' Judgments of Counseling," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XIV (1943), pp. 140-42.

TABLE 1

AIDS RECEIVED FROM FACULTY COUNSELORS EXPRESSED IN PERCENTAGES[1]

Aids	1939-40	1940-41	1941-42
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Help in selecting courses	81	72	93
Vocational advice	36	45	28
Suggestions about study methods .	30	43	30
Pointing out my responsibilities.	9	21	11
Suggestions about part-time work.	1	2	6
Loans or other financial aids . .	2	1	2
Advice about student activities .	7	10	15
Advice about making friends . . .	3	4	3
Suggestions as to how to develop self-confidence	7	8	3
Talks about personal problems . .	12	13	7
Discussion of emotional difficulties	1	2	2
Suggestions for making the University a more friendly place. . .	11	15	21
Reference to a personnel agency on campus	25	16	15

[1] Ibid., p. 141.

Table 2 is a reproduction of Table II from the report; it shows to what degree the students perceived they received assistance.

TABLE 2

STUDENTS' RATING ON A SIX-POINT SCALE OF THEIR INTERVIEWS WITH THEIR COUNSELORS[1]

Aids	1939-40	1940-41	1941-42
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Of great value	15	24	18
Quite helpful	34	33	41
Some assistance	43	30	30
Of little value	6	9	7
Not helpful at all	2	3	3
Answer not checked	0	1	1

The authors report that over ninety percent of the students for all three years said that they would urge a brother or sister to consult a faculty counselor.

The rapid post-war increase in enrollment at Miami University led the university staff to create a coordinating committee to study the faculty advising program for upperclassmen.[2] Purposes of the study were:

1. To ascertain the manner in which the program actually functions.

[1] Ibid., p. 142.

[2] Marian L. Cameron, "An Evaluation of a Faculty Advisory Program," Educational and Psychological Measurement, XII (1952), pp. 730-740.

2. To determine the upperclass students' needs which could be served by the faculty adviser.
3. To determine how the program could be made more effective.

A rating scale was distributed to the University's upperclassmen. Of the 3,000 plus upperclassmen, completed scales were received from 1,182 or 39 percent. Items of greatest satisfaction with the program were: receiving course grades personally from the adviser; obtaining views of adviser as to educational program; receiving a clear picture of requirements for graduation and obtaining views of adviser on specific courses.

Services desired but not received were listed as: receiving helpful written materials; feeling that the student has a better understanding of his possibilities for success; better understanding of how the advisory program operates; learning how to study more effectively.

A questionnaire was sent to advisers in order to ascertain how the program actually functioned. They were asked to report their number of advisees, their estimated number of hours per year spent on various advisory activities and the number of advisees which they considered equivalent to one hour of teaching load. University-wide, the average number of advisees per adviser was seventy-seven. The advisers estimated they spent 3.30 hours with each advisee. (The author does not state whether the hours were per semester or

per year.) They considered that sixty to seventy-five advisees would be commensurate with three hours reduction in teaching load.

Conclusions drawn were:

1. Students expressed a need for more faculty assistance.
2. Both students and faculty felt that lack of time was the chief deterrent to more effective service on the part of advisers.
3. Both groups expressed the need for more information and coordination.
4. There is need for continuing research in this field.
5. The program at Miami is sound in its conception and outline.

Kinds of Published Research

Descriptive

A study of the literature supports Rossmann's statement that, "Most studies prior to 1960 primarily attempted to describe a particular advising program without using a control group."[1] Lonzo Jones' description of the Indiana State

---

[1]Rossmann, Final Report, p. 2.

University freshman counseling program is typical of these kinds of reports.[1]

Jones reports that freshmen were assigned to advisers who taught in the student's tentative major field. The advisers carried a full teaching load and were asked, in addition, to have a get-acquainted interview with each of their advisees during Freshman Days, to arrange a schedule of weekly conferences during the first six weeks of school and to have a progress interview when the mid-term grades were available. Freshmen were publicly advised of this schedule.

The counselors met individually with the Director of Personnel for half-hour conferences three times during the first five months of the school year. Students with mid-term grades which were substantially lower than predicted, were encouraged to reduce outside schedules, etc.

No statistical tests were performed nor were conclusions made. The author did, however, plan to use the same program for the next year.

Questionnaire-Based Studies

The questionnaire type study reveals to some degree the attitudes of people who are invclved in a given enterprise. The literature reveals two published studies of this type which are germane to the concerns of this paper.

---

[1]Lonzo Jones, "Faculty Counseling for Freshmen," Educational and Psychological Measurement, VII (1947), pp. 564-568.

At Brooklyn College faculty advisers are released from one teaching class and in its place spend six hours weekly counseling.[1] In September of 1955, each of forty-two faculty counselors was assigned a group of freshmen whom he would carry for the full four college years. The counselors went through an intensive training program.

In the spring of 1956, a check list and a sentence-completion form was submitted to the entire freshman class consisting of 452 students. One hundred responses were studied and Kiell concluded:

1. Some counselors should be available for unscheduled drop-in visits.
2. Students believe the main function of the counselor revolves around program planning and, therefore, desire that faculty advisers be proficient in this area.

At Alleghany College, Wharton and associates perceived a widening gap between the faculty and students and assessed the situation to determine how to improve relationships.[2] After consultation with various campus groups, they decided to invite selected juniors and seniors to assist faculty in

---

[1]Norman Kiell, "Freshmen Evaluation of Faculty Counselors," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXV (February, 1957), pp. 361-364.

[2]Ruth Knights, John McKean, and William Wharton, "Student Assistants for Faculty Advisors," The Journal of College Student Personnel, VII (January, 1966), pp. 37-40.

freshman advisement. An adequate number of upperclassmen agreed to participate in the program. During the spring term, faculty advisers were given a list of the participating upperclassmen and were invited to rank their first four choices of possible assistants. Where possible, the faculty member was assigned his first choice.

Late in the spring term, the selected students were trained in academic advisement. They received additional training when they arrived on campus early for the fall term.

When the freshmen arrived, the faculty-adviser and his student assistant entertained them at dinner in the cafeteria and, in most cases, retired to the adviser's home for informal conversation. At this time they scheduled a personal visit with each advisee for the following day. Before the freshmen arrived for the personal conference, the adviser had time to survey each folder which contained the freshman's test scores and interest inventory.

Faculty members reported that student assistants aided in the following ways: putting freshmen at ease, looking up details, adding information, reworking conflicts, aiding in course choices and saving time. The first year, twenty-eight of fifty-two faculty requested student assistants. During the second year, thirty-eight of fifty-four faculty participated. These numbers increased to forty-nine of sixty-two in the third year.

During the second year, a short questionnaire was circulated to the thirty-eight advisers and forty assistants. When asked the question, "Would you like to see the program continued?", one hundred percent of both groups replied in the affirmative.

Early Experimental Studies

In the 1930's, Henry Beaumont compared students in the three freshman advisement system at the University of Michigan. The systems were:

1. . . . a few counselors spend most of their time checking academic schedules to ascertain their conformity to University regulations.
2. . . . the members of a larger staff spend considerable time with their students, checking their social adjustment . . .
3. . . . a definite effort is made to include vocational guidance . . .[1]

The author measured the three groups on these criteria:

1. Withdrawal during the freshman year.
2. Academic averages maintained during the freshman year.
3. Above average and below average marks.

He concluded that:

1. Students in number two increased their rate of withdrawal the most over a five-year period.

---

[1]Henry Beaumont, "The Evaluation of Academic Counseling," Journal of Higher Education, II (1939), p. 80.

2. Students in number one decreased the most in GPA over a five-year period.
3. Students in number one decreased the most in percent of students above the average GPA of the University's entire population.

This study is of limited value because of the fact that students were not randomly selected to enter the three programs. It is reported here in order to demonstrate the type of studies which were conducted during the pre-war years.

Control Group Studies

In later years researchers performed some experiments using control groups. One such study was performed by Guthrie and O'Neill who studied three groups of second-semester freshmen to assess the value of dormitory counseling as performed by graduate students.[1] Group I received a minimum of fifteen minutes of individual counseling at least once a week for a period of ten weeks. The counseling consisted of study habit advice and general academic counseling. The only limit was "No Tutoring."

Group II was seen as often as Group I but no attempt was made to counsel students about their academic program. This was a control for personal attention. Group III received no more attention than any other dormitory resident.

---

[1]George M. Guthrie and Harry W. O'Neill, "Effects of Dormitory Counseling on Academic Achievement," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXI (1953), pp. 307-309.

The researchers studied the second-semester GPA and found no significant difference among the groups. They concluded that the activity of the dormitory counselor, as described, has no effect on the academic achievement of the student. They also generalized that a desire for help and a decision to seek help is essential before counseling of this sort can be effective.

Sander was also interested in the value of upperclassmen and graduate students as academic advisers.[1] His study measured three variable products of academic advisement: first semester grade-point-average, retention into the second semester, and change in accuracy of self perception.

The subjects were 429 randomly selected male students who lived in residence halls at the State University of Iowa in the fall semester of 1960. The subjects were divided into three groups; each subject in treatment Group A received four one-hour individual interviews with the resident adviser of his section. Subjects in Group B participated in four one-hour group sessions with the resident advisers in their sections. Subjects in Group C received no special educational advising from their resident advisers during the course of the investigation. The advisers were junior, senior and graduate students who received comparable training.

---

[1]Daryl L. Sander, "Experimental Educational Advising in Men's Residence Halls," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLII (April, 1964), pp. 787-790.

When adjustments were made for group differences on the control variables, ACT scores and high school GPA, Sander found no significant differences among the groups in first-semester-college GPA nor in persistence into the second semester.

At North Carolina State Morehead and Johnson compared forty-eight randomly selected first-time engineering freshmen with their counterparts, 178 like freshmen who were not chosen in the random sample.[1] The two groups were highly homogenous in that their mean age, their predicted grade-point-average and five personality variables were not significantly different.

The forty-eight people in the experimental group were scheduled to meet eight times during the academic year with their advisers: twice each semester in groups of twelve and twice each semester individually. Group meetings of approximately forty-five minutes consisted of instruction, advice, discussion and informal conversation. Individual conferences of approximately twenty minutes were scheduled to discuss matters of academic progress and any other topics the student considered important.

The control group received advice once in groups during orientation week, were given help in course scheduling

---

[1] J. Clyde Johnson and Charles G. Morehead, "Some Effects of a Faculty Advising Program," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLIII (1964), pp. 139-144.

for the fall and spring semesters, received notifications of mid-term failures and were invited to come in for consultations when they felt faculty help was needed.

The researchers hypothesized that the experimental group would have a significantly higher GPA at the end of the freshman year and that the control group would drop out at a significantly higher rate. Their research supported both hypotheses.

Caution should be used in interpreting these data in that the researchers infer without so stating that it was they who advised the experimental group. They both have a counseling and psychology background; thus, their presence with the experimental group vis-à-vis the presence of less-specialized personnel with the control group would bias the results.

At Macalester College in 1964, Rossmann conducted an experiment in intensive faculty advising.[1] Matched groups of sixty pairs of males and sixty pairs of females were studied. Faculty members who volunteered to participate in the experiment were given one-third off their normal teaching load and were assigned ten males and ten females from the experimental group with whom they were to advise on a continuing basis through the freshman year. The control

---

[1]Rossmann, Final Report, p. 9 f.

group received only the regular faculty counseling. The experiment was replicated with freshmen who entered in the fall of 1965.

Tests were performed to ascertain differences in GPAs, retention, probation, environmental perception and personality. No significant differences were found in GPAs of either the male or female matched groups. No significant difference was found in male retention; however, the specially-counseled females did persist one year at a significantly higher rate than did their regularly-counseled counterparts. This significant retention rate did not persist into the junior year. No significant differences were observed in the rate of probation or of students' being dropped for scholastic reasons.[1]

The Omnibus Personality Inventory was administered to the experimental group and to a random sample of the control group in the spring of 1965. No sustained significant differences were revealed by this instrument.[2]

Results obtained by two different administrations of the College and University Environment Scales were inconclusive.[3] Rossmann concludes " . . . that the value of the experimental program has been quite limited." " . . . the program has had essentially no impact."[4]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 18.
[2] Ibid., p. 19.
[3] Ibid., p. 21 f.
[4] Ibid., p. 38.

William F. Brown and Vernon G. Zunker performed a series of studies and experiments in recent years which began with their survey of a twenty percent stratified random sample of four-year institutions of higher learning in forty-eight states to ascertain information concerning the use of student counselors.[1] The completed questionnaire was returned by ninety-five percent of the institutions. Sixty-seven percent of the responding institutions with total enrollment under 2,000 reported the use of undergraduate student counselors. Sixty-three percent of larger institutions reported the use of undergraduates in this manner.

Ninety-four percent and ninety-eight percent respectively, of the institutions reporting the use of student-to-student counseling replied in the affirmative to the question, "Do you plan to continue the use of student counselors at your institutions?"

Seventy-three and eighty-five percent believed that the use of student counselors by colleges is likely to increase during the next ten years.

Of all the studies surveyed, Brown's was most successful in terms of producing higher grades.[2] At Southwest Texas State College Brown matched 216 pairs of students on

---

[1]William F. Brown and Vernon G. Zunker, "Student Counselor Utilization at Four-Year Institutions of Higher Learning," The Journal of College Student Personnel, VII (January, 1966), pp. 41-46.

[2]William F. Brown, "Student to Student Counseling for Academic Adjustment," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLIII (April, 1965), pp. 811-817.

sex, high school quartile rank, high school size, scholastic ability and study orientation. Experimental subjects were divided into fifty-four counselee groups with the four freshmen in each group being carefully matched. Six upperclassmen, three males and three females, were randomly assigned as counselors to same-sex counselee groups. Counselors spent six hours with each group; two hours were devoted to survival orientation; two to test interpretation and two to study skills' guidance.

Dr. Brown states that all three counseling activities incorporate the following characteristics: (1) utilization of the peer approach; (2) utilization of the group approach; (3) utilization of the motivation approach (each freshman's study behavior and academic values are systematically surveyed); and (4) utilization of the prevention approach (effort is made to identify potential academic problems).

Two instruments, The Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes and the Effective Study Test, were employed to evaluate the programs in communicating information about efficient study procedures. The counseled males scored significantly higher on a test-retest on both instruments than did the uncounseled males. The same was true for the females.

Counseled males made a first-semester grade-point-average of 2.27; their uncounseled counterparts made a 1.88.

For females the corresponding figures were 2.69 and 2.06. In both cases the differences were significant at the .01 level.

Brown concludes with the following six reasons for utilizing selected and trained undergraduates in freshman academic advisement:

1. Peer-delivered information and advice frequently receive readier acceptance by the typical 18-year-old than does the counsel given by teachers and parents.
2. Wide and earlier guidance contact with freshman is assured.
3. It counteracts the extensive informal advising of freshmen by upperclassmen.
4. Professional guidance workers are freed to handle more specialized counseling.
5. The systematic exploration of preventive measures for potential academic problems is permitted.
6. It provides for improved communication channels between students and faculty.

In a telephone conversation with the researcher, Brown reported that his colleagues had challenged his conclusions because they were based on a comparison of students

counseled by upperclassmen vis-à-vis non-counseled students.[1] This motivated him to study, with Zunker, a comparison of the related effectiveness of student and professional counselors.[2] In essence, they replicated the previous study except that they replaced the non-counseled group with a professionally-counseled group. Three conclusions are drawn:

1. Student counselors were as effective as professional counselors on all criteria of counseling productivity employed in this study.
2. Student counselors received greater acceptance from counselees than did the professional counselors.
3. Freshmen counseled by student counselors made greater use of the information received during counseling as reflected by earned grades and residual study problems.

Summary of Review of Literature

The literature reviewed in these pages leads to the conclusion that most institutions are using some rather

---

[1]William F. Brown, telephone conversation, April 25, 1968.

[2]William F. Brown and Vernon G. Zunker, "Comparative Effectiveness of Student and Professional Counselors," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLV (March, 1966), pp. 738-743.

loosely coordinated system of faculty advisement. There is no evidence to indicate that experiences such as the following are exceptions rather than rules:

> . . . the university provided me with a freshman adviser to whom I was to go when my first month's grades were turned in and regularly thereafter once a month. My particular adviser was an ascetic-looking assistant professor in English, very scholarly and by no means interested in callow freshmen. He had a half dozen other freshmen besides me to advise, and his technique was to get rid of us as quickly as possible.
>
> Every month he gave me my grades and said, "That's fine; you're doing very well." I said, "Thank you," and walked out. In later years when I became interested in the institution of freshmen advisers, I questioned numerous students on the campus and found not one who had received more advice from his than I had from mine.[1]

It seems apparent that there is very little contentment with the faculty advisement system among any of the campus publics. In 1955, Jamrich mailed a questionnaire to thirty private liberal arts colleges. He found, among other data, that only one-third of the institutions completing the questionnaire described their faculty advising program as "successful."[2] However, very few alternatives have been put forth as possible replacements for the faculty system. The successes which Wharton and Brown reported in their utilization of upperclassmen for advising are exceptional.

---

[1]Hardee, The Faculty in College Counseling, p. 82.

[2]Rossmann, Final Report, p. 5.

CHAPTER III

DESCRIPTION AND COMPARISON OF POPULATION GROUPS

In evaluating the two advisement systems referred to in Chapter I, it was first necessary to describe and compare the groups which compose the study universe.

Selection of Subjects

The students selected to constitute the universe of this study were homogeneous in terms of previous educational experience, time and place of initial matriculation into higher education and retention during the nine months succeeding their initial enrollment. Thus, all subjects:

1. Had high school or equivalent educational attainment prior to the fall of 1966.
2. Had no previous higher education experience prior to the fall of 1966.
3. Entered the University of Oklahoma in the fall of 1966.
4. Attained a GPA for fall semester 1966 and spring semester 1967 at the University of Oklahoma.

A search of the records in University College revealed that 2,363 people met the foregoing criteria. Fourteen hundred and ninety-one of these people, when pre-enrolling for the spring 1967 semester chose to enroll without aid of an adviser. The remainder elected to see an adviser. University College identified the self-advised students by, when noting that they had signed their own enrollment card, stamping a mark by their names on a computer print-out which contained the names of all University College students. Students whose enrollment cards were signed by an adviser were not so marked on the print-out. This print-out was matched with a print-out which contained the spring semester 1967 grades, hours and GPA for all University College students; hence, the researcher could ascertain whether or not the students met the aforementioned criteria and were thus qualified subjects for the study.

Gathering the Data

The following data were gathered for each subject from records in the University of Oklahoma Counseling Center, in University College and in the Office of Admissions and Records:

1. Name
2. Student Identification Number
3. Method of Advisement
4. College of Intended Entrance

5. Scores on the American College Test Battery
6. Number of Hours Completed Fall Semester 1966
7. GPA Fall Semester 1966
8. Credit Hours Attempted Fall 1966 (random sample)
9. Credit Hours Completed Fall 1966 (random sample)

The data to be gathered were selected for the following reasons: name and I.D. number were selected in order to have a cross check with which to assure clear identification of the subjects; method of advisement was selected in order to have a criterion whereby the subjects could be separated into groups for purposes of comparison; college of intended entrance was selected in order to sub-divide the groups by means of the expressed interest of the individual subjects; ACT scores, which are required for freshman entrance into the University, were selected in order to have indices of previous academic development; number of hours completed for fall of 1966 was selected in order to have a quantitative measure of immediate past performance in the University; GPA for fall of 1966 was selected in order to have a qualitative measure of immediate past performance in the University; credit hours attempted and completed for fall of 1966 were gathered for a random sample of 100 faculty-advised and 100 self-advised students in order to ascertain whether differences exist in terms of number of hours dropped. The random sample was used because hours attempted were not readily retrievable for the entire population.

No other data were deemed germane to this part of the study.

Procedure

Group A was compared with Group B on the following variables:

1. ACT English Score
2. ACT Mathematics Score
3. ACT Social Science Score
4. ACT Natural Science Score
5. ACT Composite Score
6. GPA Fall, 1966
7. Hours Completed Fall, 1966

Group AA was compared with Group BB on hours dropped fall semester, 1966.

Hypotheses

In order to compare the faculty-advised and self-advised groups, their characteristics were analyzed by testing the following hypotheses.

1. There is no significant difference between faculty-advised and self-advised freshmen as measured by the ACT English score.

2. There is no significant difference between faculty-advised and self-advised freshmen as measured by the ACT Mathematics score.

3. There is no significant difference between faculty-advised and self-advised freshmen as measured by the ACT Social Science score.

4. There is no significant difference between faculty-advised and self-advised freshmen as measured by the ACT Natural Science score.

5. There is no significant difference between faculty-advised and self-advised freshmen as measured by the ACT Composite score.

6. There is no significant difference between faculty-advised and self-advised freshmen as measured by their first-semester college grade-point-average.

7. There is no significant difference between faculty-advised and self-advised freshmen as measured by the number of hours completed in the fall semester of 1966.

8. There is no significant difference between faculty-advised and self-advised freshmen as measured by the number of hours dropped during the fall semester of 1966.

Treatment of Data

A brief review of statistical tests revealed that the data in this study could best be tested for significance of difference between means by using the t test. Milton Smith refers to it as, "A standard procedure for testing the significance of a difference between the means

of two large independent or uncorrelated samples . . ."[1] Therefore, t tests for difference between means were performed on each variable in order to determine significant in-put differences between the groups.

Results

A significant difference between the two groups was found as measured by the ACT English score. The self-advised students had a mean of 21.01, which is significantly higher than the mean of 20.20 produced by the faculty-advised group. The null hypothesis is rejected. Table 3 shows the difference.

TABLE 3

GROUP DIFFERENCE AS MEASURED BY ACT ENGLISH SCORE

	Faculty-Advised	Self-Advised
N	894	1,469
M	20.20	21.01
S	5.13	4.60
t = 3.87	P at .001	

The groups are also significantly different as measured by the ACT mathematics score. The self-advised

[1] G. Milton Smith, A Simplified Guide to Statistics for Psychology and Education (3rd ed.; New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1962), p. 73.

group's mean of 21.98 is significantly higher than the faculty-advised mean of 21.05. The null hypothesis is rejected. Table 4 shows the pertinent data.

TABLE 4

GROUP DIFFERENCE AS MEASURED BY ACT MATHEMATICS SCORE

	Faculty-Advised	Self-Advised
N	894	1,469
M	21.05	21.98
S	6.71	6.03
t = 3.39	P at .001	

A study of the two groups' ACT scoial science scores produced the data seen in Table 5. The null hypothesis is rejected.

TABLE 5

GROUP DIFFERENCE AS MEASURED BY ACT SOCIAL SCIENCE SCORE

	Faculty-Advised	Self-Advised
N	894	1,469
M	22.27	23.07
S	6.26	5.68
t = 3.11	P at .01	

A smaller difference than those on the three previous scores was found on the ACT natural science score; however, this difference is also significant. The null hypothesis is rejected. Table 6 shows this difference.

TABLE 6

GROUP DIFFERENCE AS MEASURED BY ACT NATURAL SCIENCE SCORE

	Faculty-Advised	Self-Advised
N	894	1,469
M	22.11	22.80
S	6.25	5.89
t = 2.65	P at .01	

The ACT composite score verifies and emphasizes the difference between the two groups. The null hypothesis is rejected. Data on the composite score is found in Table 7.

No significant difference was found between the two groups as measured by their number of hours completed in the fall of 1966. The null hypothesis is not rejected. Table 8 shows the basic data for this criterion.

Perhaps the best indicator of future academic success is the first semester GPA. The self-advised group had an insignificantly higher GPA than did its faculty-advised

TABLE 7

GROUP DIFFERENCE AS MEASURED BY
ACT COMPOSITE SCORE

	Faculty-Advised	Self-Advised
N	894	1,469
M	21.52	22.32
S	5.26	4.67
t = 3.77	P at .001	

TABLE 8

GROUP DIFFERENCE AS MEASURED BY HOURS
COMPLETED FALL 1966

	Faculty-Advised	Self-Advised
N	894	1,469
M	14.14	14.24
S	2.17	2.08
t = 1.12	(n. s.)	

counterpart. The null hypothesis is not rejected. The data is shown in Table 9.

TABLE 9

GROUP DIFFERENCE AS MEASURED BY GPA FALL 1966

	Faculty-Advised	Self-Advised
N	894	1,469
M	2.18	2.23
S	.823	.830
t = 1.31	(n.s.)	

Table 10 shows that there is a significant difference at the .05 level between the two groups as measured by the number of hours dropped during the fall semester of 1966. The null hypothesis is rejected. Sixteen self-advised students dropped a total of thirty-eight credit hours during the semester; thus, the one hundred students dropped an average of .38 of an hour. Of the one hundred faculty-advised students, one out of every four dropped some hours during the semester; they dropped a total of sixty-six credit hours.

The relatively low number of self-advised students who dropped the lower number of hours during the first semester may be an indicator of their feeling toward their

environment. Perhaps when pre-enrollment time arrived, they felt more adequate than did their colleagues who chose to see an adviser.

TABLE 10

GROUP DIFFERENCE AS MEASURED BY CREDIT HOURS DROPPED FALL SEMESTER 1966

	Faculty-Advised	Self-Advised
N	100	100
M	.66	.38
S	1.29	1.03
S.E.	.130	.103
t = 2.12	P at .05	

Summary

The data presented in this chapter show that the students who had significantly higher ACT scores chose to be self-advised. The data shows no conclusions for differences between hours completed fall 1966 or GPA fall 1966. Thus, it may be said that students who score higher on the ACT battery have a significant proclivity to choose self-advisement. Table 11 presents a summary of data revealed in chapter three.

TABLE 11

SUMMARY OF GROUP DIFFERENCES

Criterion	Faculty-Advised Mean	Self-Advised Mean	t	P
ACT English	20.20	21.01	3.87	.001
ACT Mathematics	21.05	21.98	3.39	.001
ACT Social Science	22.27	23.07	3.11	.01
ACT Natural Science	22.11	22.80	2.65	.01
ACT Composite	21.52	22.32	3.77	.001
Hours Completed	14.14	14.24	1.13	n.s.
GPA	2.18	2.23	1.31	n.s.
Hours Dropped	.66	.38	2.12	.05

CHAPTER IV

PRODUCTS OF THE ALTERNATIVE ADVISEMENT SYSTEMS

Introduction

From a pragmatic point of view, administrators responsible for academic advisement systems must demand that the system "work." Generally, there has been very little research performed which gets to the root of this question; consequently, this part of the present study is devoted to an evaluation of the alternative advisement systems which are currently operative in University College.

In order to make some evaluations, it is first necessary to postulate the desired goals of academic advisement. As a minimum standard, an effective academic advisement program should meet the following goals:

1. Students should enroll in course loads which are appropriate in terms of quantity.
2. Students should enroll in courses which will facilitate their college retention.
3. Students should enroll in courses in which they are capable of making a satisfactory grade.

4. Students should enroll in courses which are in keeping with the peculiar requirements of the institution.

In designing this study, the researcher discussed the alternative advisement systems with various campus personnel; some upperclassmen stated that their basic objection to the self-advisement system was that self-advised students tend to take heavier academic loads than they are capable of completing. Therefore, it was decided to include this phenomenon, listed as number one above, in the study.

Because society has generally accepted the proposition that continuance in formal education is a desireable activity for its young people, academic advisement should promote this goal; therefore, this study measured the academic retention of corresponding groups of faculty-advised and self-advised youngsters.

With such a wide range of educational opportunities as is now afforded American youth, it seems fair to state that each youngster should be encouraged to enroll in courses and/or programs in which he can reasonably succeed. For those young people who have been admitted to the University of Oklahoma, this means they should enroll in courses and programs in which they can earn a satisfactory grade. This study, consequently, compared the alternative advisement systems by examining the grades earned by students who had experienced one or the other of the two systems.

Each institution of higher education publishes one or more catalogs, and often other materials, which are intended to assist students in course selection and other facets of academic planning. At the University of Oklahoma, enrollments which are not in keeping with the spirit and/or letter of these publications are referred to as "advisement errors" or "enrollment errors"; this study endeavored to measure the number and kinds of these errors.

In view of the fact that this chapter consists of descriptions of and reports on four sub-studies, each of them will be dealt with separately.

Course Load Quantity

In examining course load quantity, it was necessary to observe such factors as hours attempted, hours dropped, hours completed and the various differences between groups as measured by these variables.

Hypotheses

9. There is no significant difference between faculty-advised and self-advised freshmen as measured by the number of hours dropped during the spring semester of 1967.

10. There is no significant difference between the fall semester performance and the spring semester performance as measured by the number of hours dropped by faculty-advised freshmen.

11. There is no significant difference between the fall semester performance and the spring semester performance as measured by the number of hours dropped by self-advised freshmen.

12. There is no significant difference between faculty-advised freshmen and self-advised freshmen as measured by the number of hours attempted during the spring semester of 1967.

13. There is no significant difference between the number of hours faculty-advised freshmen completed in the fall semester of 1966 and the number they attempted during the spring semester of 1967.

14. There is no significant difference between the number of hours faculty-advised freshmen men completed in the fall semester of 1966 and the number they attempted during the spring semester of 1967.

15. There is no significant difference between the number of hours faculty-advised freshmen women completed in the fall semester of 1966 and the number they attempted during the spring semester of 1967.

16. There is no significant difference between the number of hours self-advised freshmen completed in the fall semester of 1966 and the number they attempted during the spring semester of 1967.

17. There is no significant difference between the number of hours self-advised freshmen men completed in the

fall semester of 1966 and the number they attempted during the spring semester of 1967.

18. There is no significant difference between the number of hours self-advised freshmen women completed in the fall semester of 1966 and the number they attempted during the spring semester of 1967.

19. There is no significant difference between faculty-advised and self-advised freshmen as measured by the difference between their difference between hours completed fall semester of 1966 and attempted spring semester of 1967.

The Population

The foregoing hypotheses were tested on Groups AA and BB comprised of students randomly selected from Groups A and B.[1] Samples were selected for measuring the variables in this section because of the lack of a method of ready mass retrieval of the number of hours attempted by all students in the population. Each individual transcript card had to be found in one of two alphabetical files in order to find hours attempted. An N-count of 100 each was arbitrarily established for Groups AA and BB.

---

[1] N. M. Downie and R. W. Heath, Basic Statistical Methods (2nd ed.; New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965), pp. 316-317.

Data Gathering

Each subject's transcript card in the University of Oklahoma Office of Admissions and Records was examined and the following data were gathered:

1. Hours attempted fall semester of 1966.
2. Hours attempted spring semester of 1967.

In addition, the following data were gathered from computer print-outs produced by the Office of Admissions and Records:

1. Hours completed fall of 1966.
2. Hours completed spring of 1967.

Treatment of Data

Because the data were uncorrelated and the N's large, the data were subjected to t tests of significance to ascertain significant differences.

Results

Table 12 reveals that there is no significant difference between the two groups as measured by hours dropped during the spring semester of 1967. The null hypothesis is not rejected.

The data revealed in Tables 13 and 14 show that neither group experienced a significant difference between the number of hours dropped during the fall semester and the number dropped during the spring semester. Both groups

TABLE 12

CREDIT HOURS DROPPED SPRING SEMESTER 1967

	Faculty-Advised	Self-Advised
N	100	100
M	.87	.54
S	1.88	1.32
S.E.	.189	.133
t = 1.38	(n.s.)	

TABLE 13

CREDIT HOURS DROPPED FALL AND SPRING
BY FACULTY-ADVISED FRESHMEN

	Fall	Spring
N	100	100
M	.66	.87
S	1.29	1.88
S.E.	.130	.189
t = 1.02	(n.s.)	

dropped more hours during the latter semester, but neither increase is significant. Neither of the null hypotheses is rejected.

TABLE 14

CREDIT HOURS DROPPED FALL AND SPRING
BY SELF-ADVISED FRESHMEN

	Fall	Spring
N	100	100
M	.38	.54
S	1.03	1.32
S.E.	.103	.133
t = .96	(n.s.)	

As previously mentioned, some students believe that self-advised students tend to take heavier loads than do faculty-advised students. This subject was researched, and the data revealed in Table 15 was produced. These data do not lead to the rejection of the null hypothesis as there is no significant difference between the two groups as measured by the number of credit hours attempted during the spring semester. Thus, the campus myth is without foundation.

In an attempt to measure how realistically each group of students views its immediate future academic ability, the difference between their number of hours completed in the

TABLE 15

CREDIT HOURS ATTEMPTED SPRING 1967

	Faculty-Advised	Self-Advised
N	100	100
M	14.86	14.93
S	2.67	2.19
S.E.	.168	.220
t = .25	(n.s.)	

fall and their number of hours attempted in the spring was measured. In order to observe this phenomenon more closely, the differences between hours completed fall and attempted spring were measured and tested for Groups AA and BB and for the men and women therein. The data revealed in Tables 16, 17 and 18 show that the men attempted significantly more hours during the spring semester than they had completed during the fall; no significant difference was found for women on this criterion. The null hypotheses are rejected for the men but not for the women. For faculty-advised freshmen as a whole, the null hypothesis is rejected at the .01 level; for self-advised freshmen, it is not rejected.

Therefore, as measured by this criterion the spring enrollments of the men are unrealistic, whereas the women's

spring enrollments are more in keeping with their past record. The data in Tables 16, 17 and 18 suggest that the common conception of a "normal" load may be in error. The 200 students in this study completed an average of 14.22 credit hours during the fall and spring semesters; this figure is somewhat lower than the "average load" which is often described as "15 or 16 hours."

TABLE 16

CREDIT HOURS COMPLETED AND ATTEMPTED
BY FACULTY-ADVISED FRESHMEN

	Completed Fall	Attempted Spring
N	100	100
M	14.15	14.86
S	1.56	1.68
S.E.	.157	.169
t = 3.07	P at .01	

TABLE 17

CREDIT HOURS COMPLETED AND ATTEMPTED
BY SELF-ADVISED FRESHMEN

	Completed Fall	Attempted Spring
N	100	100
M	14.38	14.93
S	1.91	2.18
S.E.	.192	.219
t = 1.89	(n.s.)	

TABLE 18

CREDIT HOURS COMPLETED AND ATTEMPTED
BY MEN AND WOMEN

	N	Completed Fall	Attempted Spring	Difference	P
Faculty-Advised Men	61	14.39	15.16	.77	.05
Faculty-Advised Women	39	13.97	14.38	.41	n.s.
Self-Advised Men	63	14.54	15.16	.62	.05
Self-Advised Women	37	14.51	14.54	.03	n.s.

A test of significance for the difference between the hours attempted and completed by faculty-advised students vis-à-vis the hours attempted and completed by self-advised students reveals, as shown in Table 19, that there is no significant difference. Although both groups attempted significantly more hours in the spring than they completed in the fall, neither group was more prolific in this matter than the other. The null hypothesis is not rejected.

TABLE 19

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN HOURS ATTEMPTED SPRING AND COMPLETED FALL

Group	Attempted Spring	Completed Fall	Difference
Faculty-Advised	14.86	14.20	.66
Self-Advised	14.93	14.41	.52
Difference of Differences			.14
t = .38 (n.s.)			

Summary of Course Load Quantity

During the fall semester self-advised students dropped significantly fewer hours than did the faculty-advised students. There is no significant difference between the two groups' hours dropped during the spring semester. In neither group is there a significant difference between hours dropped fall and spring. Neither group

attempted a significantly higher number of hours in the spring than did the other group. Faculty-advised freshmen attempted significantly more spring hours than they completed in the fall; however, this difference is attributable to the men, because the women's increase was insignificant.

Enrollment Errors

Regardless of the number of hours attempted and/or completed, no enrollment can be judged good or bad until and unless it is evaluated in terms of the unique requirements of a particular institution. At the University of Oklahoma, these requirements are postulated in the various college catalogs and in the "Freshman Guide to Academic Planning." This part of the study measured the number of enrollment errors committed by faculty-advised and self-advised groups and compared them on this criterion.

Hypothesis

20. There is no significant difference between faculty-advised and self-advised freshmen as measured by the number of enrollment errors committed in their spring 1967 enrollment.

Definition of Enrollment Errors

For purposes of this analysis, the term "enrollment error" is operationally defined as:[1]

---

[1]These definitions were verbally given to the researcher by the staff of University College and represent

1. Enrollment in a course for which the student had no course prerequisite.
2. Enrollment in a course for which the student had a low ACT test score.
3. Enrollment in a course which does not count toward a degree.
4. Enrollment in a course which is not open to University College students.
5. An enrollment in which more than fifty percent of the courses are numbered 100 or higher.
6. Enrollment in a course for which the prerequisite is sophomore standing.
7. An enrollment in which two courses satisfy the same requirement.
8. A course enrollment which is not recommended by University College, e.g., taking two science courses in one semester.

The Population

Groups AA and BB constituted the population for this part of the study.

Data Gathering

The transcripts of the 200 students were searched in order to find the enrollment errors committed in the

---

the combined judgment of the Dean of University College and the Assistant to the Dean.

spring semester of 1967. As a double check, both the researcher and the Assistant to the Dean of University College surveyed the transcripts. In judging for enrollment errors, no attempt was made to evaluate the wisdom of the person responsible for a student's enrolling in one or another or failing to enroll in one or another course for which the student was legitimately qualified. Only those phenomena referred to in Definitions of Enrollment Errors were counted.

Treatment of Data

Because the data were uncorrelated and the N's were large, t tests were used to discriminate between insignificant and significant differences.

Results

Table 20 shows the frequency distribution of the types of advisement errors made in the enrollments of faculty-advised and self-advised students.

A t test of significance was applied to the data to ascertain whether the twenty-six enrollment errors in the second-semester enrollments of the faculty-advised students were significantly greater than the thirteen errors committed by the self-advised freshmen. The null hypothesis is rejected. Faculty-advised people made significantly more enrollment errors than did the self-advised students. The relevant data is presented in Table 21.

TABLE 20

DISTRIBUTION OF ENROLLMENT ERRORS

Type of Error	Faculty-Advised	Self-Advised
1. No course prerequisite	8	1
2. Low test score	0	2
3. Course which does not count toward degree	0	1
4. Not open to University College students	0	0
5. More than 50% of courses are #100 or higher	0	0
6. Sophomore standing	16	8
7. Duplicate credit	1	0
8. Not recommended	1	1
TOTAL	26	13

TABLE 21

ENROLLMENT ERRORS

	Faculty-Advised	Self-Advised
N	100	100
Number of Errors	26	13
M	.26	.13
S	.48	.33
S.E.	.0486	.0331
t = 2.21	P at .05	

Table 20 shows that the most commonly made enrollment error for both groups was number six, enrollment in a course for which the catalog states enrollees must have sophomore standing; second-semester freshmen may enroll in some of these courses if they have permission from the instructor or head of the department. No subject in this study had sophomore standing in the spring of 1967; they all were second-semester freshmen.

The question arises, "Did some of the students who enrolled in 'sophomore-standing' courses have permission to enroll?" If they did, the permission would have been verbal and therefore, no record is extant. The catalogs make no statement as to what criteria permission is predicated on; however, it seems reasonable to assume that permission would

be predicated on some indication of a student's high ability to perform college work.

Table 22 shows the distribution of fall and spring semester overall grade-point-averages of the sixteen faculty-advised people who enrolled in "sophomore-standing" courses in the spring term of 1967. These students did not compile an impressive GPA the first semester. Their second-semester overall GPA was less than the desired 2.00.

Table 23 is a tabulation of the grades the sixteen students made in the "sophomore-standing" courses. The student who made an I in the spring of 1967 had one year to get the grade changed to a passing grade. As of May 27, 1968, the grade had not been made up. If the two students who made W and I are discounted, the remaining fourteen made an average grade of 1.86 in the "sophomore-standing" courses.

Table 24 shows a distribution of first and second-semester overall grade-point-averages made by the eight self-advised students who enrolled in a "sophomore-standing" course.

These students did not compile an impressive first-semester GPA. Their second-semester GPA was also less than the desired 2.00.

Table 25 is a tabulation of the grades the eight students made in the "sophomore-standing" courses. The eight students made an average GPA of 1.75 in the "sophomore-standing" courses.

TABLE 22

FALL AND SPRING SEMESTER GRADES OF SIXTEEN FACULTY-ADVISED FRESHMEN WHO ENROLLED IN "SOPHOMORE-STANDING" COURSES IN THE SPRING OF 1967

	First Semester	Second Semester
	2.57	2.63
	2.47	3.00
	3.25	1.38
	0.00	0.00
	2.79	1.82
	2.15	1.20
	3.27	2.77
	2.67	2.07
	2.00	0.85
	1.71	1.47
	2.47	1.80
	2.25	2.00
	2.38	1.58
	0.80	1.60
	2.50	2.24
	2.94	2.00
Sum	36.22	28.41
M	2.26	1.78

TABLE 23

GRADES EARNED BY SIXTEEN FACULTY-ADVISED FRESHMEN IN "SOPHOMORE-STANDING" COURSES IN THE SPRING SEMESTER OF 1967

Grade	Number
A	1
B	4
C	4
D	2
F	3
W	1
I	1

M = 1.86

TABLE 24

FALL AND SPRING SEMESTER GRADE-POINT-AVERAGES OF EIGHT SELF-ADVISED FRESHMEN WHO ENROLLED IN "SOPHOMORE-STANDING" COURSES IN THE SPRING OF 1967

	First Semester	Second Semester
	3.19	2.13
	1.50	2.85
	2.18	1.62
	3.40	2.43
	1.77	1.60
	0.80	1.25
	2.87	1.93
	1.75	1.80
Sum	17.46	15.61
M	2.18	1.95

TABLE 25

GRADES EARNED BY EIGHT SELF-ADVISED FRESHMEN IN "SOPHOMORE-STANDING" COURSES IN THE SPRING SEMESTER OF 1967

Grade	Number
A	0
B	3
C	1
D	3
F	1

M = 1.75

While there is no data available with which to ascertain whether or not the twenty-four students had permission to enroll in the "sophomore-standing" courses, the first-semester overall grade-point-averages, the second-semester overall grade-point-averages and the grades made in the "sophomore-standing" courses all indicate that these were, on the average, questionable enrollments.

Of the twenty-four students who enrolled in a "sophomore-standing" course, twelve enrolled in Economics 41, "Principles of Economics." This course is open to second-semester freshmen by permission. Table 26 is a tabulation of the grades made in this course by the twelve students.

The twelve students made an average grade of 1.17 in Economics 41. Their first-semester overall GPA was 2.02. Their second-semester overall GPA was 1.68. Their second-semester overall GPA excluding their hours and grades

TABLE 26

GRADES EARNED IN ECONOMICS 41 BY TWELVE SECOND-SEMESTER FRESHMEN IN THE SPRING SEMESTER OF 1967

Grade	Number
A	0
B	0
C	5
D	4
F	3

M = 1.17

in Economics 41 was 1.80. Table 27 shows the first-semester GPA, the second-semester GPA and the second-semester GPA when calculated by excluding the hours and grades in Economics 41. These data were included in order to shed light on the practice of allowing freshmen to enroll in "sophomore-standing" courses.

The difference of .1266 between the second-semester GPA and the second-semester GPA excluding Economics 41 produces a t value of 8.22 which, with eleven degrees of freedom, is significant at the .001 level of confidence. Thus, had the students who enrolled in Economics 41 enrolled in courses in which they could have earned a grade equal to their grade average excluding Economics 41, they would have earned a significantly higher GPA for the spring semester of 1967.

Summary of Enrollment Errors

The professional time expended in the faculty advisement system failed to produce better enrollments in

TABLE 27

GRADE-POINT AVERAGES OF TWELVE SECOND-SEMESTER FRESHMEN WHO ENROLLED IN ECONOMICS 41 IN THE SPRING SEMESTER OF 1967

Student	Fall Semester	Spring Semester	Spring Semester Excluding Economics 41
A	1.71	1.47	1.64
B	2.00	0.85	1.10
C	2.38	1.58	1.44
D	0.80	1.25	1.67
E	0.80	1.60	1.50
F	1.75	1.80	2.00
G	2.25	2.00	2.33
H	2.87	1.93	1.92
I	2.47	1.80	2.00
J	2.94	2.00	2.00
K	2.50	2.24	2.29
L	1.77	1.60	1.75
MEAN	2.02	1.68	1.80

terms of numbers of enrollment errors. Faculty-advised students averaged making twice as many errors as did self-advised students.

Retention

Another factor in evaluating an advisement system is its ability to encourage its clientelle to persist in their academic programs. Persistence of academically qualified students in various stages of education is a desired means toward a more sophisticated society. In recognition of this fact, this part of the study measured the retention of the original population into the spring semester of 1968. Students who enrolled in the University of Oklahoma in the spring semester of 1968 were counted as being persisters. No effort was made to ascertain whether or not these students were enrolled in the fall of 1967 or how many hours they had completed as of the spring of 1968; in other words, no effort was made to ascertain whether or not they had been in continuous enrollment. A student could have dropped out for the fall 1967 semester, re-entered for the spring 1968 semester and been counted as a persister.

Hypothesis

21. There is no significant difference between faculty-advised and self-advised students who entered the University of Oklahoma as first-time-entering freshmen in the fall of 1966 as measured by their percentage of retention

into the spring semester of 1968.

The Population

The foregoing hypothesis was tested on the 2,363 students who constituted the original population of this study.

Data Gathering

As previously stated, the student identification number of each of the students in the original population was gathered from computer print-outs. This information was punched into cards, and the card deck was matched against a computer tape containing the records of all students enrolled in the University of Oklahoma as of the March 1, 1968, up-dating. Cards of the then-enrolled students were thus separated from cards of those who were not enrolled as of the above date; the cards were then gang-punched in order to differentiate the two groups.

Treatment of Data

In view of the fact that the data are uncorrelated and N's are large, t tests of significance of difference between percentages were applied to the data.

Results

Table 28 shows the results of the test of significance between proportions. The null hypothesis is not rejected because the t value is low. There is no difference between the groups as measured by retention.

TABLE 28

DIFFERENCE IN RETENTION RATES

	Faculty-Advised	Self-Advised
N	887	1,476
P	.687	.704
S.E.	.0155	.0116
t = .876	(n.s.)	

Grade-Point-Average

The quality of students' performance in institutions of higher education is to a large degree measured in terms of grade-point-averages. Persistence in and graduation from the University of Oklahoma is partially dependent on certain grade-point-averages. Among other criteria, a 2.00 grade-point-average in a minimum of twenty-six credit hours is required for entrance into the degree-granting colleges at the University of Oklahoma. The GPA earned by its clientelle is thus one means of evaluating an advisement system. Consequently, this part of the study measured and compared the difference between the fall and spring semester GPA differences.

Hypotheses

22. There is no significant difference between faculty-advised and self-advised freshmen men as measured

by the difference between first and second-semester GPA.

23. There is no significant difference between faculty-advised and self-advised freshmen women as measured by the difference between first and second-semester GPA.

The Population

The foregoing hypotheses were tested on 1,463 men and 899 women.

Data Gathering

As previously mentioned, the fall semester GPA was gathered for purposes of description. The spring semester GPA was gathered from a computer print-out generated by the Office of Admissions and Records. The differences were computed by the researcher.

Treatment of Data

With large N's and uncorrelated data the t tests of significance for difference between means were applied to the data.

Results

The data revealed in Table 29 shows that there was no significant difference between the fall and spring semester GPA differences of the men. The faculty-advised and self-advised men dropped their GPA by .07 and .05 respectively from fall to spring. The t value of .51 does not reject the hypothesis of no difference.

TABLE 29

FALL AND SPRING GPA DIFFERENCES FOR MEN

Group	N	Fall GPA	Spring GPA	Difference
Faculty-Advised	562	2.13	2.06	.07
Self-Advised	901	2.17	2.12	.05
t = .51 (n.s.)				

As seen in Table 30, both groups of women improved their collective GPA from fall semester to spring semester; the self-advised women improved one-tenth of a grade-point which improvement is only slightly greater than the improvement shown by the faculty-advised women. Thus, the null hypothesis is not rejected.

TABLE 30

FALL AND SPRING GPA DIFFERENCES FOR WOMEN

Group	N	Fall GPA	Spring GPA	Difference
Faculty-Advised	331	2.28	2.30	.02
Self-Advised	568	2.33	2.43	.10
t = 1.94			(n.s.)	

Summary of Grade-Point-Average

As measured by this criterion, the advisement alternative has no effect on men. The data shows that the alternative may have had a slightly significant effect on women. Generally, the data speaks inconclusively to this point.

Summary of Chapter IV

Faculty-advised students dropped more hours during the first semester, but there was no difference between the two groups as measured by hours dropped during the spring semester of 1967. Both groups of men attempted significantly more hours in the spring than they completed in the fall; as measured by this criterion, their spring enrollment was unrealistic. As measured by this criterion, both groups of women had realistic spring semester enrollments.

As measured by enrollment errors, the faculty-advised system is less effective than the self-advised system. Students of both groups enrolled in courses which were not designed for freshmen and which consequently hurt the freshmen's GPA.

No difference was found in the retention rates of faculty-advised and self-advised students.

No difference was found in the GPA drop from fall to spring of the men while self-advised women improved their GPA more than the faculty-advised women improved theirs.

CHAPTER V

ATTITUDES AND OPINIONS TOWARD THE ALTERNATIVE ADVISEMENT SYSTEMS IN UNIVERSITY COLLEGE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

The Population

The evaluation of a social phenomenon is to some degree dependent upon knowledge of the perceptions held by people who are affected by the particular phenomenon. In the case of the advisement systems in University College, the students and faculty members related to University College are the people most directly affected. Therefore, this study sought the opinions of three groups: faculty members who were assigned to University College faculty advisement during the spring semester of 1968, faculty-advised study-universe students who were enrolled in the University of Oklahoma as of March 1, 1968, and the self-advised study-universe students who were enrolled on the aforementioned date.

The Instrument

The Likert scale shown in Appendix B was constructed in order to obtain opinions and attitudes of the three

groups. The scale was arranged so that the first nine items are positive statements concerning the faculty-advisement system; the second nine are positive statements concerning the self-advisement system. Each of the first nine statements endeavored to measure the respondent's attitude toward the faculty-advisement system from a different facet; the last nine items did likewise for the self-advisement system. The reasons for eighteen items are: 1.) These constitute all the facets of measurement which the researcher could conceive. 2.) By using a large number of indices of opinion, the instrument has greater reliability. Respondents were invited to register their degree of agreement/disagreement with each of the items.

Scoring the Instrument

The first nine items were scored on the following basis:

Strongly Disagree	=	1
Disagree	=	2
Undecided	=	3
Agree	=	4
Strongly Agree	=	5

The second nine items were scored on the following basis:

Strongly Agree	=	1
Agree	=	2
Undecided	=	3
Disagree	=	4
Strongly Disagree	=	5

Individual item scores were totaled so that a total index of attitudes could be ascertained. Thus, a high score

indicates approval of the faculty-advisement system; conversely a low score indicates approval of the self-advisement system. The possible range of scores is eighteen to ninety.

Gathering the Data

The scale was mailed first-class to the faculty-advised and self-advised students who were enrolled in the University as of March 1, 1968. The faculty members received their scales through the faculty exchange. Self-addressed business-reply envelopes were included in the mailings to all recipients. A brief mimeographed cover letter was included.[1]

Two weeks after the original mailing, follow-up letters and scales were sent to all non-responding recipients. Students received a mimeographed cover letter by first-class mail; faculty members received a typed letter with personalized inside address and salutation via the faculty exchange.[2] Table 31 shows the rate of return for the three groups.

Hypotheses

In order to examine the question of attitudes toward the two advisement patterns under analysis, the following hypotheses were postulated and tested:

24. Faculty advisers, as measured by the scale, significantly prefer neither of the University College

---

[1] See Appendix A.

[2] See Appendix E.

TABLE 31

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF LIKERT SCALES RETURNED[1]

Group	First Mail-Out	Usable Returns	Percent
Faculty-Advised Students	616	349	56.7
Self-Advised Students	1,049	557	53.1
Faculty Members	124	98	79.0
TOTAL	1,789	1,004	56.1

advisement systems at the University of Oklahoma.

25. Faculty-advised students, as measured by the scale, significantly prefer neither of the University College advisement systems at the University of Oklahoma.

26. Self-advised students, as measured by the scale, significantly prefer neither of the University College advisement systems at the University of Oklahoma.

27. There is no significant difference, as measured by the scale, between the opinions of faculty advisers and faculty-advised students concerning the advisement systems in University College.

28. There is no significant difference, as measured by the scale, between the opinions of faculty advisers and self-advised students concerning the advisement systems

[1]Twenty-nine scales were returned which were not usable.

in University College.

29. There is no significant difference, as measured by the scale, between the opinions of faculty-advised students and self-advised students concerning the advisement systems in University College.

Treatment of Data

If a person circled the U for Undecided on each of the eighteen items, his score would be fifty-four; thus, this figure was adopted as the "expected" mean. Means, standard deviations, and standard errors were computed for the three groups of respondents. T tests for significant differences between two means were performed to ascertain to what degree each group preferred either of the two advisement systems. The t test is the appropriate test for the significance of difference between means when data are uncorrelated and N's are large. T tests for the difference between individual group means were then performed in order to ascertain their differences.

Results

The faculty members' basic data is presented in Table 32.

The t value shown in Table 32 is significant at the .01 level of confidence; thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. The data suggests that the faculty advisers, as measured by the scale, significantly disapprove of the

TABLE 32

FACULTY MEMBERS' DATA ON THE LIKERT SCALE

N	Expected Mean	Mean	Difference	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	T Value	P
98	54	51.6	2.4	7.7	.785	- 3.31	.01

faculty-advisement system and approve of the self-advisement systems.

Basic data from the faculty-advised students is found in Table 33.

TABLE 33

FACULTY-ADVISED STUDENTS' DATA ON THE LIKERT SCALE

N	Expected Mean	Mean	Difference	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	T Value	P
349	54	47.7	6.3	8.1	.434	- 14.52	.001

The t value shown in Table 33 is significant at the .001 level of confidence. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected, and the data reveal that, as measured by the scale, the faculty-advised students prefer the self-advisement system vis-à-vis the faculty-advisement system.

Basic data for the self-advised students is presented in Table 34.

TABLE 34

SELF-ADVISED STUDENTS' DATA ON THE LIKERT SCALE

N	Expected Mean	Mean	Difference	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	T Value	P
557	54	45.8	8.2	7.9	.335	- 24.5	.001

The t value shown in Table 34 is significant at the .001 level of confidence; therefore, the hypothesis of no difference is rejected. The data reveal that the self-advised students, as measured by the scale, significantly prefer the self-advisement system over the faculty-advisement system.

Thus, it may be concluded that all three groups of respondents, as measured by the scale, prefer the self-advisement system. The question then arises, "Do the three groups, as measured by the scale, express significantly different degrees of preference for self-advisement as opposed to faculty-advisement?" T tests for significant mean differences among these groups revealed the data reported in Table 35. These data reveal whether or not there are significant differences among the three groups in their degrees of acceptance of self-advisement and rejection of faculty-advisement.

The first two t values in Table 35 are significant at the .001 level; the last one is significant at the .01.

TABLE 35

DIFFERENCES AMONG GROUP MEANS

Groups	Difference	T Value	P
Faculty/Faculty-Advised	- 3.9	- 4.34	.001
Faculty/Self-Advised	- 5.8	- 6.80	.001
Faculty-Advised/Self-Advised	- 1.5	- 2.74	.01

Thus, at these levels both student groups, as measured by the scale, reject faculty-advisement to a significantly greater degree than does the faculty group. The self-advised students, when compared to their faculty-advised counterparts, significantly prefer the self-advisement system.

Summary

The data presented in chapter five reveal that, as measured by the scale, all three groups prefer self-advisement to faculty-advisement. The students prefer self-advisement to a greater degree than do the faculty members with the self-advised students preferring their own method to the greatest degree.

CHAPTER VI

PREFERENCE FOR CHANGE IN UNIVERSITY COLLEGE ADVISEMENT

The Population

The students identified as the population for Chapter V generally constituted the population for this part of the study. Slight variances were the results of some students' returning one instrument without returning the other one.

The Instrument

A rating scale was constructed by the researcher; it was designed to offer respondents a wide latitude of preference for change within the bounds of a closed-end instrument.[1] The items described various approaches to the advisement problem. Item ten was deliberately left open-ended so that respondents could report their preference for items not covered by the first nine items of the scale. The first nine items covered all the alternatives that the researcher could conceive.

---

[1] See Appendix C.

Gathering the Data

The data for this part of the study were gathered exactly as reported in Chapter V. The rating scale was enclosed in all mailings referred to in Chapter V. Table 34 describes the return of the Preference-for-Change scale.

TABLE 36

RETURN RESULTS FOR THE PREFERENCE-FOR-CHANGE RATING SCALE

Group	Initial N-Count	Number Usable Forms Returned[1]	Percent
Faculty Members	124	102	82.3
Faculty-Advised	616	341	55.4
Self-Advised	1,049	547	51.2
TOTAL[2]	1,789	990	55.3

[1]Twenty-nine scales were unusable.

[2]Fifty-eight envelopes returned undeliverable.

Scoring the Instrument

Respondents were invited to rate their choices by placing a "1" in the blank to the right of their first choice, a "2" in the blank by the second choice, and a "3" by their third choice. In scoring the instrument, each "1" response was weighted 3; each "2" response was weighted 2, and each "3" response was weighted 1. The points for each

group were then totaled to provide a total score on each item for each of the three groups. Had their choices been evenly distributed, the respondents would have given each item an average of 6/10 of a point. Therefore, the expected score for a group on any item would be N times 6/10. Table 37 shows the expected score, achieved score, and achieved percent of expected score for the faculty members. Tables 38 and 39 show the same information for the faculty-advised and self-advised groups.

TABLE 37

FACULTY MEMBERS' SCORES ON THE PREFERENCE-FOR-CHANGE SCALE (N = 102)

Item	Expected Score	Achieved Score
1	61.2	59
2	61.2	11
3	61.2	68
4	61.2	138
5	61.2	14
6	61.2	62
7	61.2	30
8	61.2	56
9	61.2	146
10	61.2	24
Mean		60.2
Standard Deviation		44.4

TABLE 38

FACULTY-ADVISED STUDENTS' SCORES ON THE PREFERENCE-FOR-CHANGE SCALE (N = 341)

Item	Expected Score	Achieved Score
1	204.6	296
2	204.6	129
3	204.6	367
4	204.6	194
5	204.6	28
6	204.6	150
7	204.6	182
8	204.6	233
9	204.6	408
10	204.6	53
Mean		204.0
Standard Deviation		121.0

TABLE 39

SELF-ADVISED STUDENTS' SCORES ON THE PREFERENCE-FOR-CHANGE SCALE (N - 547)

Item	Expected Score	Achieved Score
1	328.2	432
2	328.2	256
3	328.2	611
4	328.2	302
5	328.2	55
6	328.2	290
7	328.2	295
8	328.2	280
9	328.2	655
10	328.2	90
Mean		326.6
Standard Deviation		184.0

As seen in Table 37, the faculty members rank two items very high. These two are numbers 4, "Faculty should be invited to volunteer . . ." and number 9, the status quo. The scores on both of these items are more than one and one-half sigma above the mean. The next succeeding score is only one-sixth of a sigma above the mean. It appears then, that faculty members prefer to maintain the status quo with the qualification that faculty members be invited to volunteer for the task rather than be assigned to the job as they now are.

Table 38 shows that the faculty-advised students prefer two choices over any others. Number three, "Each academic department should assign a faculty member full-time to advise University College students who are interested in majoring in that department," and number nine, the status quo, received the highest scores. Both of these scores are considerably more than one sigma above the mean. It would, therefore, appear that the faculty-advised students prefer to be able to make a choice of whether or not to have an adviser but feel that the adviser should be a person who has been assigned full-time to the task of advising students interested in a particular department.

The self-advised students scored similarly to the faculty-advised. Table 39 shows that numbers three and nine each scored more than one and one-half sigma above the mean indicating the self-advised students' preferences are similar

to those of the faculty-advised students.

Table 40 shows the ranking of each item by each group. It clearly shows that all three groups rank item nine (the status quo) as their first choice. Item three was ranked high by all three groups. Both student groups ranked item one as their third preference. It is interesting to note that all three groups rated items two, five and ten in the bottom triad of their rankings. They, thus, reject the concept of individual responsibility or of upperclassmen's performing advisement.

TABLE 40

RANKING OF ITEMS BY THE THREE GROUPS

Choice	Self-Advised	Faculty-Advised	Faculty
1st	9	9	9
2nd	3	3	4
3rd	1	1	3
4th	4	8	6
5th	7	4	1
6th	6	7	8
7th	8	6	7
8th	2	2	10
9th	10	10	2
10th	5	5	5

Table 41 shows the number and percent of each group which reported each item as their first choice. These data further substantiate the conclusions drawn from Tables 37, 38 and 39.

TABLE 41

PREFERENCE-FOR-CHANGE SCALE ITEMS LISTED AS RESPONDENTS' FIRST CHOICE

Item No.	Faculty Members (N=102)		Faculty-Advised (N-338)		Self-Advised (N=551)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1	11	10.8	56	16.6	88	16.0
2	2	2.0	17	5.0	35	6.4
3	11	10.8	72	21.3	103	18.7
4	19	18.6	26	7.7	37	6.7
5	1	1.0	4	1.2	4	.7
6	11	10.8	19	5.6	45	8.2
7	2	2.0	20	5.9	32	5.8
8	5	4.9	25	7.4	37	6.7
9	34	33.3	85	25.1	143	26.0
10	6	5.9	14	4.1	27	4.9

Summary

The data contained in this chapter indicate a desire for freedom on the part of individuals. The faculty like the system as it now is with the qualification that volunteers from the faculty be assigned to perform University

College faculty advisement. The students want to be able to choose self-advisement, but they want to have a specialist on hand to advise them if and when they feel the need for help.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study observed selected phenomena concerning the academic advisement system in University College at the University of Oklahoma. As guideposts for the study, twenty-nine hypotheses were postulated. Using data related to 2,363 students who composed the population which entered the University of Oklahoma as first-time-entering freshmen in the fall of 1966 without previous college work and persisted through two semesters at the University of Oklahoma, the hypotheses were tested. In some cases, data related to 200 randomly sampled students were used to test the hypotheses.

Findings

Rejected Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were rejected at the level indicated:

1. There is no significant difference between faculty-advised and self-advised freshmen as measured by the ACT English score. .001

2. There is no significant difference between

faculty-advised and self-advised freshmen as measured by the ACT Mathematics score. .001

3. There is no significant difference between faculty-advised and self-advised freshmen as measured by the ACT Social Science score. .01

4. There is no significant difference between faculty-advised and self-advised freshmen as measured by the ACT Natural Science score. .01

5. There is no significant difference between faculty-advised and self-advised freshmen as measured by the ACT Composite score. .001

8. There is no significant difference between faculty-advised and self-advised freshmen as measured by the number of hours dropped during the fall semester of 1966. .05

13. There is no significant difference between the number of hours faculty-advised freshmen completed in the fall semester of 1966 and the number they attempted during the spring semester of 1967. .01

14. There is no significant difference between the number of hours faculty-advised freshmen men completed in the fall semester of 1966 and the number they attempted during the spring semester of 1967. .05

17. There is no significant difference between the number of hours self-advised freshmen men completed in the fall semester of 1966 and the number they attempted during

the spring semester of 1967. .05

20. There is no significant difference between faculty-advised and self-advised freshmen as measured by the number of enrollment errors committed in their spring 1967 enrollment. .05

24. Faculty advisers, as measured by the scale, significantly prefer neither of the University College advisement systems at the University of Oklahoma. .01

25. Faculty-advised students, as measured by the scale, significantly prefer neither of the University College advisement systems at the University of Oklahoma. .001

26. Self-advised students, as measured by the scale, significantly prefer neither of the University College advisement systems at the University of Oklahoma. .001

27. There is no significant difference, as measured by the scale, between the opinions of faculty advisers and faculty-advised students concerning the advisement systems in University College. .001

28. There is no significant difference, as measured by the scale, between the opinions of faculty advisers and self-advised students concerning the advisement systems in University College. .001

29. There is no significant difference, as measured by the scale, between the opinions of faculty-advised students and self-advised students concerning the advisement systems in University College. .01

Hypotheses Which Were Not Rejected

Using the .05 level of confidence, the following hypotheses were not rejected:

6. There is no significant difference between faculty-advised and self-advised freshmen as measured by their first-semester college grade-point-average.

7. There is no significant difference between faculty-advised and self-advised freshmen as measured by the number of hours completed in the fall semester of 1966.

9. There is no significant difference between faculty-advised and self-advised freshmen as measured by the number of hours dropped during the spring semester of 1967.

10. There is no significant difference between the fall semester performance and the spring semester performance as measured by the number of hours dropped by faculty-advised freshmen.

11. There is no significant difference between the fall semester performance and the spring semester performance as measured by the number of hours dropped by self-advised freshmen.

12. There is no significant difference between faculty-advised freshmen and self-advised freshmen as measured by the number of hours attempted during the spring semester of 1967.

15. There is no significant difference between the

number of hours faculty-advised freshmen women completed in the fall semester of 1966 and the number they attempted during the spring semester of 1967.

16. There is no significant difference between the number of hours self-advised freshmen completed in the fall semester of 1966 and the number they attempted during the spring semester of 1967.

18. There is no significant difference between the number of hours self-advised freshmen women completed in the fall semester of 1966 and the number they attempted during the spring semester of 1967.

19. There is no significant difference between faculty-advised and self-advised freshmen as measured by the difference between their difference between hours completed fall semester of 1966 and attempted spring semester of 1967.

21. There is no significant difference between faculty-advised and self-advised students who entered the University of Oklahoma as first-time-entering freshmen in the fall of 1966 as measured by their percentage of retention into the spring semester of 1968.

22. There is no significant difference between faculty-advised and self-advised freshmen men as measured by the difference between first and second-semester GPA.

23. There is no significant difference between faculty-advised and self-advised freshmen women as measured

by the difference between first and second-semester GPA.

Conclusions

1. Of the various methods of freshman academic advising reviewed in the literature, the most successful is one in which trained upperclassmen perform a large part of the freshman academic advisement.

2. When given the opportunity to choose between the two alternatives now existent in University College, most students prefer to do their own academic planning without assistance from faculty members.

3. The courses which are listed in the catalog as having the prerequisite of sophomore standing are so listed for good reason.

4. In some cases, students are experiencing academic difficulty as a result of failure to carefully follow published enrollment instructions.

5. Although self-advised students performed significantly better than faculty-advised students on the ACT battery, the self-advised students did not persist into the fourth semester at any significantly greater rate. Consequently, it seems reasonable to conclude that ACT scores are not reliable predictors of persistence into the fourth semester at the University of Oklahoma.

6. The faculty-advisement system in use in University College at the University of Oklahoma is held in low

esteem by faculty and students.

7. Students desire to have a faculty member who is skilled in academic advisement readily available in order that they may visit with him if and when they so desire.

8. Faculty and students present no mandate for change in the advisement system used in University College at the University of Oklahoma.

Recommendations

As a result of this study, the following recommendations are offered:

1. It is recommended that an active program of research be performed with experimental groups to ascertain what kinds of advisement programs are effective at the University of Oklahoma.

2. It is recommended that the purposes of the academic advisement system in University College be clearly delineated and promulgated to the professional staff and to the students.

3. It is recommended that courses which give freshmen particular difficulty be identified and that students be discouraged from taking these courses during the freshman year.

4. It is recommended that the self-advisement option be continued for students who desire it.

5. It is recommended that skilled advisers be available to freshmen who desire advisement assistance.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Arbuckle, Dugald. Student Personnel Services in Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1953.

Arkin, Herbert, and Colton, Raymond R. Tables for Statisticians. New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1950.

Campbell, D. P. The Results of Counseling; Twenty-five Years Later. Philadelphia: Saunders, 1965.

Dickson, W. J., and Roethlisberger, F. J. Management and Worker. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949.

Downie, N. M., and Heath, R. W. Basic Statistical Methods. 2nd ed. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965.

Garrett, Henry E. Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1958.

Hardee, Melvene Draheim. The Faculty in College Counseling. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959.

Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967.

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

Smith, G. Milton. A Simplified Guide to Statistics for Psychology and Education. 3rd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1962.

Travers, Robert M. W. An Introduction to Educational Research. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1958.

Tyler, Leona E. The Work of the Counselor. 2nd ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961.

Williamson, E. G. How To Counsel Students. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1939.

Articles

Anderson, R. A. "Feasibility Study of Preregistration for a Small College." College and University, XLI (Spring, 1966), pp. 302-306.

Barger, Ben, and Hall, Everette. "Time of Dropout as a Variable in the Study of College Attrition." College and University, XLI (Fall, 1965), p. 84.

Brown, William F. "Student to Student Counseling for Academic Adjustment." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLIII (April, 1965), pp. 811-817.

_____, and Zunker, Vernon G. "Comparative Effectiveness of Student and Professional Counselors." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLV (March, 1966), pp. 738-743.

_____. "Student Counselor Utilization at Four-Year Institutions of Higher Learning." The Journal of College Student Personnel, VII, No. 1 (January, 1966), pp. 41-46.

Cameron, Marian L. "An Evaluation of a Faculty Advisory Program." Educational and Psychological Measurement, XII (Winter, 1952), pp. 730-740.

Clark, Kenneth E., and Paterson, Donald G. "Students' Judgments of Counseling." Journal of Higher Education, XIV (January, 1943), pp. 140-142.

Davis, Frank, and Norris, Pearle. "Helping Students Choose Curricula." Guidance Handbook for Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1949.

Dykstra, J. W. "Consumer Protection in the Higher Education Marketplace." Phi Delta Kappan, XLVII (April, 1966), pp. 446-448.

Forrest, Donald V., and Knapp, Robert H. "Summer College Orientation Programs." The Journal of College Student Personnel, VII, No. 1 (January, 1966), pp. 47-49.

Gaw, Esther Allen. "Advising Means Administration." Journal of Higher Education, IV (March, 1933), pp. 179-186.

Guthrie, George M., and O'Neill, Harry W. "Effects of Dormitory Counseling on Academic Achievement." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXI (February, 1953), pp. 307-309.

Hardee, Melvene Draheim. "Faculty Advising in Contemporary Higher Education." Educational Record, XLII (April, 1961), p. 116.

Hills, D. A., and Williams, J. E. "Effects of Test Information Upon Self-Evaluation in Brief Educational-Vocational Counseling." Journal Counseling Psychology (in press 1965).

Johnson, J. Clyde, and Morehead, Charles G. "Some Effects of a Faculty Advising Program." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLIII (October, 1964), pp. 139-144.

Jones, Lonzo. "Faculty Counseling for Freshmen." Educational and Psychological Measurement, VII (Autumn, 1947), pp. 564-568.

Kiell, Norman. "Freshmen Evaluation of Faculty Counselors." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXV (February, 1957), pp. 361-364.

Koile, Earl A. "Characteristics of College Teachers Interested in Faculty Counseling Activities." Journal of Counseling Psychology, II, No. 1 (Spring, 1955), pp. 32-34.

McCracken, Charles. "Student Counseling by Student." School and Society, XLVIII (April, 1938), pp. 434-438.

Malnig, Lawrence R., and Tuleja, Thaddeus V. "Orientation--Let Your Students Run It." Journal of Higher Education, XXVIII (February, 1957), pp. 96-100.

Rose, Harriett A. "The Effect of the Preadmission Interview on Students of Doubtful Academic Ability." College and University, XLI (Fall, 1965), pp. 80-83.

Rossmann, Jack E. "An Experimental Study of Faculty Advising." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLVI (October, 1967), p. 160.

Sander, Daryl L. "Experimental Educational Advising in Men's Residence Halls." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLII (April, 1964), pp. 787-790.

Tinsley, Mary Ann. "The Faculty Adviser in the Liberal Arts College." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXIV (December, 1955), pp. 219-220.

Wallace, David. "A Case For- and Against- Mail Questionnaires." Public Opinion Quarterly, XII, No. 1 (July, 1947), pp. 40-52.

_____, "Mail Questionnaires Can Produce Good Samples of Homogeneous Groups." The Journal of Marketing, XVIII (Spring, 1954), pp. 53-60.

Walters, J. E. "Seniors as Counselors." Journal of Higher Education, II (November, 1931), pp. 446-448.

Wrenn, C. Gilbert. "Utilizing Student Advisers." Journal of Higher Education, V (April, 1934), pp. 189-190.

Miscellaneous

American College Testing Program. American College Test. Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, Incorporated, 1961.

American College Testing Program. Report from the President to Annual Meeting of the Corporation, May 5-6, 1968. (Mimeographed.)

Brown, William F. Student Counselor's Handbook. San Marcos, Texas: By the Author, P. O. Box 603, 1967.

Coffelt, John. Speech at Oklahoma Association of Junior College at the University of Oklahoma, April 14, 1967.

Coffelt, John J., and Hobbs, Dan S. In and Out of College. Oklahoma City: Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, 1964.

Fryer, William Neal. "Faculty Counseling at Abilene Christian College." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Columbia Teachers College, 1966.

Koile, Earl A. "The Development of a Measure of Interest for Selecting Faculty Counselors." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Harvard, 1953.

Rossmann, Jack E. Final Report to the Louis W. and Maud Hill Family Foundation on An Experimental Program for the Advising of Freshmen. Macalester College, November, 1966.

Schoenherr, Charles William. "Strengthening the Freshman Faculty Counseling Program at Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois, through a Faculty-Student Action Research Group." Dissertation Abstract Vol. 26, Teachers' College 1964-65, p. 179.

The University of Oklahoma. Bulletin Issue for the College of Arts and Sciences. Norman, Oklahoma: Office of Publication, University of Oklahoma Press, June 1, 1967.

_____. Bulletin Issue for the College of Business Administration. Norman, Oklahoma: Office of Publication, University of Oklahoma Press, April 1, 1967.

_____. Bulletin Issue for the College of Education. Norman, Oklahoma: Office of Publication, University of Oklahoma Press, June 15, 1967.

_____. Bulletin Issue for the College of Engineering. Norman, Oklahoma: Office of Publication, University of Oklahoma Press, September 15, 1967.

_____. Bulletin Issue for the College of Fine Arts. Norman, Oklahoma: Office of Publication, University of Oklahoma Press, October 15, 1967.

_____. Bulletin Issue for the College of Pharmacy. Norman, Oklahoma: Office of Publication, University of Oklahoma Press, February 1, 1968.

_____. Bulletin Issue for the College of Social Work. Norman, Oklahoma: Office of Publication, University of Oklahoma Press, January 15, 1968.

_____. Bulletin Issue for the School of Library Science. Norman, Oklahoma: Office of Publication, University of Oklahoma Press, July 15, 1967.

_____. Bulletin Issue for the School of Nursing. Norman, Oklahoma: Office of Publication, University of Oklahoma Press, July 15, 1967.

_____. Bulletin Issue for the University College. Norman, Oklahoma: Office of Publication, University of Oklahoma Press, March 1, 1968.

_____. Bulletin Summer Session '68. Norman, Oklahoma: Office of Publication, University of Oklahoma Press, April 15, 1968.

_____. "Freshman Guide to Academic Planning." Norman, Oklahoma, 1967. (Mimeographed.)

_____, Minutes of Academic Advisory Council. (Not dated.) (Mimeographed.)

Zunker, Vernon G. "A Comparison of the Effectiveness of Student and Certified Counselors in a Selected Program of Academic Adjustment Guidance." Unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, College of Education, University of Houston, 1964.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

March 18, 1968

Greetings,

In connection with a research project, I am interested in your opinions concerning University College academic advisement at the University of Oklahoma. I would greatly appreciate your candid opinions relating to the items on the adjoining pages.

Would you be so kind as to complete the enclosed forms and return them to me in the enclosed postage-paid envelope?

Thank you for your time and contribution to this project.

Cordially,

J. Dan Recer

enclosures

APPENDIX B

The items below are intended to help describe your attitudes toward the advisement systems in University College at the University of Oklahoma. Please read each item and circle the appropriate abbreviation at the right of each item. Following is the code:

SD	Strongly disagree
D	Disagree
U	Undecided
A	Agree
SA	Strongly Agree

1. University College faculty advisers are vitally interested in student advisement problems . . . . . SD D U A SA

2. University College faculty advisers spend adequate time with each advisee . . . . . SD D U A SA

3. University College faculty advisers are well-informed about advisement problems . . SD D U A SA

4. University College faculty advisers are well-trained to perform advisement . . . . . SD D U A SA

5. University College faculty advisers enjoy performing advisement . . . . . SD D U A SA

6. University College faculty advisers are readily available to advise advisees . . . . SD D U A SA

7. University College faculty advisers advise advisees into appropriate courses . . . . . SD D U A SA

8. University College faculty advisers advise advisees to take appropriate numbers of hours . . . . . SD D U A SA

9. University College faculty advisers know the student's aptitudes and abilities . . . SD D U A SA

10. Self-advisement assists a person toward greater self-reliance . . . . . SD D U A SA

11. Self-advisement saves time of faculty and students . . . . . SD D U A SA

12. Second-semester freshmen are capable of advising themselves . . . . . SD D U A SA

13. Published enrollment instructions are or could be written clearly enough to produce good self-advisement . . . . . SD D U A SA

14. Second-semester freshmen give enough attention to published enrollment instructions to produce good self-advisement . . . SD D U A SA

15. Second-semester freshmen have enough interest to do a good job of self-advisement. . . . . SD D U A SA

16. Second-semester freshmen know their own aptitudes and abilities well enough to perform good academic self-advisement . . . SD D U A SA

17. If a second-semester freshman cannot enroll himself, he has no business in college . . SD D U A SA

18. Self-advised freshmen take appropriate numbers of hours . . . . . SD D U A SA

APPENDIX C

Suggestions for Changes in Academic Advisement In University College at the University of Oklahoma

The items below constitute possible changes in academic advisement in University College. Please read through all the items first. Then rank the three which you think would be best in order of your preference for them. Place the number "1" in the blank to the right of your first choice, "2" beside your second choice, and "3" beside your third choice. Please rank only 3 choices.

1. The University should hire enough people who are trained in guidance and counseling to perform all University College advisement. _____

2. Upperclassmen trained in academic advisement should perform University College advisement. _____

3. Each academic department should assign a faculty member full time to advise University College students who are interested in majoring in that department. _____

4. Faculty should be invited to volunteer to do University College academic advisement and should be given substantial teaching load reductions to do so. Thus, only volunteers would perform this task. _____

5. University College students should be responsible for their own academic advisement without assistance from others. _____

6. Student self-advisement should be instituted for all University College students except first-time-entering freshmen. _____

7. Graduate assistants with similar academic interests should be trained to perform all University College advisement. _____

8. The University College office should train special personnel to perform all academic advisement in University College. _____

9. The system as it now stands is good. i.e. Students may choose to be faculty-advised or self-advised. _____

10. Other: _____

_____ _____

Your further comments are welcomed and solicited. Please use the back of this sheet.

APPENDIX D

April 15, 1968

Dear Colleague:

During the week of March 25, I sent you two questionnaires concerning advisement at the University of Oklahoma. Perhaps the letter failed to reach you. I am enclosing additional copies of the two instruments and a stamped return envelope.

If you could spare a few minutes to complete the two forms and mail them back to me, it would greatly assist me on my doctoral dissertation.

Cordially,

J. Dan Recer

JDR:as

enclosures

APPENDIX E

April 12, 1968

Dear Professor _____:

On March 27, I mailed you copies of the two enclosed survey instruments. Perhaps they did not reach you. If you could possibly find the time, I would appreciate your completing the forms and returning them to me. This study is being done as one part of my doctoral dissertation.

Respectfully,

J. Dan Recer

JDR:as

enc.

APPENDIX F

RECER ADVISEMENT STUDY

BASIC DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT

I. D. # _____

Name _____
(Last) (Initial) (Initial)

SEX M F

MA S F

College 1 A&S 2 Bus. Ad. 3 Educ. 4 Eng. 5 F.A.
8 Pharm. 9 Undecided 0 Nursing

ACT _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
English Math Social Science Natural Science Comp.

Hours Fall '66 _____ GPA Fall '66 _____

Hours Spring '67 _____ GPA Spring '67 _____

APPENDIX G

RECER ADVISEMENT STUDY

RANDOM SAMPLE GROUPS' DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT

Hours attempted Fall, 1966 _____

Hours attempted Spring, 1967 _____

1. No course prerequisite _____
2. Low test score _____
3. Course which does not count toward degree _____
4. Not open to University College students _____
5. More than 50% of courses are #100 or higher _____
6. Course open to those of Sophomore standing _____
7. Duplicate credit _____
8. Practice which is not recommended _____