2016

Student Perceptions of Academic Advising at Two-Year Colleges

Wayne T. Whitmore
Minnesota State University Mankato

Student Perceptions of Academic Advising

At Two-Year Colleges

By

Wayne Whitmore

This Dissertation is Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for

the Educational Doctorate Degree

In Educational Leadership

Minnesota State University, Mankato

Mankato, Minnesota

March 2016

Date:_____

This Dissertation has been examined and approved.

Examining Committee:

_____
Dr. Jason Kaufman, Advisor

_____
Dr. Timothy Berry, Committee Member

_____
Dr. Brian Fors, Committee Member

Abstract

This research project examined students' perceptions of academic advising through an online survey method at select two-year colleges within the Minnesota State College and University System. The purpose of this research was to build upon scant existing research relating to student satisfaction with academic advising models utilized by individual colleges. The purpose was to also identify the academic advising model preferred by students. The sample for this research consisted of 177 students enrolled at two-year state community and technical colleges. Outcomes indicated a preference for the developmental model of academic advising. Outcomes also indicated that the developmental model of academic advising was reported to be commonly utilized by the colleges participating in the research.

Acknowledgements

In completing this dissertation and preparing to graduate, I am fulfilling a longtime wish to advance my knowledge and education. I am also demonstrating to my daughter, Olivia, that learning is a lifelong adventure to be cherished rather than dreaded. I am also making my mother very happy, even though she is no longer here to see me walk the stage in commencement.

I am forever indebted to the faculty and staff members in the Department of Educational Leadership for their roles in shaping and guiding my educational experience. While it has not been easy, it has been a learning experience I will remember fondly for the rest of my life. I am also indebted to my wife, Jane Greathouse, and my daughter, Olivia Whitmore, who understood my desire and supported me fully in my working nights, weekends, and summers in completion of this degree. Without their support, this would not be happening. I especially appreciated those days I was allowed to sleep in!

I am also indebted to my cohort within the Educational Leadership Program, as they motivated me and encouraged me to drive onward to complete this degree. Special thanks to Kayla, Ed, Jay, and Megan, who essentially became my "posse" and who were there for me as I was there for them. Best wishes and best of times, guys!

And finally, I owe Dr. Jason Kaufman a huge thanks for everything. He was a great dissertation advisor who was knowledgeable both about the process and in how to motivate me through the process. Again, I likely would not be here today without his support.

It is not everyday a person gets to achieve a part of his lifelong dream. Nor is it every day that a person gets to experience so many talented people on the way to this

dream. Abraham Lincoln, one of my leadership icons, once said, “Always bear in mind that our own resolution to succeed is more important than any other.” I think that once we set our minds to a goal, we are all capable of achieving those goals! My advice to others… set those goals and start pursuing them, because if I can do it, so can you!

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter I

Introduction

Background of the Problem

The definition of academic advising has evolved over time. O'Banion (1972), in his seminal article, defined this as a process involving a relationship respectful of student concerns whose purpose was to enhance self-awareness and fulfillment within the student through the advisor's role as a guide and teacher. The definition has also included facilitating the student's rational processes, problem-solving, behavioral awareness, and decision-making skills (Crookston, 1972). Today, academic advising is defined as an information exchange designed to foster student's educational and career goals, with the burden of responsibility upon the student (Rutgers, 2014). Minnesota State University, Mankato (2014) defines academic advising as a partnership between the advisor and the student, placing emphasis upon planning, communication, and personal responsibility. Kuhn (2011) defined academic advising as situations in which a college student receives direction and advice from an institutional representative in regards to personal, social, or academic matters in a manner that mentors, informs, counsels, or suggests a path to follow.

Tinto (2007) wrote that faculty and staff members in academia often know why students leave, but the issue is that the college needs to know how to get students to stay and be successful. Advising and successful retention of students appears to go hand-in-hand. Nutt (2003) wrote that academic advising is central to successful efforts in educating and retaining students, providing a personal connection to the institution

that is key to student retention and success. Tinto (1993) described retention as an outcome of an engaging and successful college experiences.

Woolston (2002), in his research, found that student satisfaction with undergraduate education was high, but that satisfaction with advising was much lower. It is possible that the advising model being used by the advisor may influence student satisfaction with advising (Broadbridge, 1996). Hale, Graham, and Johnson (2009) reported one influence to be the congruence between the student's preferred advising style and their advisor's academic style. Sutton and Sankar (2011) found that provision of course-specific information led to higher student satisfaction with advising. Other rationales for low student satisfaction with advising include inaccurate course requirements information from advisors, as well as a lack of knowledge and/or sharing of information about special programs, financial help, and career opportunities (Haag, et al, 2007). Other student complaints included their perceptions that the advisors were too overwhelmed to provide adequate advising (Haag et al, 2007) or having very limited time with their advisor (McCuen, Gulsah, Gifford, & Srikantaiah, 2009).

As Ryan (2013) reported in her study of retention and academic achievement at two-year colleges, insufficient or incompetent academic advising is a major contributor to student attrition. Ryan's (2013) research found that first time college students were more likely to be retained and to do better if they knew and met with their academic advisor regularly. Moreover, Kolenovic, Linderman, and Karp (2013) reported findings indicating an intervention plan utilized in their research that required, among others, bi-monthly meetings between students and their academic advisors led to a 53 percent greater chance of completion and graduation, as those in the intervention program were

graduating at a rate of 30 percent at two years and 55 percent at three years compared to their average of 11 percent at two years and 25 percent at three years. Crookston (1972) and Lowenstein (2005) described the developmental and prescriptive models of academic advising respectively. Their research suggested that collegiate academic advising can follow either a developmental or prescriptive path, either of which impacts college students in positive or negative ways. Alternatively, Habley (2004) and Pardee (2010) reported on organizational structures that impact academic advising as well, including a centralized, decentralized, or a shared structure of service provision. These different structures can also have positive and negative impacts on the college student through academic advising.

Prescriptive and developmental models of advising

Lowenstein (2005) likened the prescriptive model of advising to bookkeeping. The advisor simply tells the student what steps they need to take, including the rules that must be followed, and the student's only role is obedience or compliance whilst the advisor documents that all steps and rules were followed. In this model, the process is pushed upon the student with no real chance for feedback or interactions. Conversely, the developmental model (Crookston, 1972), while being concerned with the overall outcome for the student, is also concerned with building and employing the student's skills and abilities in decision-making, evaluation, problem-solving, interpersonal interactions, and rational processes in reaching the overall outcome for the student. In other words, the student is involved in the process.

Organizational models of advising

Other researchers pointed to organizational issues that can influence student satisfaction with advising. Specifically, the organizational model of advising being utilized by a college can impact student's levels of satisfaction with academic advising. Habley (2004) provided a construct to describe advising programs. His concept included a faculty-only model, in which students are assigned to instructional faculty member for advising Habley (2004).

Additionally, Habley (2004) included a supplementary model, which has an instructional faculty member and an advising office for general referrals and academic information. Another model Habley (2004) included was a split model, in which some students are advised in an advising office, while others are assigned to faculty advisors. Habley (2004) also incorporated a dual model, in which each student has two advisors- a faculty advisor and an academic advisor. Finally, Habley (2004) included a total intake model, in which students first are advised by academic advisers and then assigned to academic departments or instructional faculty for advising.

Pardee (2010) reported three models of advising in predominant use: the centralized model, the decentralized model, and the shared model. Pardee (2010) differentiated the three models in this fashion. The centralized model has all academic advising occurring in one area on campus, and all students go there for advising services. The decentralized model has faculty members advising students within their respective programs. The shared model has facets of both centralized and decentralized advising, as there is both an advising center for students to utilize, and faculty members

who also advise students. Essentially, the work by Habley (2004) on advisor versus faculty driven advising postulates for centralized versus decentralized service provision.

Student experiences with advising

Student experiences of advising across these models may result in perceived disconnects. For instance, Saving and Keim (1998) reported that in decentralized models, faculty members felt that training for advising was needed and they disagreed with students in what role they were to play as advisors. Harrison (2009) reported that just one of 636 academic job ads she reviewed requested evidence of effectiveness as an adviser, and only 48 of those advertisements included advising as a job requirement. This begs the question of how does one advise students if one has no training or experience in this area. The centralized model has operational issues as well. As reported by Pardee (2000), it may lead to overloaded academic advisors and a lack of knowledge and expertise regarding academic programs. The shared model may share the same issues as the centralized and decentralized models, with the addition of mixed messages if seeing more than one advisor (Pardee, 2010).

Purpose Statement

This study examined two major characteristics in the advising of two- year college students. It also built upon the limited amounts of research relating to academic advising models utilized and student satisfaction with these models at two-year colleges. As noted by Christian and Sprinkle (2013) in their research on college student advising, little research has been conducted upon this topic. There was a decided need to build upon existing research to better understand the role of college student advising and the impact it can have upon students. Consequently, the scope of this research was on

academic advising models and their impact upon college students, to add to existing research, and to open new avenues of research.

Hypotheses

The primary focus of this study was to examine student satisfaction with academic advising at two-year colleges based upon the model of academic advising being utilized by the student's college. Additional information was obtained through analysis of the data based upon gender, ethnicity, and the age of the participants in ranges.

First, it was hypothesized that students would show a preference for the developmental model of advising. It is a collaborative model, which provides for input and buy-in from students (Christian and Sprinkle, 2013). Second, it was hypothesized that male students would report a preference for the prescriptive model of academic advising. Christian and Sprinkle (2013) found that males were more likely to prefer the prescriptive model of advising and showed little concern in having an inspiring or motivating advisor or an individualized schedule. Third, it was hypothesized students would report advisors were utilizing the prescriptive model of advising. Students have been conditioned to this model (Pardee, 1993), so it would be natural for some to prefer it and for faculty members who came up through that system to use prescriptive advising.

Significance of the Research

This research was important because the results can have real-world implications for both colleges and students through updating advising models and building student success and retention. Additionally, there had been precious little research done in this area. This research was also significant, given the role of academic advising in student

achievement and success. This project benefited research in academic advising, and it has real-world applications at the college level.

Limitations

The focus of the research study was limited to two two-year community and technical colleges within the state of Minnesota. An obvious limitation of this research was that potential findings are applicable to two-year community and technical colleges only. Another possible limitation of this research was that it may not apply to two-year colleges outside of Minnesota, as such colleges may vary state by state. However, the focus on two-year colleges allowed for greater relevance and applicability of the outcomes to that population of institutions.

Chapter II

Review of the Literature

Even though academic advising is prevalent at most colleges and universities, and has far-reaching ramifications for the student, the program, and the institution, little research has actually been carried out on this topic (Christian & Sprinkle, 2013). Such a situation begs the question of why academic advising has seen a paucity of research. Brock (2010) reported that degree attainment has not improved over the last 40 years, even with increased access to higher education. The National Center for Education Statistics (2012) reported that about than six out of ten students finish college within six years. Additionally, Brock (2010) stated that students at two-year colleges are far less likely to complete their degrees than those at four-year colleges.

Tinto (1993) and Cuseo (1997) reported more students leave higher education settings prior to completion than graduate. The National Center for Education Statistics (2013) reported that 58.5 percent of students overall graduate within six years. CCSSE results (2013) indicated that only 46 percent of students report developing an academic plan, even though 66 percent of colleges report having a process in place to help first-year students set academic goals by the end of their first year. Since academic advising plays a significant part in the retention of students (Myers and Dyer, 2005), strategizing to find ways to retain students once they have enrolled and are actively taking classes is a pressing issue for colleges.

Satisfaction with Academic Advising

In a nationwide survey of student satisfaction involving 226,423 undergraduates at 425 U.S. colleges and universities (Noel-Levitz, 2006), it was determined

that academic advising is consistently the second-most-important area of the college experience for students (after quality of instruction). In 2012, 191,857 students responded to surveys where they ranked academic advising as their third highest priority behind institutional effectiveness and registration (Noel-Levitz, 2012). It was concluded by Low (2000) that thriving institutions share three basic characteristics: student satisfaction data drives their future directions, their focus is on the needs of their students, and they are continuously refining the overall quality of the student's educational experience.

Through a review of the research, Brock found that, among others, student support services that promote ongoing and personalized advising had improved student outcomes (2010). Cuseo (n.d.) reported academic advising has positive ties to overall student retention and satisfaction with the college experience and effective educational and career planning. Drake (2011) discussed reliable academic advising as being a vital link in retention. Research by Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) similarly suggested that academic advising is actively beneficial to student achievement. Seidman (1991), through random assignment in academic advising, found significant increases in persistence into the second year of college. Drake (2011) wrote that academic advising involved building a relationship with the student, including tying their personal strengths and interests to their academic goals to promote a more positive outcome. Hester (2008) reported that advising interactions serve to foster planning, decision-making, problem-solving, and cognitive skills development. Campbell and Nutt (2006) purported that academic advising had to be viewed as a part of the educational process, as it played a critical role in helping students connect with learning opportunities. This helped students by supporting their engagement in the process, as well as helping them be successful in

attaining important learning outcomes (Campbell and Nutt, 2006). Lowenstein (2005) explained the role of an excellent academic advisor as doing the same for a student's entire course load as a teacher does for one course. Campbell and Nutt (2006) elaborated by laying out similarities between teachers and academic advisors, including developing a clear curriculum with learning outcomes, creating a varied learning experience for the student, and laying out measures to determine achievement of learning outcomes. Indeed, quality academic advising is beneficial for academic programs and the college as a whole, as it increases retention rates among students (Crookston, 1972; Wessell, Engle, & Smidchens, 1978; Bean and Bradley, 1986; Pike, 1993; Gerdes & Mallinckrodt, 1994; Corts, Loundsbury, Saudgras, & Tatum, 2000, Thompson, Orr, & Grover, 2007; & Hester, 2008.). Sutton and Sankar (2011) reported that it costs less to retain current students than it does to recruit new students. Thus, it appears that academic advising plays a major role in student success and retention (Hale, Graham, and Johnson, 2009; Lau, 2003; Myers and Dyer, 2005; Pascarella and Terenzini, 2005; Tinto, 1993).

Given the connections between academic advising and retention, Hale, Graham, and Johnson (2009) reported that attempts to improve retention should begin with evaluations of current student satisfaction, perceptions, and wishes regarding academic advising. Light (2001), wrote that academic advising likely is an overlooked and underestimated attribute of a student's successful experience in college. Additionally, Haag, Hebele, Garcia, and McBeath (2009) discussed how attrition in an engineering program is related to academic and career advising and faculty, among others. Low (2000) and Light (2001) pointed to student satisfaction as being an integral part of a student's college experience. Ryan (2013) found through her research that first-time

students are more likely to be retained and will perform better when they know and regularly meet with their academic advisor. Frost (1991) reported the primary purpose of academic advising is to assist students in developing meaningful educational plans within the context of the student's life goals. Myers and Dyer (2005) wrote that academic advising should improve the student's academic and social assimilation into an institution. Academic advising can have a positive effect upon students. It could be the only real opportunity for a consistent and personal relationship between the student and college personnel, in which care and concern is demonstrated (Drake, 2011). It also significantly impacts economic success for colleges and universities, as well as other criterion by which a college is viewed as being successful (Passarcella & Terenzini, 1991).

Hale, Graham, and Johnson (2009) found that student satisfaction with academic advising is higher when there was congruence between a student's preferred advising style and the advising model utilized by their advisor. The authors also determined that 95.5 percent of their participants preferred a developmental or collaborative advising model (Hale et al, 2009). McCuen, Akar, Gifford, and Srikantaiah (2009) found through their research into advisor-advisee communication that several factors were important to student's satisfaction with their advisor, including adequate explanations from advisors, time with the advisor, and the personality of the advisor. Students preferred having an advisor who assists in the selection of classes, but who allows the student to make any decisions regarding classes and class selection (Hester, 2008; Propp and Rhodes, 2006; & Smith and Allen, 2006). Wood, Baghurst, Waugh, and Lancaster (2008) discovered through their research that students who participated in their study wanted to be more

involved in the academic advising process, but that they needed more information regarding program requirements, sequence, and transferability of credits. In other words, academic advisors needed to provide more information for students to make informed decisions. Further, findings suggested that students also wanted to be more actively engaged with their academic advisors, including guidance, in-depth discussions, and getting to know their advisors better as professionals (Wood et al, 2008; Legutko, 2006.).

Woolston (2002) found that student satisfaction with undergraduate education was high, but that satisfaction with advising was much lower. The negative perceptions Woolston (2002) picked up on were found to be attributable to a gap between what students wanted to talk over with their advisor and what was actually discussed. In addition, poor academic advising was cited by Jain, Shanahan, and Roe (2009) as a crucial factor in high student attrition rates in engineering programs. Some rationale for low student satisfaction with advising included inaccurate course requirement information from advisors, as well as a lack of knowledge and/or a lack of sharing of information about special programs, financial help, and career opportunities (Haag, et al, 2007). Other student complaints included their perceptions that the advisors were too overwhelmed to provide adequate advising (Haag et al, 2007) or having very limited time with their advisor (McCuen, Gulsah, Gifford, & Srikantaiah, 2009).

What can be done to improve academic advising? Research indicates that items such as regular one-to-one advisor-student contact, being knowledgeable about academic programs and curricular requirements, and communication skills (Chickering & Gamson, 1987; Glennen & Vowell, 1995; Nutt, 2000, Creamer & Scott, 2000).

Models of Academic Advising

Crookston (1972) and McArthur (2005) reported that academic advising could be split into two categories: prescriptive advising or developmental advising (also known as collaborative). Prescriptive advising typically views the faculty member as the authority who directs the student with little or no input from the student, whereas the collaborative model of advising involves a mutually-based decision-masking process and is more of a mentoring model of advising (Christian & Sprinkle, 2013). Students whose advisors are prescriptive were less likely to have the same opportunities regarding integration into social and academic areas of the college as those who have advisors who are more developmental by nature (Braxton & McClendon, 2001; Myers & Dyer, 2005). Tinto's model of attrition (1993) indicated that these students are less likely to successfully navigate the educational environment and graduate. Other researchers, however, made note of advantages in the prescriptive model. Fielstein (1989) reported that over 50 percent of students rated some prescriptive activities as high priority, including course selection, graduation requirements, and planning an educational pathway. Additionally, many students have been conditioned to the prescriptive model of advising, as this was the only approach they have known (Pardee, 1994). Minority students often have shown a preference for the prescriptive model (Brown & Rivas, 1994).

Hollis (2009) described developmental advising as a process that depends on a strong relationship between the advisor and the advisee. It is also a tool to encourage students to feel comfortable and then encourage their growth academically and professionally (Bland, 2003). In 1977, the National Academic Advising Association began actively promoting the developmental advising model (Saving and Keim, 1998;

Pardee, 1994). Bland (2003) also reported that to truly be effective, the advisor must be aware of services offered by the college and should advocate for that student. As a tool of growth for the student, the developmental model incorporates intentional stimulation and involvement of the student (Winston et al, 1982 & Hester, 2008). However, research indicated some weaknesses with the developmental model, including time spent, caseload sizes, a lack of training, and increased out-of-class expectations (Gordon, 1994; Ender, 1994).

Smith (2007) utilized an intrusive collaborative model to improve success rates for at-risk students, reporting that this model built a stronger faculty-advisor communication model. Heisserer and Parette (2002) included academically disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, students from a low socioeconomic status, ethnic minorities, and probationary students in defining a category of at-risk students. The literature on attrition and retention suggested that a critical factor in students choosing to remain in college is contact with a significant person at the institution (Chickering & Gamson, 1987; Glennen, Farren, & Vowell, 1996). Fowler & Boylan (2010) found that developmental educators with academically deficient and underprepared students could be more successful if they incorporated intrusive academic advising to also help the student with personal issues and other nonacademic factors. Hollis, (2009) described developmental advising as a process that depends on a strong relationship between the advisor and the advisee.

Laanan (2000) wrote that community colleges provide the opportunity for students from all walks of life to advance their education and careers. Because of this, there is also a need for advising of students who are lacking in college readiness skills, as

eight million college students are over the age of 25 (Digest of Education Statistics, 2012). Additionally, survey results from the U.S. Department of Education indicate that 96 percent of high school students lack advanced math proficiency (Bozick, 2008). Building on this, 52 percent of these developmental students came from homes that have parents who have not attended college (Horn, 2005). This could lead to delays in seeking higher education, and a need for developmental education upon entering higher education. Researchers have also posited that, in addition to testing cognitive scores that place students in developmental classes, educators should also be looking at affective items such as attitudes toward learning and the willingness to seek out and accept help (Boylan, 2009; Sedlacek, 2004).

This is where the role of academic advisor becomes crucial to student success. Hollis (2009) discussed the need for academic advisors to alleviate student's stress levels by helping them navigate the morass of academic policies, guidelines, and educational requirements. The author further reported that, indeed, academic advisors often hold the keys to success in guiding students through this process (Hollis, 2009). It is written that effective advising only occurs when the advisor, the student, and the institution are aware of their corresponding roles (Creamer, 2000; Johnson & Morgan, 2005). Johnson and Morgan (2005) also touched upon the importance of communication with students, and the need to incorporate technology by adding web-based advising resources that were mandatory for students. However, tying this back to a previous comment, there is a paucity of actual research regarding academic advising and models utilized (Christian & Sprinkle, 2013), especially given that degree attainment has not improved over the last 40 years (Brock, 2010).

Gender and Academic Advising

Chao and Nath (2011) reported gender roles as being complex patterns of social constructions regarding beliefs, attitudes, and expectations. Gender roles played a part in Aguirre's (2000) findings that experiences of frostiness and an alienating climate awaited women and minority faculty members. Does this also trickle down to female students? Those who play a role in academic advising should understand the roles of identity development related to gender, race, class, sexuality, and other populations, given the increased amounts of diversity within our student populations (Creamer, 2000; King, 2005; McKewen, 2003). Christian and Sprinkle (2013) found that gender influenced both student's perceptions and their ideals regarding academic advising, as males were more likely to prefer the prescriptive model of advising and showed no concern in having a motivational advisor or having an individualized schedule.

Ethnicity and Academic Advising

Questions also arise regarding race, ethnicity, and advising. Bahr (2008) raised the issue of whether the effects of academic advising were moderated by the race or ethnicity of the student. Research also indicated that racism may still be alive and well on college campuses, as African-American students were more likely to be subjected to negative stereotypes regarding their academic abilities (Bahr, 2004; Rankin & Reason, 2005; Davis et al, 2004). Mitchell, Wood, and Witherspoon (2010), in their analysis, listed three items of concern in the academic advising of minority students, including persistent patterns of low retention, low achievement, and low levels of satisfaction. It has also been reported that minority students attending college where they are the predominant minority report experiencing undue psychological stress (Strayhorn &

Saddler, 2009). Mentoring, loosely defined as both an informal and a formal process through which less experienced students are engaged in a supportive way by more experienced college faculty or staff members, is one way to help these students be more successful in their college endeavors (Strayhorn & Saddler, 2009). This ties back to Hollis (2009) and Bland (2003), who saw the developmental advising process being dependent upon a strong relationship between the student and advisor, which encouraged students to feel comfortable and to grow academically and professionally.

Locus of Control

Locus of control is considered to be a kindred concept with gender and ethnicity, as they are all considered personal characteristics of the individual. Locus of control can be defined as the extent to which we perceive control over our environment, and whether we control our fate or if outside forces control our fate (Myers, 2014). The concepts of internal versus external control evolved from social learning theory (Rotter, 1975). Those with an internal locus of control tend to take responsibility for their actions and achievements, while those with an external locus of control tend to place responsibility for actions and achievements upon others (Phares, 1976; Ramanaiah & Adams, 1981; Martin & Dixon, 1994; & Myers, 2014). What does this mean for college students and academic advising? It can influence a student's preference for developmental or collaborative advising versus prescriptive advising. Rotter (1965) reported findings, which indicated that when reinforcement was seen to be contingent upon one's own behaviors, people were more prone to taking social actions to better oneself, were more likely to remember and apply information relating to future goals, and showed more overall concern regarding their abilities and potential failures. He went on to report that

those who displayed a more internal locus of control seemed to have had a greater need for independence and is more resistant to subtle attempted influences (Rotter, 1965). Based on this, it can be construed that students with an internal locus of control will prefer the developmental or collaborative model of academic advising, and those with an external locus of control will prefer a prescriptive model of advising.

Otten (1977) reported that research indicates a positive relationship between academic performance and an internal locus of control. Dollinger (2000) wrote that his research findings were consistent with the literature in demonstrating that students with an internal locus of control are more likely than their external locus of control peers to be cognizant of relevant goals within the academic environment. According to Dollinger (2000), and supported by other research, those with an internal locus of control were more likely to acquire and use data pertinent to their goals even when that data may not have initially appeared relevant to their goals (Phares, 1976). This data seem to indicate that students with an internal locus of control will be more successful than their peers with an external locus of control. This may, in fact, not be the case. Otten (1977) found an interesting item in his research, which was that doctoral students who were classified as having an internal locus of control were more likely to either obtain their doctorate within five years or drop out, whereas those with an external locus of control were more likely to keep working after the five years. Again, this is a point where academic advising may play a key role. Perhaps those with an external locus of control who were experiencing a prescriptive form of advising were more susceptible to prompting to continue their studies.

Summary

Academic advising is both prevalent and has an impact on both the student and the college (Christian & Sprinkle, 2013). In fact, in nationwide surveys, students ranked academic advising as their second and third highest priority (Noel-Levitz, 2006; Noel-Levitz, 2012). The potential benefits of optimized academic advising are many, including overall improved student outcomes (Brock, 2010), retention and completion (Drake, 2011), student achievement (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005), and it connects students with learning opportunities (Campbell & Nutt, 2006). Unfortunately student satisfaction with academic advising has seen little research (Christian & Sprinkle, 2013). Hence, the need for further research regarding student preferences for academic advising.

Models of academic advising include the developmental (or collaborative) model and the prescriptive model (Crookston, 1972; McArthur, 2005). The prescriptive model views the advisor as the expert where the student has little or no input (Christian &Sprinkle, 2013). Some research indicates less positive outcomes for students (Tinto, 1993), while other research points to positives of prescriptive advising, including ease of course selection and ease of using a system students have been conditioned to through past experience (Feilstein, 1989; Pardee, 1994). The developmental model is seen as a tool of growth for the student that encourages comfort with academic and professional growth (Bland, 2003). Issues, however, include the time-intensive nature of developmental advising, exacerbated by large caseloads, as well as a lack of formal training (Gordon, 1994; Ender, 1994). This also hastens the need for further research, given the positive outcomes associated with developmental or collaborative advising and the focus on retention and completion.

Other characteristics also play a role in student's acceptance of and perceptions of academic advising. Gender roles can have an influence upon the academic advisor, and it plays a role in how the student perceives what is being said (Aguirre, 2000; Christian & Sprinkle, 2013). Other researchers have found gender differences in preferences of academic advising models utilized (Christian & Sprinkle, 2013). Ethnicity is another characteristic that plays a role in academic advising. Researchers have found that racism may indeed be alive and well on campus, including negative stereotypes regarding abilities (Bahr, 2004; Rankin & Reason, 2005; Davis et al, 2004), undue psychological stress (Strayhorn & Saddler, 2009), and low retention, low achievement, and low levels of satisfaction with academic advising (Witherspoon, 2010). A third characteristic that plays a role in academic advising is that of locus of control, which refers to the extent to which we perceive control over our environment and whether or not we control our own fate (Myers, 2014). Research indicates locus of control can be split up into either internal or external locus of control, depending upon whether the student sees themselves as having control over the academic advising environment, or if they view themselves as being controlled by the academic advising environment. This may have an impact upon the student's choice of developmental or prescriptive advising as an ideal model. It is also concern as to whether there is a positive or negative influence if there is no congruence between a student's locus of control and academic advising mode utilized. These characteristics also drive the need for further research into this arena of study.

Chapter III

Methodology

The primary focus of this study was to examine student satisfaction with academic advising at two-year colleges based upon the model of academic advising being utilized by the student's college. Additional information was obtained through analysis of the data based upon gender, ethnicity, and the age of the participants in ranges. This study examined three hypotheses in detail, as explained below.

First, it was hypothesized that students will show a preference for the developmental model of advising. As Christian and Sprinkle (2013) noted, a developmental or collaborative model involves both the student and the advisor in the decision-making process. It also encourages student growth and development academically and professionally (Bland, 2013). It is believed that students will want this process to be collaborative and a process that will help them grow and develop.

Second, it was hypothesized that male students will report a preference for the prescriptive model of academic advising. Christian and Sprinkle (2013) noted in their findings that male students showed a preference for the prescriptive advising model. Male students also were not really that concerned with an individualized schedule or having a motivational advisor (Christian and Sprinkle, 2013). This could simply be due to long-term exposure and conditioning It was theorized that this research will mirror Christian and Sprinkle's findings regarding male college students.

Third, it was hypothesized students will report advisors are utilizing the prescriptive model of advising. Based upon the researcher's experiences as a student and as a faculty member within the system, this is the model theorized to be prevalent system-

wide in MnSCU. Pardee (1994) talked about how students have become conditioned to this model of advising through long-term exposure. It was further theorized that the current collection of advisors may have been developed and conditioned within that system, and are themselves prescriptive advisors.

Subjects

Participants for this study were recruited from two public community and technical colleges in Minnesota State Colleges and Universities system (MnSCU). MnSCU is a connected system of all public colleges and universities within the state of Minnesota. The population sampled ranged from a large two-year college within a major metropolitan area to much smaller two-year college in out-state settings. Students were invited to complete the survey via email at their respective institutions. The study excluded students under 18 years of age.

Procedure for Data Collection

The research methodology chosen for this study was a cross-sectional survey research design. The survey was administered online, and students had the option to opt out. Data was collected via Qualtrics (www.qualtrics.com) and analyzed utilizing JASP.

Consent for participation in this research was provided as an introductory page that could be printed out by the student. By continuing on to the survey (see Appendix A), the student agreed to participate in the research, as well as stating that they were over the age of 18 years. All students had the ability to opt out at their convenience and by their choice. No coercion or extra credit was utilized to gain participation.

Instrumentation

The instrument utilized in this study is a 58-item questionnaire (see Appendix A) with two subscales: student perceptions and student ideals. It was an updated survey utilized by Christian and Sprinkle (2013). It was modified from Crookston's pioneering research (1972) into academic advising. Factor analyses were run by Christian and Sprinkle (2013) to determine conceptual fit of the scale items. Further, alphas were obtained and analyzed to ascertain instrument reliability (Christian & Sprinkle, 2013).

Procedure for Data Analysis

This research relied upon an examination of frequency data regarding nominal variables, such as type of advising utilized. Analyses sought out significant differences along the subscales across the demographic variables of age, gender, and ethnicity. This was executed via performance of a chi-square analysis on each of the three hypotheses in this study. Additionally, the data obtained regarding semesters completed were examined through a Pearson product moment correlation.

Chapter IV

Results

Demographic Characteristics

One hundred ninety-eight participants from two institutions of higher learning representing both major metropolitan and out-state colleges responded to an invitation to complete a brief survey. One institution was a community college located in metropolitan Minneapolis, Minnesota, with an enrollment of 14,197 students. The other institution was a community and technical college in outstate Minnesota, with an enrollment of 5,481 students. Of these, 18 participants submitted incomplete surveys and another three participants self-reported as being 17 years of age. Consequently, responses from 177 participants were utilized in the analysis of data.

Forty participants (22.9%) reported as male, and 130 participants (73%) reported as female. Seven participants (4.0%) chose not to respond to this question. participants were also asked to self-select their race/ethnicity. One hundred thirty-four participants (75.7%) reported their race/ethnicity as White/Caucasian. Twenty-one participants (11.9%) reported their race/ethnicity as Black/African-American. Fourteen participants (7.9%) reported their race/ethnicity as Latino/Hispanic. Three participants (1.7%) reported their race/ethnicity as Asian/Pacific Islander. Two participants (1.1%) reported their race/ethnicity as Multiracial. Three participants (1.7%) reported their race/ethnicity as other. participants reported a mean age was of 26.6 years (SD =11.45).

Participants were asked to report their number of completed semesters at the time of completion of the survey. Seventy-two participants (41%) reported being in or having completed one semester of college. Fifty-three participants (30%) reported being in or

having completed two semesters of college. Finally, fifty-two participants (29%) reported having completed three or more semesters of college.

Participants were asked to report their current major of study. For the purposes of this study, these majors were separated into two categories: liberal arts majors and technical majors. Sixty-four participants (36%) reported having a liberal arts-focused major. One hundred and eleven participants (63%) reported having a technical-focused major. Two participants (1%) chose not to answer this question.

Participants were asked to report the advising type currently provided to them by their respective institution. Ninety-nine participants (56%) reported receiving academic advising from advisors housed in student affairs at their respective institutions. Sixty-two participants (35%) reported receiving academic advising from faculty advisors. Finally 16 (9%) participants reported receiving academic advising from other advisors, including Student Support Services, TRIO, and others (see Table 1).

Table 1: Population Demographics

Gender	Male: 22.5% N = 40	Female: 73.0% N = 130	Not Reported: 4.0% N = 7			
Ethnicity	African-American: 11.9% N = 21	Caucasian: 75.7% N = 134	Hispanic /Latino: 7.9% N = 14	Multi-racial: 1.1% N = 2	Asian/Pacific Islander: 1.7% N = 3	Other: 1.7% N = 3
Age	Mean: 26.463	Range: 17 - 100				
Semesters Completed	Mean: 1.881	Range: 1 - 5	41% ≤ 1 Semester N = 72	30% ≤ 2 Semesters N = 53	29% ≥ 3 Semesters N = 52	
Advising	Faculty Advisor /Major: 36% N = 62	General Advising: 56% N = 99	Special Programs: 9% N = 16			
Student Major	Liberal Arts: 36% N = 64	Technical: 64 % N = 111	Other 1% N = 2			

Student Perceptions and Ideals

Participants were asked to complete a two-part 58-item questionnaire (see Appendix A), which examined students' current perceptions of academic advising, as well as student ideals regarding what they see as an ideal academic advising model that would best serve them in the future. The first part of the instrument consisted of 29 statements that examined the participant's current perceptions regarding academic advising. The second half of the instrument consisted of 29 statements that examined the participant's ideals regarding academic advising.

It was hypothesized that students would show a preference for the developmental model of academic advising. The subscale measuring student preferences (see Appendix A) utilized a four-point response system, with a response of one or two indicating a preference for the prescriptive model, and a response of three or four indicating a preference for the developmental model. Results indicated that participants showed a strong preference for the developmental model of advising ($98\%^{D}$, $2\%^{P}$; $M = 2.261$; $SD = 0.48$). The ideals subscale utilized a two-point response system, meaning participant's responses of 1 indicated a preference for the prescriptive model and a response of 2 indicated a preference for the developmental model (see Appendix A). Responses in the subscale measuring ideals also indicated a unanimous preference for the developmental model as their ideal model ($100\%^{D}$, $0\%^{P}$; $M = 1.353$; $SD = 0.17$); (see Table 2).

It was hypothesized that male students would show a preference for the prescriptive model of academic advising. Results from the perceptions subscale indicated that male participants showed a preference for the developmental model of academic advising ($69\%^{D}$, $30\%^{P}$; $M = 2.281$; $SD = 0.1365$). Results from the ideals subset indicated

that male participants showed a strong preference for the developmental model of academic advising as their ideal model (79 %^{D}, 17%^{P}; M = 1.362; SD = 0.0681); (see Table 2).

It was hypothesized that students would report their current advisors are utilizing a prescriptive model of academic advising. Results from the perceptions subsection of the survey indicated that participants viewed their current academic advising model as being a developmental model (76%^{D}, 24%^{P}; M = 2.261; SD = 0.48). Additionally, results from the ideals subsection also indicated that participants viewed their ideal academic advising model as being a developmental model (100%^{D}, 0%^{P}; M = 1.797; SD = 0.40). Individual scores by gender further supported the view of the current academic advising model being developmental in nature. Male scores indicated that participants viewed their current academic advising model as being a developmental model (Perceptions: 77%^{D}, 23%^{P}; M = 2.280; SD = 0.1365; Ideals: 100%^{D}, 0%^{P}; M = 1.362, SD = 0.0681). Female scores indicated that participants viewed their current academic advising model as being a developmental model (75%^{D}, 25%^{P}; M = 2.255; SD = 0.1259; Ideals: 100%^{D}, 0%^{P}; M = 1.351, SD = 0.0688).

Table 2: Analysis of Hypothesis Data

Hypothesis 1: Students will show a preference for the developmental model of academic advising.

Subset	N	Developmental N	Prescriptive N	M	SD
Current Perceptions	177	N = 174, (98%)	N = 3, (2%)	2.261	0.48
Ideals	177	N = 177, (100%)	N = 0, (0%)	1.353	0.17

Hypothesis 2: Male students will show a preference for the prescriptive model of academic advising.

Subset	N	Developmental N	Prescriptive N	M	SD
Current Perceptions	40	N = 28, (69%)	N = 12, (30%)	2.281	0.1365
Ideals	40	N = 32, (79%)	N = 8 , (21%)	1.362	0.0681

Hypothesis 3: Students will report their current advisors are utilizing a prescriptive model of academic advising.

Subset	N	Developmental	Prescriptive N	M	SD
Current Perceptions	177	N = 134, (76%)	N = 43, (24%)	2.261	0.48
Ideals	177	N = 177, (100%)	N = 0, (0%)	1.353	0.17

Analysis of Perceptions and Ideals Subsets

A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine whether there were differences between gender and participant's perceptions and ideals regarding the developmental model of academic advising. For perceptions, differences between these variables was non-significant, X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.826, $p > 0.05$. There was no apparent difference between gender and perceptions regarding the developmental model of academic advising. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the difference between gender and participant's ideals for the developmental model of academic advising. Regarding ideals, differences between these variables was also non-

significant, X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.868, $p > 0.05$. There was no apparent difference between gender and the participant's ideals regarding the developmental model of advising.

A chi-square test of independence was also performed to examine differences between race/ethnicity and participant's perceptions and ideals regarding the developmental model of academic advising. For perceptions, differences between these variables were non-significant, X^2 (5, N = 177) = 0.489, $p > 0.05$. Similarly, regarding the ideals subset, differences between race/ethnicity and the developmental model of academic advising was non-significant X^2 (5, N = 177) = 0.451, $p > 0.05$. There were no apparent difference between race/ethnicity and the developmental model of academic advising.

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was performed to examine relationships between participant's semesters completed and their perceptions regarding the developmental model of academic advising. For perceptions, a negative relationship was found between semesters completed and perceptions, r = -0.175, $p < 0.05$. For ideals, relationships were non-significant, r = 0.074, $p > 0.05$. There is a relationship between numbers of semesters completed and participant's perceptions of the developmental model of academic advising.

A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine differences between participant's perceptions and current academic advising regarding the developmental model of academic advising. For perceptions, differences were non-significant, X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.356, $p > 0.05$. For ideals, differences were significant, X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.007, $p < 0.05$. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine differences between participant's ideals and of current academic advising regarding the

developmental model of academic advising. There is no apparent difference between perceptions of current academic advising and the developmental model of academic advising. There appears to be a difference between ideals regarding current academic advising and the developmental model of academic advising (see Table 3).

Table 3: Analysis of Perceptions and Ideals Subsets

Gender:		
	Perceptions	$X^2(2, N = 177) = 0.826, p > 0.05$
	Ideals	$X^2(2, N = 177) = 0.868, p > 0.05$
Ethnicity:		
	Perceptions	$r = -0.175, p < 0.05$
	Ideals	$r = 0.074, p > 0.05$
Semesters Completed:		
	Perceptions	$X^2(2, N = 177) = 0.032, p < 0.05$*
	Ideals	$X^2(2, N = 177) = 0.558, p > 0.05$
Current Advising Model:		
	Perceptions	$X^2(2, N = 177) = 0.007, p < 0.01$**
	Ideals	$X^2(2, N = 177) = 0.356, p > 0.05$

Analysis of Questions

Perceptions

A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine differences between participant's gender and their perceptions regarding the developmental model of academic advising. Question 15 results indicate differences were significant, X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.001, $p < 0.05$. Question 24 results indicate differences were significant, X^2 (2, N

= 177) = 0.020, $p < 0.05$. All other questions revealed differences that were not significant (see Table 4). Of those found to be significant, males and females rated these questions higher equally, at 75% each.

A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine differences between participant's ethnicity and their current perceptions regarding the developmental model of academic advising. Question 21 results indicate differences were significant, X^2 (5, N = 177) = 0.038, $p < 0.05$. Question 23 results indicate differences were significant, X^2 (5, N = 177) = 0.001, $p < 0.05$. Question 27 results indicate differences were significant, X^2 (5, N = 177) = 0.013, $p < 0.05$. Question 28 results indicate differences were significant, X^2 (5, N = 177) = 0.010, $p < 0.05$. All other questions revealed differences that were not significant (see Table 4). A further examination of these found to be significant revealed that 88% of Caucasians, 71% of Latino/Hispanics, 62% of African-Americans, and 100% of those in the categories of Asian/Pacific Islanders, multiracial, and other rated these questions highly.

Table 4: Preferences Analysis by Gender and Ethnicity and Individual Questions

Each question is a "forced choice" with an answer of 1 or 2 denoting a preference for the first statement, and an answer of 3 or 4 denoting a preference for the second statement.

Gender Analysis		**Results**
Question 15: My advisor is more interested in research or teaching than advising.	Advising is as important to my advisor as other duties.	X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.001, $p < 0.01$**
Question 24: I chose my major because I find it interesting.	I chose my major because I needed to pick a major and finish college.	X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.020, $p < 0.05$*
Ethnicity Analysis		
Question 21: I am concerned with having a good schedule of classes that fit the time I want to meet.	I am concerned with having classes I need to graduate.	X^2 (5, N = 177) = 0.038, $p < 0.05$*
Question 23: I chose my major because I find it interesting.	I chose my major because I thought the classes were easy.	X^2 (5, N = 177) = 0.001, $p < 0.01$**
Question 27: I am interested in obtaining the skills I need for a career.	I am interested in graduating.	X^2 (5, N = 177) = 0.013, $p < 0.05$
Question 28: I am interested in learning as much as I can about my chosen profession.	I am interested in learning what I need to "get by" and pass the class.	X^2 (5, N = 177) = 0.010, p <5

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was performed to examine relationships between participant's semesters completed and their perceptions regarding the developmental model of academic advising. Question 2 results indicate a positive correlation, $r = 0.161$, $p < 0.05$. Question 6 results indicate a negative correlation, $r = -0.152$, $p < 0.05$. Question 12 results indicate a positive correlation, $r = 0.150$, $p < 0.05$. These findings indicate a relationship between semesters completed and current perceptions regarding the topics of the questions with significance. All other questions revealed relationships that were not significant (see Table 5).

A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine differences between participant's current academic advising model and their perceptions regarding the developmental model of academic advising. Question 1 results indicate differences were

significant, X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.035, $p < 0.05$. Question 2 results indicate differences were significant, X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.014, $p < 0.05$. Question 3 results indicate differences were significant, X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.031, $p < 0.05$. Question 4 results indicate differences were significant, X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.006, $p < 0.05$. Question 12 results indicate differences were significant, X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.048, $p < 0.05$. Question 13 results indicate differences were significant, X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.047, $p < 0.05$. Question 14 results indicate differences were significant, X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.001, $p < 0.05$. Question 17 results indicate differences were significant, X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.009, $p < 0.05$. Question 18 results indicate differences were significant, X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.005, $p < 0.05$. All other questions revealed differences that were not significant (see Table 5). These findings indicate their perceptions of their current academic advising model aligns with the developmental model.

Table 5: Preference Analysis by Semesters Completed and Current Academic Advising Model and Individual Questions

Each question is a "forced choice" with an answer of 1 or 2 denoting a preference for the first statement and an answer of 3 or 4 denoting a preference for the second statement.

Semesters Completed Analysis		
Question 6: My advisor ensures I get into the classes I need. It is my responsibility to ensure I get into the classes I need.	It is my responsibility to ensure I get into the classes I need.	$r = -0.152$, $p < 0.05$
Question 12: My advisor is available at any time during the academic year for questions.	My advisor is only available to me during the department's advising times.	$r = 0.150$, $p < 0.05$
Current Academic Advising Model Analysis		
Question 1: My advisor picks the classes I need to take.	My advisor and I choose classes together.	X^2 $(2, N = 177) = 0.035$, $p < 0.05$*
Question 2: My advisor motivates me.	My advisor does not motivate me.	X^2 $(2, N = 177) = 0.014$, $p < 0.05$*
Question 3: My advisor is motivated by me.	My advisor seems indifferent to me.	X^2 $(2, N = 177) = 0.031$, $p < 0.05$*
Question 4: My advisor ensures my requirements for graduation are met.	It is my responsibility to ensure my requirements for graduation are met.	X^2 $(2, N = 177) = 0.006$, $p < 0.01$**
Question 12: My advisor is available at any time during the academic year for questions.	My advisor is only available to me during the department's advising times.	X^2 $(2, N = 177) = 0.048$, $p < 0.05$*
Question 13: My advisor tells me what I need to take and when.	It is my responsibility to know what I need to take and when.	X^2 $(2, N = 177) = 0.047$, $p < 0.05$*
Question 14: My advisor is also a mentor to me.	My advisor does not mentor me.	X^2 $(2, N = 177) = 0.001$, $p < 0.01$**
Question 17: I can discuss things other than school with my advisor.	I cannot discuss things other than school with my advisor.	X^2 $(2, N = 177) = 0.009$, $p < 0.01$**
Question 18: My advisor helped me develop a plan of study.	I developed my plan of study alone.	X^2 $(2, N = 177) = 0.005$, $p < 0.01$**

Ideals

A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine differences between respondent's gender and their ideals regarding the developmental model of academic advising. All questions revealed differences that were not significant.

A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine differences between respondent's ethnicity and their ideals regarding the developmental model of academic advising. Question 21 results indicate differences were significant, X^2 $(5, N = 177) = 0.051$, $p < 0.05$. Question 27 results indicate differences were significant, X^2 $(5, N = 177) = 0.045$, $p < 0.05$. Question 28 results indicate differences were significant, X^2 $(5, N =$

177) = 0.040, $p < 0.05$. All other questions revealed differences that were not significant (see Table 6).

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was performed to examine relationships between participant's semesters completed and their perceptions regarding the developmental model of academic advising. Question 1 results indicate a positive relationship, $r = 0.030$, $p < 0.05$. All other questions revealed differences that were not significant (see Table 6). There is a relationship between numbers of semesters completed and participant's perceptions of the developmental model of academic advising.

Table 6: Ideal Analysis by Semesters Completed and Ethnicity and Individual Questions

Each question is a "forced choice" with an answer of 1 or 2 denoting a preference for the first statement or the second statement.		
Semesters Completed Analysis		
Question 1: My advisor picks the classes I need to take.	My advisor and I choose classes together.	$r = 0.030$, $p < 0.05$*
Ethnicity Analysis		
Question 21: I am concerned with having a good schedule classes that fits the times I want to meet.	I am concerned with having classes I need to graduate.	X^2 (5, $N = 177$) = 0.051, $p < 0.05$*
Question 27: I am interested in obtaining the skills I need for a career.	I am interested in graduating.	X^2 (5, $N = 177$) = 0.045, $p < 0.05$*
Question 28: I am interested in learning as much as I can about my chosen profession.	I am interested in learning what I need to "get by" and passed the class.	X^2 (5, $N = 177$) = 0.040, $p < 0.05$*

A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine differences between participant's current academic advising model and their ideals regarding the developmental model of academic advising. Question 2 results indicate differences were significant, X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.004, $p < 0.05$. Question 3 results indicate differences were significant, X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.002, $p < 0.05$. Question 8 results indicate differences were significant, X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.006, $p < 0.05$. Question 11 results indicate differences were significant, X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.015, $p < 0.05$. Question 13 results indicate differences were significant, X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.025, $p < 0.05$. Question 14 results indicate differences were significant, X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.001, $p < 0.05$. Question 17 results indicate differences were significant, X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.016, $p < 0.05$. Question 18 results indicate differences were significant, X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.001, $p < 0.05$. Question 19 results indicate differences were significant, X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.007, $p < 0.05$. Question 29 results indicate differences were significant, X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.049, $p < 0.05$. All other questions revealed differences that were not significant (see Table 7).

Table 7: Ideals Analysis by Semesters Completed and Current Academic Advising Model and Individual Questions

Each question is a "forced choice" with an answer of 1 or 2 denoting a preference for the first statement, and an answer of 3 or 4 denoting a preference for the second statement.

Current Academic Advising Model Analysis		
Question 2:My advisor motivates me.	My advisor does not motivate me.	X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.004, $p < 0.01$**
Question 3: My advisor is motivated by me.	My advisor seems indifferent to me.	X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.002, $p < 0.01$**
Question 8: My advisor makes me feel like I can pursue any career and succeed.	My advisor makes me feel inadequate.	X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.006, $p < 0.01$**
Question 11: My advisor keeps up with his/her responsibilities.	My advisor often does not keep up with his/her responsibilities.	X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.015, $p < 0.05$*
Question 13: My advisor tells me what I need to take and when.	It is my responsibility to know what I need to take and when.	X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.025, $p < 0.05$*
Question 14: My advisor is also a mentor to me.	My advisor does not mentor me.	X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.001, $p < 0.01$**
Question 17: I can discuss things other than school with my advisor.	I cannot discuss things other than school with my advisor.	X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.016, $p < 0.05$*
Question 18: My advisor helped me to develop a plan of study.	I developed my plan of study alone.	X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.001, $p < 0.05$
Question 19: My advisor will help me find employment after graduation.	My advisor will not will help me find employment after graduation.	X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.007, $p < 0.05$
Question 29: I take classes based on whether they are interesting to me.	I take classes based on whether I have to have them to graduate.	X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.049, $p < 0.05$

Summary

Overall, data from 177 participants were examined in this study. Of these participants, almost three-quarters of participants were female. In this same vein, three-quarter of participants were Caucasian, and about one quarter were multiracial and/or persons of color. A fairly even split was reported regarding semesters completed, with 41 percent selecting one semester, 30 percent selecting two semesters, and 29 percent selecting three or more semesters. Over 63 percent of participants reported having a technical education major, while about 36 percent reported having a liberal arts major. Fifty-six percent of participants reported receiving centralized advising, while 35 percent

reported receiving academic advising from faculty members. Nine percent of participants reported receiving academic advising from other advisors on campus. Participants completed a two-part questionnaire with a total of 58 items. The first subset of questions examined participant's current perceptions of academic advising, and the second examined participant's ideals regarding academic advising. The subsets examined participant's preferences and ideals for the developmental model of academic advising versus the prescriptive model of academic advising.

Results indicated an overwhelming preference for the collaborative developmental model of academic advising regarding current perceptions (98%), suggesting that most participants viewed their current academic advising as being developmental in nature. Similarly, participants reported an overwhelming preference for the developmental model of academic advising regarding their ideals for academic advising (100%), indicating that participants see their ideal academic model as being developmental in nature. Furthermore, regarding the second hypothesis, male participants showed a preference for the developmental model in both current perceptions (69%) and ideals (79%) subsets. Regarding the third hypothesis, participants reported their perceptions that their current academic advisors were utilizing a developmental model (76%), and in their ideals (100%) regarding academic advising. Male and female participant's individual scores echoed the overall findings.

A chi-square analysis of the subsets revealed no differences between most subsets. Gender and preferences and ideals for the developmental model of advising, race/ethnicity and participant perceptions and ideals regarding preferences and ideals for the developmental model of advising, and semesters completed and participant

perceptions and ideals regarding preferences and ideals for the developmental model of advising revealed no differences. Regarding current academic advising models, no differences were discovered between it and participant perceptions regarding preferences for the developmental model of advising. However, differences were discovered between current academic advising models and ideals regarding the developmental advising model.

A chi-square analysis of individual questions revealed differences among some subsets and participant's preferences. Differences were found among gender, ethnicity, semesters complete, and academic advising model utilized. A chi-square analysis of individual questions revealed differences among some subsets and participant's ideals. Differences were found among ethnicity, semesters complete, and current academic advising model.

Chapter V

Discussion

Academic advising can take on many facets at two-year colleges today. It can be described as prescriptive or developmental, each of which can be portrayed as impacting student success in different ways (Lowenstein, 2005; Crookston, 1972). There are also different structures of academic advising, including centralized, decentralized, or a mix of the two (Pardee, 2010; Habley, 2004). Building upon this, students may also experience academic advising from a faculty member, an academic advisor, or from advisors within special programs such as the TRIO program. There are also good and bad academic advisors that impact the student experience within the educational system (Ryan, 2013).

Given these factors relating to successful academic advising that could be examined, this study examined the perceptions and ideals of students in regard to academic advising models. Specifically, it examined whether respondent's preferences and ideals showed a preference for the developmental model of academic advising or the prescriptive model of academic advising. Data were harvested from 177 students representing two two-year colleges in the state of Minnesota. The results of this study could be meaningful in building an understanding of student satisfaction with academic advising in relation to retention and completion rates of students. Additionally, it could provide both information and awareness to campuses in regards to their academic advising practices both past and future.

Summary of Findings

In this study, results indicated participants showed a preference for the developmental model of academic advising. These results supported predicted outcomes.

These findings indicate that, overall, both the participants' perceptions of academic advising and their ideals regarding academic advising involve a developmental approach to academic advising.

Similarly, male participants indicated an overwhelming preference for the developmental model of academic advising in both the preferences subset and the ideals subset in the survey. These results were contrary to predicted outcomes, and indicate that the male participant's perceptions of academic advising and their ideals of academic advising involve a developmental approach to academic advising. Current advisors were reported by participants as typically utilizing a developmental model of advising. Additionally, participants reported that this preference was congruent with their ideal advising.

The outcomes of chi-square analyses indicated no difference between gender and the developmental model of academic advising in preferences or ideals. This indicates there is no evidence of differences between gender and the developmental model of academic advising, meaning that gender cannot be conclusively said to be a determinant of choice regarding types of academic models. Additionally, no relationship was indicated between race/ethnicity and the developmental model of academic advising in preferences or ideals. This indicates there is no evidence of a relationship between race/ethnicity and the developmental model of academic advising, meaning that race/ethnicity cannot be conclusively said to be a determinant of choice regarding types of academic models.

However, regarding semesters completed, outcomes indicated a mild negative correlation between semesters completed and the developmental model of academic

advising regarding respondent's perceptions. This indicates that the number of completed semesters may influence the respondent's perceptions of the developmental model of academic advising. There was no relationship between the number of semesters completed and the developmental model of academic advising regarding respondent's ideals. This indicates that the number of semesters completed cannot be said to impact respondent's ideals regarding academic models utilized.

Finally, regarding current advising models, there was a strong relationship between respondent ideals regarding academic advising models currently utilized and the developmental model of academic advising. This indicates that the current academic advising model being utilized may influence the respondent's ideals regarding the developmental model of academic advising. There was no relationship between respondent's perceptions regarding academic models utilized and the developmental model of academic advising. This indicates that current academic models being utilized cannot be said to influence respondent's perceptions regarding the developmental model of academic advising.

An analysis of the data question-by-question relating to the variables of gender, ethnicity, semesters completed, and current advising model revealed some relationships.

Implications

The implications of this study are substantial, but may prove problematic to put into action. In this study, a large proportion of participants reported a preference for the developmental model of academic advising, as well as reporting this model to be their ideal model of academic advising. In light of these findings and corollary factors such as

cost, how does one move a college from a prescriptive model of academic advising to a developmental model of academic advising? This is the big question.

The purpose of this study was to investigate academic advising models currently utilized through looking at student's perceptions of current advising and their ideals regarding what they would like as a model of academic advising. The developmental model of academic advising, which is a collaborative model (Hester, 2008; Crookston, 1972), was overwhelmingly both the preference and ideal as reported by participants. This model directly involves the student as an active participant in the process, and is concerned with helping the student grow their skills and abilities in problem-solving, decision-making, interpersonal interactions, and rational processes (Hester, 2008; Crookston, 1972). But, as Hale, Graham, and Johnson (2009) found, congruence between the student's preferred style of advising and the actual academic advising model is very important to retention and success. This developmental process of advising is also much more time-consuming on behalf of the student and the advisor, involving frequent and multiple meetings and interactions. Gordon and Ender, in separate studies (1994), noted that weaknesses to the developmental model included caseload sizes, time spent advising each student, a lack of training, and increased out-of-class expectations for faculty advisors. This is still an issue today.

A major implication is that two-year colleges may be able to improve their retention and completion rates through a focus on the student through changes to academic advising at the college. Imagine a world where a two-year college was able to retain students after the first semester or the first year. Students paying tuition is

considered generation of revenue. As Sutton and Sankar (2011) found, it is cheaper to retain current students than to recruit new students.

It may well be time to try and convince the administrators of two year colleges to invest time, effort, and money in acquiring sufficient numbers of academic advisors, training these acquisitions and others on campus who advise students, and coordinating this advising so that students are getting the same message from everyone. This training is important, as student complaints regarding academic advising include inaccurate information, a lack of knowledge of college offerings, limited time with their advisors, overwhelmed advisors, and a lack of sharing of resources (McCuen, Gulash, Gifford, & Srikantaiah, 2009; Haag et al, 2007). How does one convince a college to invest money for a pay-off that may be several years down the road in this time of public accountability and financial struggles? It would be an investment in the student's educational experience, as thriving institutions focus on three basic things: student satisfaction data-driven decision making, focusing on student needs, and continuous improvement of the student's educational experience (Low, 2000).

Strengths and Limitations

This study displayed five main strengths. First, the developmental model of academic advising is a concurrent theme of both participants' current perceptions and ideals. The developmental model of academic advising seemed to be an underlying theme found throughout the study. It manifested itself in both perceptions and ideals of participants. In addition, there is a connection between the participant's current advising model and the developmental model of academic advising. Second, current advisors are utilizing the developmental model of academic advising. Participants reported that a large

proportion of their academic advisors are utilizing this model currently. This means that academic advisors seem to be involving their advisees in the process rather than simply dictating to the student what they need to do. This involvement in the process will hopefully give students a sense of buy-in into the process and their educational careers.

Third, there appears to be a relationship between semesters completed and the developmental model of academic advising. This seems to indicate that the more semesters completed, the higher the probability of there being a preference for the developmental model of academic advising. This finding seems to speak to experiences driving students toward a model that is more conducive in regards to involving the student in the process. Fourth, there is a relationship between current advising models and the developmental model of academic advising. Again, current respondent experiences appear to push students toward the developmental model of academic advising.

Fifth, this study has contributed to the overall body of data in regard to academic advising and academic advising models. As reported earlier, there has been little research actually carried out on this topic (Christian & Sprinkle, 2013). Even with several hypotheses not being supported, this study generated a wealth of data regarding academic advising at two-year colleges in Minnesota.

This study also had three limitations. First, the sample size was relatively small in proportion to the total number of two-year college students available. Many two-year institutions of higher learning that were invited chose to not participate in this study, or never responded at all to requests. Other institutions wanted to either edit the survey, choose the students, or had other requests that went beyond the scope of the research, and

were thus excluded from participation. Second, the study examined two-year colleges, so it is not necessarily applicable to four-year institutions of higher learning. Another issue was the somewhat limited scope of the research. By limiting it to two-year colleges in Minnesota, it excludes a general transferability of findings to four-year colleges in Minnesota. Even though four-year colleges may be experiencing the same issues, because they were excluded, the data really does not directly serve them. Finally, by limiting the research to colleges within Minnesota, there is a question of data transfer to other colleges outside Minnesota. There could be a state-specific system that could influence outcomes of the research that might not be in place in other states.

Third, a final issue is that of demographic data being incomplete. The demographic information failed to capture the name of the institution participants attended for the most part, leaving a comparison analysis of in-state metro two-year college data to rural two-year college data unfinished. Better planning and thought by the researcher could have allowed further data analysis and comparison between a large metro two-year college and a much smaller rural two-year college.

Recommendations for Future Research

Given the outcomes of the current study, and knowing the strengths and weaknesses therein, three recommendations can be made for future research. First, the study needs to be replicated in a manner that leads to a larger and more varied sample encompassing many regions both in and out of the state of Minnesota. Building the numbers of participants will allow a truer picture of the data to come to light. This will aid in generalizability across institutions and across colleges, meaning that it would have meaning beyond the Minnesota state college system to other colleges and states.

Second, this replication should also include four-year colleges within the sample pool, allowing both more generalization of outcomes and alternatively allowing comparisons of congruency across two and four year colleges. It would also concurrently build on the size of the sample. This would also help to give an understanding of academic advising models utilized at various four-year colleges. Alternatively, this study could be carried out within the four-year college setting only to examine academic advising at these institutions.

Third, any replication of the study should include more clearly defined demographic information to allow for more data analysis. This would allow comparisons of groups within the sample from different regions or metropolitan areas. It would also allow an analysis of each institution of higher learning that chose to participate in the study.

Several mitigating factors played a role in the sample size of this research. First, MnSCU, the umbrella under which all state colleges in Minnesota function, refused to distribute the survey via their "all students" email tool. Second, while all two-year colleges were contacted, several refused to participate via email, and many others simply did not participate or bother to respond to the researcher. Third, one college wanted to review the survey and pick which students actually participated in the research. These factors raise the question as to why individual institutions of higher learning would refuse to participate in research, and why MnSCU as an organization would choose to not participate. Future research, to be truly relevant, needs to be carried out throughout the system.

References

Aguirre, A. (2000). Women and minority faculty in the academic workplace: Recruitment, retention, and academic culture. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 27,*1-141. Washington, DC: George Washington University School of Education and Human Development.

Bahr, P. R. (2008). Cooling out in the community college: What is the effect of academic advising on students? *Research in Higher Education, 49*, 704-732.

Bean, J. P. & Bradley, R. K. (1986).Untangling the satisfaction-performance relationship for college students. *Journal of Higher Education, 57*, 393-412.

Bland, S. (2003). Advising adults: Telling or coaching. *Adult Learning, 14*, 1-6.

Boylan, H. (2009). Targeted intervention for developmental education students. *Journal of Developmental Education, 32*, 14-23.

Bozick, R., & Ingels, S. (2008). Mathematics coursetaking and achievement at the end of high school: Evidence from educational longitudinal study of 2002. *National Center for Education Statistics Statistical Analysis Report.* U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC.

Braxton, J.M. & McClendon, S. A. (2001).The fostering of social integration and retention through institutional practice. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory, and Practice*, *3*, 57-71.

Broadbridge, A. (1996). Academic advising- traditional or developmental approaches: Student perspectives. *British Journal of Guidance & Counseling*, *24*, 96-97.

Brock, T. (2010). Young adults and higher education: Barriers and breakthroughs to success. *The Future of Children, 20,* 109-132.

Campbell, S. M. & Nutt, C. L. (2006). Academic advising in the new global century: Supporting student engagement and learning outcomes achievement. *Peer Review, 10*, 4-7.

CCSSE. (2013). A matter of degrees: High impact practices for community college engagement. Austin, TX.

Chao, R. C. and Nath, S. R. (2011). The role of ethnic identity, gender roles, and multicultural training in college counselors' multicultural counseling competence: A mediation model. *Journal of College Counseling, 14*, 50-64.

Chickering, A. W.& Gamson, Z. F. (1987). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *AAHE Bulletin, 39*, 3-7.

Christian, T. Y. & Sprinkle, J. E. (2013). College student perceptions and ideals of advising: An exploratory analysis. *College Student Journal, 47*, 271-291.

Corts, D. P., Loundsbury, J.W., Saudgras, J. W., Tatum, R. A., & Holly, E. (2000). Assessing undergraduate satisfaction with an academic department: A method and case study. *College Student Journal, 34,* 399-408.

Creamer, D. (2000). Use of theory in academic advising. In V.N. Gordon & W. R. Habley (Eds.), Academic Advising: A Comprehensive Handbook. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

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

Cuseo, J. B. (n.d.). Academic advisement and student retention: Empirical connections and systematic interventions. Retrieved from http://www.geocities.ws /jccadjunct/advret.html.

Cuseo, J. B. (1997). Freshman orientation seminar at community colleges: A research-based rationale for its value, content, and delivery.

Davis, M., Dias-Bowie, Y., Greenberg, K., Klukken, G., Pollio, H. R., & Thomas, S. P. (2004). A fly in the buttermilk: Descriptions of university life by successful black undergraduate students at a predominately white southeastern university. *Journal of Higher Education, 75,* 420-445.

Definition of academic advising. (2014). Retrieved from Minnesota State University, Mankato. http://www.mnsu.edu/academics/advising.

Digest of Education Statistics. http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d12/tables/dt12_224.asp

Dollinger, S. J. (2000). Locus of control and incidental learning: An application to college student success. *College Student Journal, 34,* 537-541.

Drake, J. K. (2011). The role of academic advising in student retention and persistence. *About Campus,* 8-12.

Fielstein, L. L. (1989). Developmental versus prescriptive advising: Must it be one or the other? *NACADA Journal,* 9, 33-38.

Fowler, P. R., & Boylan, H. R. (2010). Increasing student success and retention: A multidimensional approach. *Journal of Developmental Education, 34*, 2-10.

Frost, S. (1991). Academic advising for student success: A system of shared responsibility. Washington: George Washington University Press.

Gerdes, H., & Mallinckrodt, B. (1994). Emotional, social, and academic adjustment of college students: A longitudinal study of retention. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 72*, 281-288.

Glennen, R. E., Farren, P. J., & Vowell, F. N. (1996).How advising and retention of students improves fiscal responsibility. NACADA Journal, 9, 25-30.

Haag, S., Hubele, N., Garcia, A., & McBeath, K. (2007). Engineering undergraduate attrition and contributing factors. *International Journal of Engineering Education, 23*, 929-940.

Habley, W. R. (2004). The status of academic advising: Findings from the ACT sixth national survey. *NACADA Monograph Series, 10.* Manhattan KS: National Academic Advising Association.

Hale, M. D., Graham, D. L., & Johnson, D. M. (2009). Are students more satisfied with academic advising when there is congruence between current and preferred advising styles. *College Student Journal, 43,* 313-324.

Harrison, E. (2009). Faculty perceptions of academic advising: "I don't get no respect!*" Nursing Education Perspectives*, 30, 229-233.

Hester, E. J. (2008). Student evaluations of advising: Moving beyond the mean. *College Teaching, 56*, 35-38

Heisserer, D. & Parrette, P. (2002). Advising at-risk students in college and university settings. *College Student Journal, 36*, 69-84.

Hollis, L. (2009). Academic advising in the wonderland of college for developmental students. College Student Journal, 43, 1-6.

Horn, L. (2005). Waiting to attend college: Undergraduates who delay their postsecondary enrollment. National Center for Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC.

Jain, R., Shanahan, B., & Roe, C. (2009). Broadening the appeal of engineering:

Addressing factors contributing to low appeal and high attrition. *Journal of Engineering Education, 25*, 405-418.

Johnson, E., & Morgan, B. (2005). Advice on advising: Improving a comprehensive university's program. *T)eaching of Psychology, 32*, 15 – 18.

King, M. C. (2005). Developmental academic advising. Retrieved from NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising. Retrieved February 19, 2015 from Http://www. nacada.ksu.edu/tabid/3318/articleType/ArticleView/articleld/264/article.aspx.

Kuhn, T. L. (2011). Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook. In Gordon, V & Habley, W. (Eds.), *Academic Advising: A Comprehensive Handbook*, 3-16. NJ: Wiley.

Laanan, F. S. (2000). Community college students' career and educational goals. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 112*, 19-34.

Lau, L. K. (2003). Institutional factors affecting student retention. *Education, 124,* 126-136.

Legutko, R. S. (2006). Students grade their professors: An evaluation of a college faculty's advising by its graduating seniors. *The Mentor, 4.* Retrieved February 6, 2015 from http:/dus.psu.edu/mentor

Light, R. J. (2001). Making the most of college: Students speak their minds. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Low, L. (2000). Are college students satisfied? A national analysis of changing expectations. Indianapolis: USA Group. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED451816.

Lowenstein, M. (2005). If advising is teaching, what do advisors teach? *NACADA Journal, 25*, 65-73.

Martin, N. & Dixon, P. (1994). The effects of freshman orientation and locus of control on adjustment to college: A follow-up study. *Social Behavior and Personality, 22*, 201-208.

McArthur, R. C. (2005). Faculty-based advising: An important factor in community college retention. *Community College Review, 32*, 1-19.

McCuen, R. H., Akar, G., Gifford, I. A., & Srikantaiah, D. (2009). Recommendations for improving graduate advisor-advisee communication. *Journal of Professional Issues in Engineering Education and Practice*, 153-160.

McKewen, M. K. (2003). New perspectives on identity development. In Komives, S. R. and Woodward, D. B., Jr. Student services: A handbook for the profession (4th Ed). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mitchell, R. W., Wood, G. K., & Witherspoon, N. (2010). Considering race and space: Mapping developmental approaches for providing culturally responsive advising. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 43*, 294-309.

Myers, D. (2014). Psychology: Tenth edition in modules. Worth: New York.

Myers, B. E., & Dyer, J. E. (2005). A comparison of the attitudes and perceptions of university faculty and administrators toward advising undergraduate and graduate students and student organizations. *NACTA Journal, 49,* 34-40.

National Center for Education Statistics (2012). http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display .asp?id =40

National Center for Education Statistics (2013). http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/

indicator_cva.asp.

Noel-Levitz (2006). Five year trend study: National student satisfaction report. Iowa City.

Noel-Levitz (2012). National student satisfaction and priorities report. Iowa City.

Nunley, C. (2007). Community colleges may be losing their edge in educating adults. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 54*, B18.

Nutt, C. L. Academic Advising and Student Retention and Persistence. Retrieved from NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources website, January 25, 2014. http:// .www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Advising-and-Student -Retention-article.asp

Nutt, C. L. (2000). One-to-one advising. In V.N. Gordon & W. H. Habley (Eds.), Academic Advising: A Comprehensive Handbook. 220-237. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

O'Banion, T. (1972). An academic advising model. *Junior College Journal*, 42, 6-9.

Otten M. W. (1977). Inventory and expressive measures of locus control and academic performance: A five-year outcome study. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 41*, 644-649.

Pardee, C. F. (1994). We profess developmental advising, but do we practice it? *NACADA Journal, 14,* 59-61.

Pardee, C. (2000). Organizational models for academic advising. In Gordon, V & Habley, W. (Eds.), *Academic Advising: A Comprehensive Handbook*, 192 – 210. NJ: Wiley

Pardee, C. (2010). Organizational structures for advising. Retrieved January 25, 2014 from the Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources.

http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/ resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Organizational-Models-for-Advising.aspx.

Pascarella, E. T. & Terenzini, K. A. (1991). Twenty years of research on college students: Lessons for future research. *Research in Higher Education, 32*, 83-92.

Pascarella, E. T., and Terenzini, K. A. (2005). How college affects students: Findings and insights from thirty years of research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Phares, E. J. (1976). Locus of control in personality. Morristown; General Learning Press.

Pike, G. R. (1993). The relationship between perceived learning and satisfaction with college: An alternative view. *Research in Higher Education, 3*4, 23-40.

Propp, K. & Rhodes, S. (2006). Informing, apprising, guiding, and mentoring: Constructs underlying underclassman expectations for advising. *NACADA Journal, 26*, 46-55.

Ramanaiah, N. V. & Adams, M. (1981). Locus of control and attribution of responsibility for academic performance. *Journal of Personality Development, 45*, 309-313.

Rankin, S. R. & Reason, R. D. (2005). Differing perceptions: How students of color and white students perceive campus climate for underrepresented groups. *Journal of College Student Development, 46*, 43-61.

Rotter, J. B. & Mulry, R. C. (1965). Internal versus external control of reinforcement and decision time. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2,* 598-604.

Rotter, J. B. (1975). Some problems and misconceptions related to the construct of internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 43,* 56-67.

Ryan, M. J. (2013). Improving retention and academic achievement for first-time college students at a two-year community college. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 37,* 131-134.

Saving, K. A. & Keim, M.C. (1998). Student and advisor perceptions of academic advising in two midwestern colleges of business. *College Student Journal, 32*, 511-522.

Sedlacek, W. (2004). Beyond the big test: Non-cognitive assessment in higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Seidman, A. (1991). The evaluation of pre/post admissions counseling process at a suburban community college: Impact on student satisfaction with the faculty and the institution, retention, and academic performance. *College and University, 66,* 223-232.

Smith, J. S. (2007). Using data to inform decisions: Intrusive faculty advising at a community college. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 31,* 813-831.

Smith, C. & Allen, J. (2006). Essential functions of academic advising: What students want and get. *NACADA Journal, 2*6, 56-66.

Strayhorn, T. L. & Saddler, T. N. ((2009). Gender differences in the influence of faculty-student mentoring relationships on satisfaction with college among African-Americans. *Journal of African-American Studies, 13*, 476-493.

Sutton, K. L., & Sankar, C. (2011). Student satisfaction with information provided by academic advisors. *Journal of STEM Education, 12*, 71-85.

Thompson, D. E., Orr, B., & Grover, K. (2007). Examining student's perceptions of their

first semester experience at a major land grant institution. *College Student Journal, 42*, 276-293.

Tinto, (1993). Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student retention. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wessell, T. R., Engle, K., & Smidchens, V. (1978). Reducing attrition on the college campus, *NASPA Journal, 16*, 26-32.

Winston, R., Miller, T., & Ender, S., eds. (1982). Developmental approaches to academic advising. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wood, J., Baghurst, T., Waugh, L., & Lancaster, J. (2008). Engaging students in the academic advising process. *The Mentor*. Retrieved on February 16, 2015 from http://dus.psu.edu/mentor.

Woolston, D. C. (2002). Improving undergraduate academic advising in engineering: It's not rocket science. Proceedings of the Frontiers in Education Conference, 3, 32C/2-32.

Appendix A

Student Perceptions of Academic Advising

I- Informed Consent

INTRODUCTION

You are invited to participate in a research study regarding your perceptions and preferences of academic advising. The goal of this survey is to understand what college students' current perceptions and preferences are regarding academic advising at two-year state colleges in Minnesota, and you will be asked to answer questions about that topic. This research is being carried out be Jason Kaufman, Ph.D., Ed.D. and Wayne Whitmore, M.S. (Minnesota State University-Mankato).

PROCEDURE

If you agree to participate as a subject in this research, you will be asked to complete an electronic survey. This survey has two parts, and may take the average user 7 to 10 minutes to complete.

POTENTIAL RISKS OF PARTICIPATION

The risks of participating in this study are no more than are experienced in daily life.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS OF PARTICIPATION

There are no direct benefits for participating. College students may benefit through the increased understanding of perceptions and preferences regarding academic advising.

VOLUNTARY NATURE OF THE STUDY

Participation is voluntary. The researcher will not be able to see who responds to the survey. You have the option to not choose to participate in this research. You may stop taking the survey at any time by closing your web browser. Participation or nonparticipation will not impact your relationship with Minnesota State University, Mankato.

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY

Survey responses will be stored in an excel spreadsheet with no identifying information. Responses will be stored electronically for three years and then any data will be destroyed. It will only be available to Dr. Kaufman and Mr. Wayne Whitmore. No names or identifying information other than the name of the respective college will be recorded.

Survey responses will be anonymous. However, whenever one works with online technology there is always the risk of compromising privacy, confidentiality, and/or anonymity. If you would like more information about the specific privacy and anonymity risks posed by online surveys, please contact the Minnesota State University, Mankato

Information and Technology Services Help Desk (507-389-6654) and ask to speak to the Information Security Manager.

CONTACTS AND QUESTIONS
This research is being directed by Jason Kaufman, Ph.D., Ed.D. (Minnesota State University-Mankato). If you have any questions about the research, please contact Dr. Kaufman at 952-818-8877 or Jason.kaufman@mnsu.edu. or Mr. Wayne Whitmore at 507-389-7400 or wayne.whitmore@southcentral.edu. If you have questions about the treatment of human participants and Minnesota State University, Mankato, contact the IRB Administrator, Dr. Barry Ries, at 507-389-2321 or barry.ries@mnsu.edu.

STATEMENT OF CONSENT
Submitting the completed survey indicates your informed consent to participate in this study. Also, submission of this survey attests that I am at least 18 years of age or older. All questions that may have arisen have been answered by this document or the investigators listed above.

Please print a copy of this page for your future reference.

MSU IRBNet ID# 744828
Date of MSU IRB approval:

II- Please select your gender:

1. Male (1)
2. Female (2)

III- Which best describes your race/ethnicity?

1. White/Caucasian (1)
2. Latino/Hispanic (2)
3. Multiracial (3)
4. Black/African-American (4)
5. Asian/Pacific Islander (5)
6. Other (6)

IV- Your age?

_____ Use the slide bar to approximate your age. (1)

V- Number of semesters of college completed?

1 - 2 (1)
3 - 4 (2)
5 or more (3)

VI- Major/Intended Major?

VII- Estimate of current GPA?

_____ Uses slide bar to approximate your grade point average. (1)

VIII- How are you currently advised?

General advising/Student affairs (1)
Faculty advisor from major department (2)
A special program like TRIO or Student Support Services (3)

IX- Perceptions Survey Directions:

For each of the items in the following section, you will be reading two statements with four circles between them. Please select the circle that most closely indicates your position on the subject. Choose the answer that most closely matches your perceptions.

Question 1: My advisor takes the classes I need to take.	0 0 0 0	My advisor and I choose my classes together.
Question 2: My advisor motivates me.	0 0 0 0	My advisor does not motivate me.
Question 3: My advisor is motivated by me.	0 0 0 0	My advisor seems indifferent to me.
Question 4: My advisor ensures my requirements for graduation are met.	0 0 0 0	It is my responsibility to ensure my requirements for graduation are met.
Question 5: My advisor is responsible for making sure I graduate.	0 0 0 0	It is my responsibility to ensure I graduate.
Question 6: My advisor ensures I get into the classes I need.	0 0 0 0	It is my responsibility to ensure I get into the classes I need.
Question 7: My advisor ensures I get into the classes I want.	0 0 0 0	It is my responsibility to ensure I get into the classes I want.

Question 8: My advisor makes me feel like I can pursue any career and succeed.	0 0 0 0	My advisor makes me feel inadequate.
Question 9: My advisor ensures that I am registered for the correct classes.	0 0 0 0	It is my responsibility to ensure I am registered for the correct classes.
Question 10: My advisor will help me graduate on time.	0 0 0 0	It is my responsibility to ensure I graduate on time.
Question 11: My advisor keeps up with his/her responsibilities.	0 0 0 0	My advisor often does not keep up with his/her responsibilities.
Question 12: My advisor is available at any time during the academic year for questions.	0 0 0 0	My advisor is only available to me during the department's advising times.
Question 13: My advisor tells me what I need to take and when.	0 0 0 0	It is my responsibility to know what I need to take and when.
Question 14: My advisor is also a mentor to me.	0 0 0 0	My advisor does not mentor me.
Question 15: My advisor is more interested in research or teaching than advising.	0 0 0 0	Advising is as important to my advisor as other duties.
Question 16: My advisor allows me to individualize my schedule.	0 0 0 0	My advisor does not allow me to individualize my schedule.
Question 17: I can discuss things other than school with my advisor.	0 0 0 0	I cannot discuss things other than school with my advisor.
Question 18: My advisor helped me to develop a plan of study.	0 0 0 0	I developed my plan of study alone.
Question 19: My advisor will help me find employment after graduation.	0 0 0 0	My advisor will not help me find employment after graduation.
Question 20: My advisor enjoys advising duties.	0 0 0 0	My advisor resents his/her advising duties.
Question 21: I am concerned with	0 0 0 0	I am concerned with having

having a good schedule of classes that fit the times I want to meet.		classes I need to graduate.
Question 22: I take classes mostly because I find them interesting.	0 0 0 0	I take classes mostly because I need them to graduate.
Question 23: I chose my major because I find it interesting.	0 0 0 0	I chose my major because I thought the classes were easy.
Question 24: I chose my major because I find it interesting.	0 0 0 0	I chose my major because I needed to pick a major and finish college.
Question 25: I am interested in self-discovery.	0 0 0 0	I am interested in graduating.
Question 26: I am interested in challenging courses.	0 0 0 0	I am interested in courses that are easy to pass.
Question 27: I am interested in obtaining the skills I need for a career.	0 0 0 0	I am interested in graduating.
Question 28: I am interested in learning as much as I can about my chosen profession.	0 0 0 0	I am interested in learning what I need to "get by" and pass the class.
Question 29: I take classes based upon whether they are interesting to me.	0 0 0 0	I take classes based upon whether I have to have them to graduate.

X- Ideals Survey Directions:

For each of the items in the following section, you will be reading two statements with two circles between them. Please select the circle that most closely indicates your position on the subject.

Question 1: My advisor takes the classes I need to take.	0 0	My advisor and I choose my classes together.
Question 2: My advisor motivates me.	0 0	My advisor does not motivate me.
Question 3: My advisor is motivated	0 0	My advisor seems indifferent

by me.			to me.
Question 4: My advisor ensures my requirements for graduation are met.	0	0	It is my responsibility to ensure my requirements for graduation are met.
Question 5: My advisor is responsible for making sure I graduate.	0	0	It is my responsibility to ensure I graduate.
Question 6: My advisor ensures I get into the classes I need.	0	0	It is my responsibility to ensure I get into the classes I need.
Question 7: My advisor ensures I get into the classes I want.	0	0	It is my responsibility to ensure I get into the classes I want.
Question 8: My advisor makes me feel like I can pursue any career and succeed.	0	0	My advisor makes me feel inadequate.
Question 9: My advisor ensures that I am registered for the correct classes.	0	0	It is my responsibility to ensure I am registered for the correct classes.
Question 10: My advisor will help me graduate on time.	0	0	It is my responsibility to ensure I graduate on time.
Question 11: My advisor keeps up with his/her responsibilities.	0	0	My advisor often does not keep up with his/her responsibilities.
Question 12: My advisor is available at any time during the academic year for questions.	0	0	My advisor is only available to me during the department's advising times.
Question 13: My advisor tells me what I need to take and when.	0	0	It is my responsibility to know what I need to take and when.
Question 14: My advisor is also a mentor to me.	0	0	My advisor does not mentor me.
Question 15: My advisor is more interested in research or teaching than advising.	0	0	Advising is as important to my advisor as other duties.
Question 16: My advisor allows me to individualize my schedule.	0	0	My advisor does not allow me to individualize my schedule.

Question 17: I can discuss things other than school with my advisor.	0	0	I cannot discuss things other than school with my advisor.
Question 18: My advisor helped me to develop a plan of study.	0	0	I developed my plan of study alone.
Question 19: My advisor will help me find employment after graduation.	0	0	My advisor will not help me find employment after graduation.
Question 20: My advisor enjoys advising duties.	0	0	My advisor resents his/her advising duties.
Question 21: I am concerned with having a good schedule of classes that fit the times I want to meet.	0	0	I am concerned with having classes I need to graduate.
Question 22: I take classes mostly because I find them interesting.	0	0	I take classes mostly because I need them to graduate.
Question 23: I chose my major because I find it interesting.	0	0	I chose my major because I thought the classes were easy.
Question 24: I chose my major because I find it interesting.	0	0	I chose my major because I needed to pick a major and finish college.
Question 25: I am interested in self-discovery.	0	0	I am interested in graduating.
Question 26: I am interested in challenging courses.	0	0	I am interested in courses that are easy to pass.
Question 27: I am interested in obtaining the skills I need for a career.	0	0	I am interested in graduating.
Question 28: I am interested in learning as much as I can about my chosen profession.	0	0	I am interested in learning what I need to "get by" and pass the class.
Question 29: I take classes based upon whether they are interesting to me.	0	0	I take classes based upon whether I have to have them to graduate.

Appendix B

Data Tables

Table 1: Population Demographics

Gender	Male: 22.5% N = 40	Female: 73% N = 130	Not Reported: 4.0% N = 7			
Ethnicity	African-American: 11.9% N = 21	Caucasian: 75.7% N = 134	Hispanic/ Latino: 7.9% N = 14	Multiracial: 1.1% N = 2	Asian/Pac Island: 1.7% N = 3	Other: 1.7% N = 3
Age	Mean: 26.463	Range: 17 - 100				
Semesters Completed	Mean: 1.881	Range: 1 - 5	≤ One Semester 41% N = 72	≤ Two Semesters 30% N = 53	≥ Three Semesters 29% N = 52	
Advising Model	Faculty Advisor: 36% N = 62	General Advising: 56% N = 99	Special Programs: 9% N = 16			
Student Major	Liberal Arts: 36% N = 64	Technical: 64% N = 111	Other: 1% N = 2			

Table 2: Analysis of Hypothesis Data

Hypothesis 1: Students will show a preference for the developmental model of academic advising.

Subset:	N:	Developmental N:	Prescriptive N:	M	SD
Perceptions	177	N = 174 (98%)	N = 3 (2%)	2.261	0.48
Ideals	177	N = 177 (100%)	N = 0 (0%)	1.353	0.17

Hypothesis 2: Male students will show a preference for the prescriptive model of academic advising.

Subset:	N:	Developmental N:	Prescriptive N:	M	SD
Perceptions	40	N = 28 (69%)	N = 12 (30%)	2.281	0.1365
Ideals	40	N = 32 (79%)	N = 8 (21%)	1.362	0.0681

Hypothesis 2: Students will report their current advisors are utilizing a prescriptive model of academic advising.

Subset:	N:	Developmental N:	Prescriptive N:	M	SD
Perceptions	177	N = 134 (76%)	N = 43 (24%)	2.261	0.48
Ideals	177	N = 177 (100%)	N = 0	1.797	0.40

Table 3: Analysis of Perceptions and Ideals Subsets

Gender		
	Perceptions	X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.826, $p > 0.05$
	Ideals	X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.826, $p > 0.05$
Ethnicity		
	Perceptions	X^2 (5, N = 177) = 0.489, $p > 0.05$
	Ideals	X^2 (5, N = 177) = 0.451, $p > 0.05$
Semesters Completed		
	Perceptions	r = -0.175, $p < 0.05$
	Ideals	r = -0.074, $p > 0.05$
Current Advising Model		
	Perceptions	X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.007, $p < 0.01$**
	Ideals	X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.356, $p > 0.05$

Table 4: Preferences Analysis by Gender and Ethnicity and Individual Questions

Gender Analysis		
Question 15: My advisor is more interested in research or teaching than advising.	Advising is as important to my advisor as other duties.	X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.001, p < 0.01**
Question 24: I chose my major because I find it interesting.	I chose my major because I needed to pick a major and finish college.	X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.020, p < 0.05*
Ethnicity Analysis		
Question 21: I am concerned with having a good schedule of classes that fit the time I want to meet.	I am concerned with having classes I need to graduate.	X^2 (5, N = 177) = 0.038, p < 0.05*
Question 23: I chose my major because I find it interesting.	I chose my major because I thought the classes were easy.	X^2 (5, N = 177) = 0.001, p < 0.001**
Question 24: I am interested in obtaining the skills I need for a career.	I am interested in graduating.	X^2 (5, N = 177) = 0.013, p < 0.05*
Question 27: I am interested in learning as much as I can about my chosen profession.	I am interested in learning what I need to get by and pass the class.	X^2 (5, N = 177) = 0.010, p < 0.05*

Table 5: Preference Analysis by Semesters Completed and Current Academic Advising Model and Individual Questions

Each question is a "forced choice" with an answer of 1 or 2 denoting a preference for the first statement and an answer of 3 or 4 denoting a preference for the second statement.

Semesters Completed Analysis		
Question 6: My advisor ensures I get into the classes I need.	It is my responsibility to ensure I get into the classes I need.	$r = -0.152$, $p < 0.05$
Question 12: My advisor is available at any time during the academic year for questions.	My advisor is only available to me during the department's advising times.	$r = 0.150$, $p < 0.05$
Current Academic Advising Model Analysis		
Question 1: My advisor picks the classes I need to take.	My advisor and I choose classes together.	X^2 $(2, N = 177) = 0.035$, $p < 0.05$*
Question 2: My advisor motivates me.	My advisor does not motivate me.	X^2 $(2, N = 177) = 0.014$, $p < 0.05$*
Question 3: My advisor is motivated by me.	My advisor seems indifferent to me.	X^2 $(2, N = 177) = 0.031$, $p < 0.05$*
Question 4: My advisor ensures my requirements for graduation are met.	It is my responsibility to ensure my requirements for graduation are met.	X^2 $(2, N = 177) = 0.006$, $p < 0.01$**
Question 12: My advisor is available at any time during the academic year for questions.	My advisor is only available to me during the department's advising times.	X^2 $(2, N = 177) = 0.048$, $p < 0.05$*
Question 13: My advisor tells me what I need to take and when.	It is my responsibility to know what I need to take and when.	X^2 $(2, N = 177) = 0.047$, $p < 0.05$*
Question 14: My advisor is also a mentor to me.	My advisor does not mentor me.	X^2 $(2, N = 177) = 0.001$, $p < 0.01$**
Question 17: I can discuss things other than school with my advisor.	I cannot discuss things other than school with my advisor.	X^2 $(2, N = 177) = 0.009$, $p < 0.01$**
Question 18: My advisor helped me develop a plan of study.	I developed my plan of study alone.	X^2 $(2, N = 177) = 0.005$, $p < 0.01$**

Table 6: Ideal Analysis by Semesters Completed and Ethnicity and Individual Questions

Each question is a "forced choice" with an answer of 1 or 2 denoting a preference for the first statement or the second statement.

Semesters Completed Analysis		
Question 1: My advisor picks the classes I need to take.	My advisor and I choose classes together.	$r = 0.030$, $p < 0.05$*
Ethnicity Analysis		
Question 21: I am concerned with having a good schedule classes that fits the times I want to meet.	I am concerned with having classes I need to graduate.	X^2 $(5, N = 177) = 0.051$, $p < 0.05$*
Question 27: I am interested in obtaining the skills I need for a career.	I am interested in graduating.	X^2 $(5, N = 177) = 0.045$, $p < 0.05$*
Question 28: I am interested in learning as much as I can about my chosen profession.	I am interested in learning what I need to "get by" and passed the class.	X^2 $(5, N = 177) = 0.040$, $p < 0.05$*

Table 7: Ideal Analysis by Current Academic Model and Individual Questions

Each question is a "forced choice" with an answer of 1 or 2 denoting a preference for the first statement or the second statement.

Current Academic Advising Analysis

Question 2: My advisor motivates me.	My advisor does not motivate me.	X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.004, $p < 0.01$**
Question 3: My advisor is motivated by me.	My advisor seems indifferent to me	X^2 (2, N = 177) = 0.002, $p < 0.01$**
Question 8: My advisor makes me feel I can pursue any career and succeed.	My advisor makes me feel inadequate.	X^2 (5, N = 177) = 0.006, $p < 0.01$**
Question 11: My advisor keeps up with his/her responsibilities.	My advisor often does not keep up with his/her responsibilities.	X^2 (5, N = 177) = 0.015, $p < 0.05$*
Question 13: My advisor tells me what I need to take and when.	It is my responsibility to know what I need to take and when.	X^2 (5, N = 177) = 0.025, $p < 0.05$*
Question 14: My advisor is also a mentor to me.	My advisor does not mentor me.	X^2 (5, N = 177) = 0.001, $p < 0.01$**
Question 17: I can discuss things other than school with my advisor.	I cannot discuss things other than school with my advisor.	X^2 (5, N = 177) = 0.016, $p < 0.05$*
Question 18: My advisor helped me to develop a plan of study.	I developed my plan of study alone.	X^2 (5, N = 177) = 0.001, $p < 0.01$**
Question 19: My advisor will help me find employment after graduation.	My advisor will not help me find employment after graduation.	X^2 (5, N = 177) = 0.007, $p < 0.01$**
Question 29: I take classes based on whether they are interesting to me.	I take classes based on whether I have to have them to graduate.	X^2 (5, N = 177) = 0.049, $p < 0.05$*